

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
May 4, 2021**

<p>This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.</p>

Participating Members:

Swati Bhatt	Los Angeles County
Millicent Crenshaw	Cambro
Burl Finkelstein (Chair).....	Kason Industries
Tony Gagliardi.....	Consultant – Public Health/Regulatory
Beth Glynn	Starbucks Coffee Company
Mike Kohler	NSF International
Bob Kuhn.....	Carlisle
Dipak Negandhi.....	A. O. Smith Water Products Division
Massoud Neshan	Arneg USA
Katita Olivarez.....	City of San Marcos Environmental Health
Michael Perez	Baring Industries
Syed Rizvi	Cornelius, Inc
Luis Rodriguez	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Sarah Stryker	The Delfield Co.

Absent Members:

Tiffany Curry.....	Franke Foodservice Solutions, Inc.
Willard Sickles.....	InterMetro Industries Corp.

Participating Observers:

Cheryl Appel.....	Manitowoc Foodservice
Giorgio Beretta	Anima
Rex Brandt	Taylor Company
Eric Basseur.....	Little Caesars Enterprises
Robert Casey	Publix
Bob Corrao.....	J.M. Smucker Co.
Trevor Fleshman	DoorDash
Scott Gurley	DeRodo, LLC
Cullen Hackler.....	Porcelain Enamel Institute
Joel Hipp	Hobart
John Hockaday	Auto-Chlor System
Matt Jenkins	McDonalds
Ron McCullough.....	Bizerba USA Inc.
Danielle Melaragno	Intertek
Brent Miller	Dairy Queen
Eric Moore	Testo Solutions USA, Inc.
David Parker	Coca-Cola
Howard Ricketts	Hoshizaki America
Mark Sanford.....	Unified Brands
John Scanlon	Hatco Corp.
Stephen Schaefer	Hoshizaki America
Nick Snyder.....	Randell Manufacturing, Inc.
Charlie Souhrada	NAFEM
Andy Stadick	Great Scrape
Nick Unger.....	Intertek
Joe Wallace.....	A. O. Smith Water Products Division

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
May 4, 2021**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Discussion

B.Finkelstein welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Zeoli read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. 14 of the 17 voting members were present (82%) which represented a quorum.

To begin the meeting, B.Finkelstein asked for motions to accept the previous meeting summary and agenda for today:

Motion: M.Neshan, accept the previous summary
Second: M.Perez
Discussion None
Vote: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
Motion: Carries

Motion: M.Neshan, accept today's agenda
Second: B.Glenn
Discussion None
Vote: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
Motion: Carries

Topic #1 – Warewashing Hot Food Holding Thermometers – 2i41

B.Finkelstein: Passed on straw ballot, no one has any further discussion. Ready to go to JC ballot.

Topic #2 – Wooden BBQ Grill Grate Scrapers – 2i42

B.Finkelstein: Issue proponent has given new language asking to allow the use of wood to scrape BBQ grill grates. Wire brushes have the issue of coming off and the pieces of wire are a health hazard if they get into food and are ingested. Asking for revision to Section 4.5 to allow wooden BBQ grill grate scrapers. Also means a revision to NSF 51. B.Finkelstein opens floor to discussion.

T.Johnson: Is the request is limited to a certain group or species of woods?

A.Stadick (issue proponent): The discussion has been centered around the hardness scale of the wood and the tightness of the grain. The push is to hit the qualifications that there are no further complications down the road. There is no specific species, but there are woods such as hickory and red oak that meet current specifications. Asking to apply current criteria for cutting boards and bakers tables to the grill scraper. Historically, wood grill scrapers are made of one solid piece of wood, so shear testing would not be applicable. Issue paper is shown for review.

M.Perez: Rather than specifying the type of wood, would it be better to reference the hardness scale so that any wood that met the hardness scale would qualify? We use things like this in other standards to determine a threshold, then the specific type of material doesn't matter.

T.Johnson: This section references wood cutting boards and bakers tables, which are not subjected to high temperature heat from a grill. Pieces of charred wood could get on the grill rather than wire.

A.Stadick: We've sold many of these items over time, even if a sliver of wood did get on the grill grate, it would burn and disintegrate.

T.Johnson: As long as there're no varnish or chemical treatment to the wood and it's already meeting existing specifications in the section, I don't see how there is an additional hazard.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
May 4, 2021**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

B.Corrao: We need to make sure that we're covering for varnish in a noncontact area like the handle, or ink for a brand name.

R.Hall: Should this be broader to address any wooden utensil used so the section doesn't need to keep being modified in the future?

T.Johnson: This is specifically a utensil to be used to clean a very hot cooking surface, so there are no microbial hazards.

M.Perez: Are the grill scrapers made of one piece of wood or multiple pieces glued together?

A.Stadick: Single piece.

M.Perez: Modify to add that scrapers should be single piece without glue with no varnishes so there is no reaction with the high heat.

B.Corrao: Cautions against saying single piece because someone may have a wooden utensil that screws into a handle.

T.Gagliardi: Why are we specifying BBQ grills rather than just the grill grate?

M.Perez: Requirements would probably go under Section 4.5 rather than Section 6 Performance.

B.Kuhn: Question on NSF 51, why was the wording "wood shall not be used in a food zone" used in the first place?

M.Kohler: Standards set out to restrict the use of wood in the first place for sanitary reasons (wood shall not be used in a food zone) Exceptions: wood cutting boards meeting criteria and wood top bakers tables.

B.Finkelstein: Suggests adding to Section 4.5 – Grill grate scrapers should be one piece of wood without glue, varnish, or finish.

M.Kohler: One way to look at this is the grill grate scraper is its own niche-type item that's not as common as cutting board or bakers table. This type of unique application of a utensil doesn't need to comply with the rest of wood requirements and spell out requirements for it specifically in NSF 2 and excuse it from the language in some of the sections in NSF 51. Leave other wood requirements alone.

There is general agreement that this is a good idea. The issue proponent says this satisfies him.

Action Item: M.Perez will draft up language, M.Kohler will help if needed. To be sent out later as a straw ballot.

B.Kuhn: Keep in mind that there are definitions for a hardwood (maple, oak) so the word hardwood covers requirements as far as sheer testing goes, so sheer testing may not need to be addressed.

D.Melaragno: Suggest incorporating definition of hardwood into NSF 170.

Topic #3 – Casters – 2i39

B.Finkelstein: Issue paper initially presented at 2019 JC F2F. We talked about it at the 1/12/20 TG meeting where it was sent to straw ballot with results of 4:7:1 (yes : no : abstain). Asked issue proponent to redesign proposal to fit the standard to eliminate the need for an exemption. Negative comments were presented to group and a discussion was opened.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
May 4, 2021**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

T.Johnson: Were instructions provided for how casters should be cleaned?

S.Gurley (proponent): Instructions for ease of cleaning are pretty much moot considering what has been discussed.

M.Perez: Can we discuss comments that came from ballot and have S.Gurley reply?

D.Negandhi: I felt like there was not enough information to say that the casters can be cleaned in a proper way similar to other food zones. It seems difficult to clean the design that was presented.

M.Perez: The product should be designed and manufactured to meet the standard, not the other way around, unless there is no other way and an exemption might be in order.

S.Gurley: This was designed long ago. The idea of a redesign is possible, but they don't feel that NSF approval is worth the effort.

D.Negandhi: You have not shown that if the equipment is soiled by mopping, etc., that the design is easily cleanable.

S.Gurley: We are working on a cover that would help and an insert that would fasten into place. Cleaning would be the same as any other caster that sits on the floor. Two scenarios (1) complete redesign and new product or (2) modification of current product.

D.Negandhi: Manufacturers redesign all the time to meet NSF requirements.

L.Rodriguez: Gov't standards try not to put exemptions, and I agree that it's better not to add more exemptions and to advise the manufacturer on how to better comply with the standard.

K.Olivarez, B.Finkelstein, and S.Stryker: My comments are in line with the others.

Motion: M.Perez, Motion to table issue paper until proponent can come back with better design or method to overcome the negative comments.

Second: T.Johnson

Discussion: M.Kohler: Are we really tabling this issue paper, or are we saying that we are dismissing it?

Motion: M.Perez, withdraw motion

Second: T.Johnson, withdraw second

Motion: D.Negandhi, motion to reject issue paper due to the rationale given in negative comments received on ballot

Second: T.Johnson

Discussion: S.Gurley: clarifying question – If we modify current design to clarify sanitary issues do, we pick up where we are leaving off, and if we do a complete redesign to, we start over?

M.Kohler: That's a certification question, you'll need to consult your account manager.

M. Perez: If product is redesigned and it now meets standard, it doesn't need to come back to group.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
May 4, 2021**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Vote: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
Motion: Carries

Topic #4 – Glass and Ceramic Dinnerware – 2i32

B.Glynn (Issue proponent): Trying to get language finalized with Kohler to get this ready for straw ballot. When we did testing for lead on glassware that had been purchased and were being used in retail food service establishments, we found it exceeded FDA food requirements. The more we tested, we found we were having problems with heavy metal content and cracking/breaking. Instead of doing all testing ourselves, we would like to incorporate into NSF standard so when we buy NSF certified products, we know that they meet requirements.

C.Hackler: I'm surprised that lead is being found because no one in US makes glass with lead anymore. Would be willing to discuss with Beth more offline.

Perez: There are two issue papers that you may want to give consideration. One is glass and thermometers, some of the language being considered is that the impact test be conducted on the same glass formulation and thick ness as the finished product. Another currently tabled issue paper has to do with allowable lead content in food contact zones. Tabled because FDA has also been petitioned, so we tabled until FDA decides what they want to do with it, but I'm sure it will come back at a later date.

B.Glynn: That's helpful, had discussion with Matt from SGS, we will go back and see if there is anything, we can pull in from those into this issue paper.

B.Corrao: Feels NSF shouldn't get too involved in breakage because it doesn't have to do with sanitation. Did you contact UL about any standard related to personal injury?

B.Glynn: We have worked with SGS for years, looking as to how to propose language for NSF to prevent broken glass from ending up in ice, other foods. We hope to focus on sanitation piece but also durability to reduce breakage on product that already exists. It may not be what we want in use, but it is in use, so we need to make it as safe as possible.

M.Kohler: I still think this is food safety related in the context in which it is proposed, because it addresses broken glass in consumables.

T.Johnson: We can look at European (ISO) standards that might be worth looking at to help better define hazards and contributing risk factors.

C.Hackler: We're broad brushing the words "heavy metals." Products in the US don't allow heavy metals. The alternatives to glass, say plastics, there are chemicals in that material which are even greater health risks when they leach out.

B.Glynn: A lot of retail food service operations don't always use US manufacturers. Looking for something to meet a certain baseline standard regardless of where the product comes from.

Action Item: B.Glynn, M.Kohler and M.MaGarrity will draft up language. To be sent out later as a straw ballot.

Motion: D.Negandhi, Motion to adjourn
Second: T.Johnson

Meeting adjourned