



SCALE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 26972 – Columbus, Ohio 43226

Tel: 866-372-4627

Web Site: <http://www.scalemanufacturers.org>

2017 CENTRAL WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ASSOCIATION RESPONSES

1. Should retail customers be allowed to generate a bar-coded ticket with pricing information on their own, like at self-service scales used in a bulk foods area? If not, why do you prevent this type of sale?

Illinois: No reason that he knows of why they would not allow it.

Indiana: Not present.

Iowa: Allow it. We are finding that pre-packed bulk foods have tares that are not close.

Kansas: Allow it. A lot of stores have items that have tare issues. Part of the problem is that they are installed with very little clearance above the items themselves. The containers or bags are hitting framework, etc. – it's a scale installation issue. We have no thoughts as to why it would not be allowed.

Michigan: Allow it.

Minnesota: Allow it.

Missouri: Allow it.

Nebraska: Allow it.

North Dakota: Allow it.

Ohio: Not present. Tom (county): None in the county he has. We wouldn't have a problem with it if he had one. Only problem he can foresee; customer punching in a low ticket value; but he thinks the stores would eventually catch this.

South Dakota: Allow it.

Wisconsin: Allow it. Issue they've seen; items like spices where the scale is not suitable for the application.

2. Scale manufacturers have received requests to install a flush mounted weighing module in a pit. In some cases the load receiving element may be very heavy and awkward to remove, have no access covers, or is not removable at all.

Is it acceptable to place a label with the required HB 44 marking requirements on an associated terminal/display unit providing the load receiving information?

If not, how do you require the load receiving element to be marked?

Illinois: Inspectors are trained look at the CC to find out where it is tagged. State director would allow it but most inspectors would not.

Iowa: Would allow it; in fact, there are situations that require it. As long as they know it uses NTEP approved components they're okay with this.

Kansas: Allow it; already have some like this. Biggest concern; scales that are newly installed – they like to verify information this when it is installed. After that, most large to medium capacity scales have a secondary marking sticker on the indicator that has the WLRE information on it. It is best to verify this on new installations

Michigan: Allow it.

Minnesota: Allow it with a supplementary declaration. Have concerns with verifying that things have been changed after the fact (like loadcells). Question: Couldn't the loadcells communicate with the indicator and send their information to the indicator? Then you could use that even for things like truck scales and keep people out of pits, etc. Today, you could ask for a variance to do this and she would work with everyone to allow it.

Missouri: Allow it.

Nebraska: Would have to verify the equipment during initial installation, and then require a supplementary document.

North Dakota: Allow it.

Ohio: Not Present. Tom (county): No problem with it; would like to check it in initial installation.

South Dakota: No problem with it, but if they're going to place information somewhere, it needs to be permanent, not on an indicator that can be changed.

Wisconsin: Allow it.

2017 NORTHEAST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ASSOCIATION RESPONSES

1. Should retail customers be allowed to generate a bar-coded ticket with pricing information on their own, like at self-service scales used in a bulk foods area? If not, why do you prevent this type of sale?

Connecticut: Allow it; they are presently available in "Stop 'n Shop"s. No objections.

Maine: Already have them; allow it. Don't see downside to consumers; the store takes risk. The stores typically have good instructions on how to operate the scale; they provide a PLU number for each product, etc. It makes sense; it speeds up the checkout process.

Massachusetts: Yes, retailers will take steps to ensure customers won't take advantage of them. Plus, the weight can be verified at the checkout lane.

New Hampshire: Yes, we allow it. Don't see downside to consumers; the store takes risk.

New Jersey: allows it.

New York: allows it.

Pennsylvania: Yes we allow it, but we've run across store owners disabling some functionality of the scales to prevent consumers from resetting zero, etc. So, they allow it, but the scale must be completely functional.

Vermont: allows it.

2. Scale manufacturers have received requests to install a flush mounted weighing module in a pit. In some cases the load receiving element may be very heavy and awkward to remove, have no access covers, or is not removable at all.

Is it acceptable to place a label with the required HB 44 marking requirements on an associated terminal/display unit providing the load receiving information?

If not, how do you require the load receiving element to be marked?

Connecticut: This presents a lot of difficulty as regulator; would take this on a case by case basis.

Maine: If there is an access panel so the components can be verified, we would allow it. If deck could be lifted even with forklift it would be okay. If not, we would not allow it. We want to be able to check that the components are NTEP certified. Simply having it shown on an indicator is not good enough.

Massachusetts: Yes, if the label is in a visible location. Otherwise, it would have to be as NTEP requires.

New Hampshire: We have concerns with the label being on an indicator; the indicator might perhaps be changed out since it is not permanent – then what? If device was being installed and it could be verified at that time; okay. But if the label is simply placed on something associated with it; not okay.

New Jersey: Emphatic NO. The nomenclature plate has to be on the device; however as technology advances, a case by case basis can be considered.

New York: No. The concern is that indicator will be switched out and that info would be lost. Would allow a tooled access plate (flush to the surface), etc. The label needs to be on load receiving element.

Pennsylvania: No. We would hope to be able to verify it during installation. Technology advancements might make it okay someday. We would need to evaluate on a case by case basis.

Vermont: Would take this on a case by case basis. Possibly would allow it; if the label could not easily be switched in and out.

2017 SOUTHERN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ASSOCIATION RESPONSES

1. Should retail customers be allowed to generate a bar-coded ticket with pricing information on their own, like at self-service scales used in a bulk foods area? If not, why do you prevent this type of sale?

Arkansas: No reason to prohibit. If we started getting complaints we might review it, but see no problems with it.

Florida: No problem with it unless there were complaints; Weight could be verified at checkout.

Georgia: We would not have a problem with it.

Kentucky: We allow it now.

Louisiana: Would allow it.

Maryland: No problem.

Mississippi: No problem. If we saw a problem we would look into it.

North Carolina: Would allow it; could not prohibit it. Concerned about customers taking tare/taking the proper product if self-labelled (i.e. switching products for a cheaper one).

South Carolina: Would allow it and would address any issues as they arise. Would need to be an NTEP approved scale.

Tennessee: We allow it; it's a business decision. We would address any issues if they arise.

Virginia: No problem with it; same as others.

West Virginia: No issues and would allow it.

2. Scale manufacturers have received requests to install a flush mounted weighing module in a pit. In some cases the load receiving element may be very heavy and awkward to remove, have no access covers, or is not removable at all.

Is it acceptable to place a label with the required HB 44 marking requirements on an associated terminal/display unit providing the load receiving information?

If not, how do you require the load receiving element to be marked?

Arkansas: Would allow it. Have no problem with label on the indicator. Potential problem with digital solution; we won't let our guys just "start pushing buttons." If help/instructions are not available during a phone call, the scale would be tagged, unless the scale operator can access the information. Don't want State guys tied up messing with it.

Florida: Agree with Arkansas. No problem with it in either scenario (label or digital), although we want to see some way to verify that the WLRE is the same one that's listed. Maybe a visible serial number on the load receiving element that matches the plate so you can verify their pairing is okay.

Georgia: Agree with Florida/Arkansas. No problem as long as the information is readily available.

Kentucky: No problem but users might change the indicator or the load receiving element and not let the manufacturer know and you might lose the ID info that way.

Louisiana: Agree with others; load receiving element should be marked so it can be matched and verified.

Maryland: Want to see how to electronically access the information on the indicator CC. We will allow a second label on the indicator.

Mississippi: Would rather see data plate, but as long as the inspector can access the information in a reasonable amount of time, it's okay.

North Carolina: If it had a duplicate label that would be fine. Education would be a challenge. Note it on placed in service report (i.e. placed label on indicator, etc.). We prefer a data label on the load receiving element.

South Carolina: Would allow it case by case.

Tennessee: Would allow it. Want ability to access the information by inspectors to verify everything.

Virginia: If the labels must match we would allow it.

West Virginia: If the labels must match we would allow it.

2017 WESTERN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES RESPONSES

1. Should retail customers be allowed to generate a bar-coded ticket with pricing information on their own, like at self-service scales used in a bulk foods area? If not, why do you prevent this type of sale?

Alaska: We haven't seen it, but would have concerns with customer manipulations.

Arizona: Nothing in our laws prevents it. We would expect issues but they could be worked out. A possible issue might be multiple tare containers.

California: Yes we would allow it; we don't consider it a detriment. It would be like the Scan and Go system in Wal-Mart. It's the store's risk and responsibility. The equipment is still type evaluated, and you can check the printed receipts.

Colorado: Our Law does not currently prohibit this type of sale. The scale in this scenario would be considered commercially used and the owner would be required to obtain a license

Idaho: Nothing in code to prevent this.

Montana: Nothing in code to prevent this.

New Mexico: We would not prohibit this.

Oregon: Yes, the content of the barcode label and the signage in the bulk section must, of course, be sufficient so that the customer can verify that the correct label is printed for the desired product and that the correct unit price is included.

Utah: Nothing in our code to prohibit this. We have concerns, and have found these systems in stores. Need to consider the type of scale for suitability, also the scale settling in an appropriate amount of time and returning to zero. The customer is not educated; there would be times when they get cheated, or the owner gets cheated.

Washington: Nothing in our code to prohibit this. The risks are to the businesses so that's acceptable.

2. Scale manufacturers have received requests to install a flush mounted weighing module in a pit. In some cases the load receiving element may be very heavy and awkward to remove, have no access covers, or is not removable at all.

Is it acceptable to place a label with the required HB 44 marking requirements on an associated terminal/display unit providing the load receiving information?

If not, how do you require the load receiving element to be marked?

Alaska: Okay if NTEP will allow it. Inspectors have to put device in service; so they would see the information then.

Arizona: It might be better if the information was designated in an NTEP approval. We would accept on terminal.

California: No. GS1, etc. in HB44 are clear; marking shall be visible after installation. UR2.3 says owner shall supply labor to make it visible. An option; California wouldn't test it if the seal wasn't visible.

Colorado: We will allow it, the information can be labeled on the terminal or display as long as it was clear as to what the manufacturer's labels referred to.

Idaho: Would consider on a case-by-case basis. We wouldn't prohibit it (see HB44 GS7).

Montana: We would allow it, assuming a secondary label would be there.

Nevada: We may accept, but would review on a case by case basis.

New Mexico: We would allow it; we would get the labor to lift it if needed.

Oregon: No, we would not allow. G-S.1. requires that the load receiving element be marked as a component of the system which is metrologically significant.

Utah: No, would not allow. Require markings to be visible.

Washington: Would consider on a case-by-case basis. We would also be open to looking at other documentation.