Discussion

W. Sickles welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A. Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Ten of the 13 voting members were present (77%) which represented a quorum.

**Topic #1 – Issue FE-2015-8 – Organic Coating, Heated Splash Zones**

W. Sickles provided a quick background of the issue, including some correspondence he and the issue proponent held since the previous teleconference. Specifically, the 2 of them had made some suggested updates to the proposed language. J. Brania indicated that the there is a definition in 170 for *heated food zone* that is quite specific when regarding to the temperature of 180F, and sometimes it’s tied together inaccurately with the definition of *splash zone* which does not require maintenance of a specific temperature:
3.231.3 **heated food zone:** Food zone surfaces that maintain a minimum temperature of 180 °F (82 °C) during normal operation.

3.231.7 **splash zone:** Equipment surfaces, other than those in a food zone, that are subject to splash, spillage, or other food soiling during operation of the equipment.

J.Brania confirmed the purpose of this proposed new definition is to add clarity between and among these other definitions.

W.Sickles added that there is a caveat to this discussion and development in that the use of the term *heated food zones* only appears in Standard 4, and *heat resistant* may be used elsewhere once it’s created. W.Sickles then opened the floor for comment.

S.Tackitt suggested one way to overcome the caveat is to add a statement to the new definition that may suggest “unless specified in other standards”. This would provide a possible exception in the future if necessary. Jonathan confirmed he had no objection to that, however if that is done, *heated splash zones* will have to be related back.

With that, the group evaluated the language currently suggested, including (1) the added words from W.Sickles and Jonathan since the previous meeting in grey, and (2) the suggestion from S.Tackitt just made in Red

3.XX **Heat resistant** – Unless defined specifically in other standards, A surface characteristic whereby the material is capable of maintaining its original surface characteristics when exposed to the heat typical for that application. The heat may be from generated by a heated appliance itself; or can be an external surface of an appliance that may be result from contacted by with heated implements and/or heated appliances.

M.Kohler said the crux of the heated splash zone is to point out the importance to temperature relative to coatings, specifically so heat doesn’t affect or introduce new zones unintentionally. To this he suggested simply adjusting the definition of *heated splash zone*, rather than creating a new one for *heat resistant.* J.Brania agreed that would work as well, adding that heated splash zones also appears in table 6.3 of Standard 51.

W.Sickles asked if this definition would go into 170 or 51, to which M.Kohler said with this proposal it would eliminate the need for the new definition entirely. S.Tackitt said he supports this as it adds clarity.

**Motion, M.Kohler**  M.Kohler and J.Brania to rework the language in 51 as described here, and send to task group straw ballot

**Second:**  S.Burton-Zick

**Discussion:**  J.Brania said this may be as simple as changing one or two words in heated splash zones. M.Perez asked if this would also result in the elimination of the
definition for “heat resistant”, to which M.Kohler confirmed it would, adding that we wouldn’t need that definition by changing a couple words in heated splash zone

Vote: all in favor; opposed none; abstentions none
Motion: Carries

Action Item:
J.Brania and M.Kohler to rework definition language for 51
A.Rose to send new language to TG straw ballot

W.Sickles asked if there were any other comments

Michael asked the group to circle back to the original issue paper regarding the proposal to add a ‘note’, asking the group and issue proponent to confirm if that also goes away by virtue of this discussion.

NOTE – For heated splash zone surfaces, organic coatings used on corrosion resistant substrates shall be exempt from heat resistance testing.

J.Brania confirmed as issue proponent that the subject of heat resistance was not included when language was updated several years ago, and he put it in the issue paper because he wanted the group to discuss.

M.Kohler suggested there are 2 items to consider here:
1) One is the terminology of the temperature from the heated food zone and tying it to another application without a specific temperature, and
2) Whether the heat resistant test should be applicable for coated materials that are in and of themselves corrosion resistant.

M.Kohler confirmed this language was last updated in 2009, and explained the group agreed that the abrasion test should be exempt because any abrading would result in exposing a smooth, non-corrosive material. Conversely, the TG felt strongly that the impact testing should remain because chipping could result in pockets and could become a cleanability issue; much the same way with heat resistance, the situation exists where the coating might fail due to heat and the coating might not be smooth (e.g. blister), leading to cleanability issues.

B.Finkelstein asked and M.Kohler confirmed that heat resistance would be similar to impact exemption. M.Kohler added that if we choose NOT to exempt, we may still want to clarify the terminology. If we decide to exempt we’ll need to work out additional definitions.

M.Perez asked J.Brania to explain the rationale of this exemption, and he confirmed that some time back, the previous language was dialed back into the existing note and he felt it wasn’t strongly discussed at the time. He added that the note itself lies at the end of subsection 6.2, but only relates to 6.2.2.2 so there’s at least ambiguity. He asked if this can be moved and A.Rose explained that from a process standpoint, a ‘note’ is
not normative and we can move this without balloting. M.Kohler recalled it was put there because it was the end of the section, and moving it would add clarity as this note is very specific to 6.2.2.2.

At this point, J.Brania confirmed that based on the discussion, if the group agreed to move the note he would take no action regarding the note proposal in the Issue paper, thus the concern is addressed.

Motion, J.Brania: Move to take no action on expanding the note language under 6.2.2.4 to include the heated splash zone surfaces. Also at the same time, would like to move the existing language immediately following section 6.2.2.2.

Second: S.Tackitt
Discussion: none
Vote: all in favor; opposed none; abstentions none
Motion: Carries

Action Item:
A.Rose to update during the next publication

**Topic #2 – Issue FE-2015-6 – Solid Surfacing Materials**

W.Sickles provided brief history, recapping the TG meeting in May 2016, and asked J.Spencer if there was anything to add to his issue paper. J.Spencer said that after the previous meetings and talking with M.Kohler as well, the easiest and most straightforward way to deal with this would be to add a statement like “all solid surface materials shall meet food zone requirements”; M.Kohler agreed, and S.Burton-Zick added that if a material is food zone approved, then it’s fairly likely to be splash zone approved.

J.Spencer reminded the group that certificates of these materials are not specific to the zones where these apply and so there are circumstances where materials not certified for a food zone may end up there. If the language is added specific to the standard, it would add clarity.

W.Sickles asked the group to discuss the best way to accomplish this. M.Kohler said at this point, what we are talking about is a one line addition of language, which may be as simple as “smooth, corrosion resistant, non-toxic, sold surface materials shall meet all food zone requirements”. This statement shouldn’t get into impact and durability testing however.

M.Perez said that solid surfacing material is a generic term and maybe should be defined specifically. M.Kohler agreed that this group will need to define what solid surfacing is, adding that there are other requirements in Standard 51 that would not pass food zone requirements for other reasons, leading to a brief discussion regarding cement based, and non-compliance due to porous reasons.

M.Perez asked M.Kohler where the type of counters this material would typically be seen, specifically food or splash zones. M.Kohler said there are a wide variety of these zones, and to differentiate where they are applied in the field is challenging, even for the more educated builders. Thus, for the product to be certified
at the very top of the requirements, will confirm compliance everywhere. This may not help what’s already installed, but moving forward would be clear.

S.Tackitt added that if this is added to Standard 51, we won’t have to worry about other standards and how it’s applied. Specifically if it’s classified as the proper material in Standard 51, the end use doesn’t matter.

**Motion, S.Burton-Zick:** draft language in 51 to incorporated solid surfacing requirements into 51 such that they are required to meet food zone requirement and are defined.

**Second:** J.Spencer

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** all in favor; opposed none; abstentions none

**Motion:** Carries

**Action item:**
M.Kohler to develop the language
A.Rose to send new language to TG straw ballot

---

**Topic #3 – Issue FE-2016-23 – Non-stick Coating of Blades**

W.Sickles read off the basics of the issue paper, adding that since there was only 10 minutes left for this call, and he simply wanted to present the idea to see if there was any immediate opposition. This will be the top of the agenda for our teleconference in May

M.Kohler provided background the quick background as issue proponent, and asked if there were any quick questions:

S.Burton-Zick asked if there were other standards where this might be found, to which M.Kohler said there are possibly similarities in Standard 8, but this is a coating requirement and belongs in 51. B.Finkelstein then asked if this might be better served in the specific standard where it appears, to which M.Kohler said that in either event, they have to connect back to standard 51, so if we put a specific parameter in 8 it will still have to refer back.

W.Sickles asked if these are primarily bread slicers, and M.Kohler confirmed yes, but recently a couple of requests have come in for deli/cheese slicers.

W.Sickles asked if there was any other business, to which nothing was added and the meeting was adjourned.