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Willard Sickles (InterMetro Industries Corp)  Burl Finkelstein (Kason Industries)
Theodore Barber (Theodore Barber & Company)  Tiffany Curry (Franke Contract Group)
Gary Maxon (The Delfield Co)

Absent Members:
Mike Kohler (NSF International)  Tony Gagliardi (Consultant)
Paul Klouse (Southern Nevada Health District)  Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Foodservice)
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Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1) FE-2015-4 - Caps and Lids.pdf

Discussion
J. Brady welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A. Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Nine of the 14 voting members were present (64%) representing a quorum.


J. Brady confirmed the only listed item for discussion was the new issue paper submitted by M. Kohler and read off M. Kohler’s historical background on the issue paper (FE-2015-4):

NSF has historically viewed the interface between a tight fitting cap/lid and the walls of a jar/container as being outside of the food zone and not subject to the radius requirement. All other exposed angles inside of the cap/lid would be subject to the radius requirement. Many NSF Food Equipment Standards offer an allowance for lesser radii where necessary to ensure proper functioning of parts (e.g. sealing ring grooves or precision operating parts) but NSF 2 does not offer this allowance. Perhaps some language could be added to boilerplate to address caps/lids to provide further clarity to all users of the standards.

Since M. Kohler was absent from the meeting, J. Brady confirmed he and M. Kohler had exchanged messages regarding this subject and wanted to point out a few things. He confirmed M. Kohler is looking for clarity on these, not specific criteria and read off the questions he asked as well as M. Kohler’s answers to the questions.
J. Brady’s questions:
1. With your recommendation of adding the commonly used lesser radii allowance in 5.2.1.3 the type container you have pictured would fall within that allowance, correct?
2. Are there container/lids that you are aware of that are currently NSF approved that would no longer meet the criteria if 5.2.1.3 were added? I wouldn’t think so since you are only looking for clarity, not added criteria.

M. Kohler’s answers:
1. The product pictured in the information paper would fall into this allowance.
2. This addition to Standard 2 would not affect currently certified products.

J. Brady confirmed that similar language regarding lesser radii is already located in several other Food Equipment Standards, including 4, 6, 8, 12, 18, and 169. He then added that language in each was somewhat different for 2 reasons:

1. Some specific language is important per each standard
2. Boiler plate language had not been development yet

M. Kohler advised him that making the language consistent between the Standards was important, but asked it be pursued separately from this issue paper. J. Brady then read off M. Kohler’s proposed new language as the group evaluated on ReadyTalk.com:

5.2.1.3 Lesser radii be may used only when necessary to ensure proper functioning of parts (such as sealing ring grooves for caps and lids or precision operating parts) provided they are easily cleanable.

J. Brady then opened up the discussion to the Group

M. Perez asked if this is a case where the term “lesser radii” is used because the items cannot be manufactured without, or because this is the way it’s always been done. J. Brady confirmed that M. Kohler is seeking clarity because nothing has been attributed in Standard 2 in the past, and the statement “only when necessary” suggests a physical limitation and would fall under Section 5.2.3, to which M. Perez stated the operative words should then be “provided they are easily cleanable”

W. Sickles said he had no issue with the proposal, but pointed out the typo: “be may” should read “may be”. The group agreed and A. Rose made the change.

M. Perez to J. Brady: within the historical background you read at the beginning, should this group consider including anything here as a splash zone. If so, than an exception should not be needed.
J. Brady said if you look at the third sentence . . .

Many NSF Food Equipment Standards offer an allowance for lesser radii where necessary to ensure proper functioning of parts (e.g. sealing ring grooves or precision operating parts) but NSF 2 does not offer this allowance.

M. Kohler is suggesting we need this type of allowance because there are types of equipment that require this allowance.

Additionally, if we look at the photos included there are parts required for the cap to function properly. This explains where the exemption would apply and not apply. A. Rose pulled up the photo and the group discussed the two different zones.

M. Perez confirmed that discussion answered his question.

There were no additional comments and J. Brady asked for a vote on current wording. There were no oppositions to the wording and the group agreed to send this to straw ballot to solicit comments from the members absent at today’s teleconference.

**Action items:**

1) A. Rose to complete straw ballot and execute once the meeting summary was complete.

Meeting adjourned