Participating members:
Jim Brady (Wawa, Inc.)
Burl Finkelstein (Kason Industries)
Tony Gagliardi (Consultant – Public Health)
Dipak Negandhi (Royal Vendors, Inc.)
Paul Klouse (Southern Nevada Health District)
Michael Perez (Baring Industries)
Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Bill Sickles (InteroMetro Industries Corp)
George Zawacki (CAD Solutions Group, Inc.)

Absent members:
Theodore Barber (Theodore Barber & Company)
Tiffany Curry (Franke Contract Group)
Gary Maxon (Delfield)
Paul Sico (Carbone Metal Fabricators, Inc.)

Secretariat:
Jessica Evans (NSF).

Participating observers:
Kevin Smith (FDA)

Supplemental Materials Referenced

Discussion
J. Brady welcomed everyone. J. Evans read the anti-trust statement and took roll call. Nine of the 14 voting members were present (64%) representing a quorum.

Hood Filters
J. Brady began the meeting with a review of where the previous meeting ended with discussions regarding hood filters. Stated “what we decided to do was to take the basic recommendation from J. Brania and use the wording “primary” rather than “exposed” section 5.52.1, so there was no need for an additional definition.” J. Brady then read 5.52.1 in its entirety and asked if anyone had any further comments.

G. Zawacki stated the 2nd sentence is misleading. Currently reads "metal OR mesh constructed filters should not be used". Suggested the group remove the word "or". The group agreed.

Question from P. Klouse: “would this particular language change, or any of the language currently used in the standard, preclude the use of removable, disposable after market ‘wool’ type filters placed in front of the hood type filters integral to the hood system?”
Several minutes of discourse followed with several members discussing including:

1) Old UL test for draining off a certain amount of grease
2) The purpose of adding this filter (reduce frequency of cleaning)
3) The many features of these disposable filters

It was agreed that

1) These now become the “exposed” filter,
2) They do not pass certification based on the current language, and
3) Changing the language of the standard to accept these filters is not what the group should be doing.

D. Negandhi commented that the filter language is pretty clear and there was no need to change. The group agreed.

G. Zawacki commented that the second and third sentences also had the ambiguous term “should not be used”. The group agreed that the term “should” needs to be replaced with “shall”.

J. Brady then read a summary of the items the group agreed upon.

The changes are to be circulated in the typical manner with Strikeouts and highlights before balloting.

"Metal mesh constructed filters shall not be used”. Change the wording to "the exposed filter shall be self-draining and designed and manufactured to be pressure cleaned". Wording will circulate to the group through the minutes with the additional details on the section of the standard, before it is put into ballot.

**Hollow Handles for Cutlery**

J. Brady moved the group to this agenda item.

M. Kohler provided several minutes of update regarding this issue. Said he originally presented the paper based on feedback of an individual (not named) within the equipment industry that he planned to meet at the NRA show, but the individual never showed.

G. Zawacki - said that there were 15-20 cutlery manufacturers at NRA, none of which had any hollow handled items. J. Brady, M. Perez and M. Kohler visited various manufacturers at NAFEM (at least 15) and were unable to collect any samples of products with hollow handles.

J. Brady asked the group: what are the next steps to move this issue forward?

M. Kohler stated he still feels that this is a safety issue worth exploring. At the show he visited several exhibitors that manufacture cutlery, but none of them were using hollow handles. Lacking immediate direction, M. Kohler stated the issue shouldn't be dropped. The group still needs research to be done to include some requirements of handles, specifically to possibly not allow hollow handles to be used at
all. Reason - over time, a seal could break down and the hollow reservoir could fill with liquid becoming contaminated in the process.

Consensus of group: More information is needed to make a decision than possessed today.

Considerations:
1) Hollow handles as being referred to could also mean moisture trapped between rubber sleeves and solid handles
2) Are sealants to be allowed in non-welded and capped handles? (K.Smith said they should not)
3) Difficult to establish objective criteria because there are still no examples of hollow handles in cutlery let alone documented cases of foodborne illness associated with this.

Next steps:
1) M.Kohler to work on wording to be added to the standard. The wording will be a starting point for the group to discuss and work on together. Wording to be proposed will include non-cutlery items as well like ice cream scoops, whisks, tongs, ladles, etc.
2) Possibly form a sub-task group for this and/or approach cutlery manufacturers for participation.

**Stove Shoe Type Products**

J.Brady introduced this subject with an explanation of the review of M.Kohler’s Proposals. M.Kohler explained the proposals whereby proposal 1 has rollers, gliders and casters grouped together and proposal 2 has rollers and gliders together, but separates out casters. Current standard has this all grouped together.

M.Perez commented that the term “rollers and gliders” are terms commonly used on drawers and drawer tracks. Feels this term might confuse when drawers and drawer tracks are located in food zones. When the terms are grouped together as currently (proposal 1) it is obvious due to the context. M.Kohler confirmed that these terms were intended to 1) support a piece of equipment and 2) allow said equipment to be mobile.

Several minutes of discourse ensued with all present members contributing input. B.Sickles read aloud the current NSF 170 definition of caster, additionally stating that there is currently no recognized definition for the term roller. M.Perez agreed that if 1) the term “roller” was removed from the language and 2) the term “glider” was defined, the remaining terms, “caster” and “glider” would be appropriate to group together in one combined section. B.Finkelstein agreed to come up with a definition for the term “gliders” to present to the group for discussion at the next meeting.

J. Brady Proposed to the group: to remove the term "rollers" from the standard. There were no objections from the group.
J. Brady then led the group back to M. Kohler’s proposal 2 to discuss the remaining language. M. Perez suggested the removal of the word “auxiliary” since the group would be defining the term glider as well as adding the term “and/or pockets” to the current term of “recesses”. The group was in agreement.

B. Finkelstein then asked should we add a statement that says these gliders must meet the leg requirements? M. Kohler reminded the group that there are separate requirements for “legs” in the standard and they do not go away with the “glider” definition”. Several minutes of discussion ensued whereby the group agreed that any piece of equipment meeting the standard for a roller glider must also still meet the requirement for legs and feet. M. Kohler suggested adding the statement to 5.22.4: “will meet the requirements of 5.21.3”. The group ultimately agreed the ownership is on the manufactures for how 5.21.3 will be met.

J. Brady thanked everyone for their participation in this very productive task group and the meeting was adjourned.

**Action Item(s):**

1) Prepare to review cutlery on the next call
2) B. Finkelstein to propose definition of gliders for discussion at next call