Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
August 29, 2017

Participating Members:
Willard Sickles (InterMetro Industries Corp.)
Michael Perez (Baring Industries)
Swati Bhatt (Los Angeles County)
Joshua Spencer (Stone Spectrum)

Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America, Inc)
Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Foodservice)
Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)

Absent Members:
Andreas Helm (German FE trade association HKI)
Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.)
Steve Tackitt (Barry-Eaton District Health Dept.)
Michèle Samarya-Timm (Somerset County Dept. of Health)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)
Kelli Fall (NSF International)

Danielle Melaragno (Intertek)
Joe Wallace (A.O. Smith Water Products)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1) Agenda - FEM - TG - 2017-08-29.pdf
2) 51i16r1 - Solid Surfacing Materials - Straw Ballot - COMMENTS.pdf
3) 51i16r1- Description & Straw ballot.pdf
4) NSF_51-2014 revisions - coatings - 2017-08-28.doc

Discussion
W.Sickles welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Eight of the 14 voting members were present (57%) representing a quorum. He briefly went over the agenda, stating the group would switch up the last 2 agenda items and spend about 30 minutes on each of these. He confirmed the first two items on the agenda are complete with no further action to be taken, thanking everyone for their work.

Topic #1 – Issue FE-2015-6 – Solid Surfacing Materials
W.Sickles quickly went over the straw ballot results and comments, then opened the floor for discussion. J.Spencer proposed the balloted definition, updated with M.Perez’s suggestion was a great place to start discussion.

Original Revision 1 straw ballot:
3.xxx solid surfacing material: Sheet material composed of uniform mixtures of food zone ingredients commonly used in the construction of countertops, tabletops, or other equipment surfaces.

Including comments from straw ballot:
3.xxx solid surfacing material: A material composed of uniform mixtures of food zone compliant ingredients commonly used in the manufacture of countertops, tabletops or other equipment surfaces. Solid surface materials include polyester, acrylic and quartz/resin based materials.
M. Perez suggested the shape of the material is not relevant and the definition should focus on the material itself. He added that some of these materials can be purchased in powdered form (corian, avonite, in the polyester family) and can be formed into many shapes. The group agreed and J. Spencer added that he is not aware of any resin based products that are not considered to be a solid surface materials.

W. Sickles then suggested that the term sheet material may be confusing, because again the shape is not important, to which J. Spencer said that in this industry the product is referred to as flat material. M. Kohler said he drafted this first draft definition and used sheet material to illustrate the typical product, not to limit, agreeing that the shape is not important and the definition should be updated.

W. Sickles asked the group if specific products/brands should be referenced for clarity, and the group quickly agreed that would be a poor idea; brands should not be referenced in Standards.

Discussion then turned to the term itself, solid surfacing materials. W. Sickles asked the group, based the previous discussion, should the word material be removed. K. Fall suggested it be retained because it’s all about the material, not the shape of the finished product; group agreed. The group further agreed in the comment from T. Gagliardi regarding use of the word ‘surface’ rather than ‘surfacing’.

The final discussion was with the last sentence regarding the provision of examples to aid in clarity. The group agreed these would help with clarity, but are not normative and thus should be presented as an informative ‘note’ after the definition. Thus the final definition:

3.xxx solid surface material: a material composed of uniform mixtures of food zone compliant ingredients commonly used in the manufacture of countertops, tabletops or other equipment surfaces.

Note: Solid surface materials include polyester, acrylic, engineered stone and quartz/resin based materials.

W. Sickles asked the group if this was ready for straw ballot with this group.

**Motion, M. Perez:** Send to straw ballot with this Task Group

**Second:** J. Spencer

**Discussion:** W. Sickles asked if it made sense to remove the word ‘surface’ entirely, because this is focused on the material. M. Kohler said no because in this case, ‘solid surface’ is an industry term; group agreed. M. Perez confirmed that the other language in this ballot from Section 4.2.6 all passed and will not need a re-vote.

**Vote:** All in favor

**Motion:** Passes

**Action Item:**
A. Rose to send this the definition to ballot

W.Sickles and A.Rose recapped the work completed during the teleconference in March 2017, and the language work completed by M.Kohler and J.Brania since that time. In particular, the ‘note’ was removed and the language was moved directly under 6.2.2.2, which establishes this as a normative exemption, and the intent of the language all along.

M.Perez made the overall observation and suggestion that the term “used on” should actually be changed to “applied to”. After a brief discussion, including a quick look at the many other places where this term is used, the group agreed it was not within the scope of this particular issue and M.Perez withdrew his comment.

The group then turned attention and spent the remaining time discussing the phrase “subject to high temperatures”

M.Perez confirmed that in 6.2.2.4 the term “heated” was essentially replaced with the phrase “subject to high temperatures”, the latter of which is not defined and thus subjective. He added without establishing a specific temperature range, or creating a definition, it leaves ambiguity.

J.Brania was not available during this call, but did provide a comment on this subject when he and M.Kohler were developing the language:

"It may be helpful to tie “high temperatures” to an operating temperature of the appliance. Otherwise it will be difficult to ascertain which temperatures are high, and do we need to start thermocouple-ing the appliance surfaces to determine if the surface temperatures are high. If we use the term “heated appliance” that becomes more clear which appliances are subject to the test, although it does suck in products that operate with low heat, such as popcorn cabinets and bun warmers."

M.Kohler elaborated that when “heated splash zone” was defined in 2002, it was not done with intent of tying it with “heated food zone”, and never intended to have a specific temperature. Some years after the definition was created, the word “heated” was added to this section, and should never have been linked specifically to 180F. Additionally, this group discussed during a previous meeting and concluded this same intent. M.Kohler added the goal of J.Brania’s Issue Paper is to move away from the term “heated splash zone”. M.Perez agreed with the intent, and added that even so the newly proposed term doesn’t have to be subjective, as this group can create a definition.

W.Sickles then asked the group to consider a different approach, whereby language be developed for the performance test such that:

1) the material shall be subjected to the suitability of the application, and
2) it is incumbent on the equipment manufacturer to prove the suitability of the coating and supply this information to the certifier when being tested.
M. Perez suggested this was a better approach because it’s specific per application. M. Kohler agreed adding we can still have the structural and abrasion performance test as is, but the heat test more specific per coating.

M. Kohler reminded the group that the other language proposed from the original IP was to move away from the 180F temperature, and be consistent wherever it ended up.

W. Sickles asked the overall question of what the group would like to do, adding that one option would be to address J. Brania’s initial IP comments, and have a separate IP or try to resolve this second. M. Kohler said this was a good idea as there are a few things going on here and thus it might be better to separate.

Action Items
W. Sickles to reach out to J. Brania regarding these language suggestions, and the rewrite of part of the IP.

W. Sickles asked if there was any new business; none was suggested

D. Melaragno asked for a follow up regarding the surface cleanability procedure. M. Kohler confirmed his update during the JC face to face last week, adding there is a draft out now but the task group is holding off at the moment based on what the dinnerware task group decides. It’s been tabled for some time and there is no further status update. M. Perez asked if it is likely this task group will get that work back here; M. Kohler said yes.

Motion, D. Negandhi: Adjourn
Second: S. Schaefer
Discussion: none
Vote: All in favor
Motion: Passes