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7) 170i22r1 - Heated Organic Coating - Ballot.docx 
8) 170i21r4 - Solid Surface Materials - Ballot.pdf 
9) 51i16r1 - Solid Surface Materials - CPHC ballot.pdf 
10) 51i16r1 - Solid Surface Materials - CPHC COMMENTS.pdf 

Discussion
B. Sickles welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A. Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Nine of the 16 voting members were present (56%) which represented a quorum. B. Sickles confirmed the first agenda item regarding the publication of Standard 51 in July, thanking everyone for the great contributions. He added that with the exception of the last agenda item, the topics for today’s discussion have received substantial attention already.

Topic #1 – 51i16r1 - Solid Surface Materials
B. Sickles recapped the discussion on this issue, as well as the negative ballot comment from the CPHC. He reminded the group that during the last TG teleconference there was limited time to discuss this, so we had agreed that he, M. Kohler and A. Rose would contact K. Smith (negative commenter) to discuss his comments and attempt to address his concerns. As the publication was due around this time, it was decided to put this off
for a later date and now that this TG is meeting again, the group can discuss the draft language and negative comments here first:

**4.2.4 Glass and glass-like materials**

Glass and glass-like materials, including porcelain, porcelain enamels, and ceramic coatings, shall not be used on surfaces intended for direct food contact that are also subject to impact by hard objects during use (e.g., countertops, tabletops, solid surface materials, cutting boards, cooking surfaces) except as permitted in 4.2.4.1.

*Rationale:* Clarifies that this requirement is applicable to solid surface materials.

---

**4.2.6 Solid Surface Materials**

4.2.6.1 Solid surface materials shall meet food zone requirements.

4.2.6.2 Solid surface materials shall be composed of uniform material throughout.

*Rationale:* Food zone requirements are applicable to all solid surface materials to avoid potential misuse in the field. If the material meets food zone requirements it will be suitable for use in all zones without the need to choose the correct product for the given application. A requirement for the material to be uniform throughout eliminates the possibility of multilayered, dissimilar materials that may be more prone to separation and failure.

---

K.Smith’s Comments

1. I think it is misguided to attempt to remedy confusion associated with a certification matter about what constitutes an acceptable countertop materials by modifying the Standard and adding a confusing new term. The proposed definition mistakenly attempts to establish 1) a requirement (food zone compliant), 2) acceptable use applications, and 3) a material specification all in one definition. Attempting to incorporate anyone of these in a definition is potentially problematic, but incorporating all three makes for a poor definition.

2. It is also inappropriate to incorporate the new term, as defined, into the list of example use applications in 4.2.4. The new term “solid surface materials” is not an example of a use application like counter top, tabletop, cutting board etc.). Also, 4.2.4 is intended to describe limitations where glass and glass-like materials can

3. It is inappropriate to incorporate the phrase like “a food zone compliant material” into a definition. It also unnecessary if you intend, as shown in proposed 4.2.6.1, to state that the material you have just defined must meet food zone requirements.

---

B.Sickles opened the floor discussion

M.Perez asked whether the group felt K.Smith is confusing this with an application, versus just the material with which is what Standard 51 does and what we are dealing with here. B.Sickles suggested that was difficult to answer since he’s not been on the calls and we haven’t discussed with him. M.Perez said a conversation with K.Smith would clear up the confusion.
D.Melaragno said she understands where the confusion lies because *countertops and tabletops* are both applications, where *solid surface materials* is the raw material possibly used to make the countertops and tabletops. B.Sickles agreed adding at the very least this may be redundant, and maybe the term *solid surface materials* should be removed from 4.2.4. Further suggesting that during the conversation with K.Smith, this may be revealed.

D.Melaragno indicated this may be sorted out with the definition, and with that the group overlapped the second agenda item. A.Rose then presented the currently motioned (but not balloted) term for 170:

3.xxx solid surface material: a food zone compliant material composed of a uniform mixture of ingredients, and commonly used in the manufacture of countertops, tabletops or other equipment surfaces. Solid surface materials include, but are not limited to, polyester, acrylic, engineered stone and quartz/resin based materials.

She suggested the group consider removing the first sentence, and simply define what a solid surface is, then in Standard 51 what the application requirements are. M.Perez added there are 2 things this sentence defines: 1) food zone compliance and 2) uniform mixture of ingredients. Everything else is descriptive. Thus, Standard 51 is restricting the use, and Standard 170 is defining the material.

With this understanding, B.Sickles again asked the group to consider dropping the term *solid surface materials* from 4.2.4, and add it to 4.2.6 parenthetically. M.Kohler said he likes B.Sickles’s suggestion, and reminded the group the reason it was decided to add this to the list of examples in 4.2.4 was the goal to ensure nobody tries to apply a ceramic coating to a solid surface material. It’s just in the examples where this cannot be used.

The group then turned attention to 4.2.6 and the redundancies with the proposed definition. T.Gagliardi and D.Melaragno suggested the requirements are already in 4.2.6 and should not be part of the definition, thus:

3.xxx solid surface material: a food zone compliant material composed of a uniform mixture of ingredients, and material commonly used in the manufacture of countertops, tabletops or other equipment surfaces. Solid surface materials include, but are not limited to, polyester, acrylic, engineered stone and quartz/resin based materials.

M.Perez then posed the question whether the definition was need at all, and M.Kohler confirmed there is still value because the new term is being used in 4.2.6. He added that the group is spending so much time trying to get this perfect that nothing’s getting done.

B.Sickles then recapped the discussed language and proposed the action items:

**4.2.4 Glass and glass-like materials**

Glass and glass-like materials, including porcelain, porcelain enamels, and ceramic coatings, shall not be used on surfaces intended for direct food contact that are also subject to impact by hard objects during use (e.g., countertops, tabletops, solid surface materials, cutting boards, cooking surfaces) except as permitted in 4.2.4.1.

*Rationale: Clarifies that this requirement is applicable to solid surface materials.*
4.2.6 Solid Surface Materials

4.2.6.1 Solid surface materials shall meet food zone requirements.

4.2.6.2 Solid surface materials shall be composed of uniform material throughout.

Rationale: Food zone requirements are applicable to all solid surface materials to avoid potential misuse in the field. If the material meets food zone requirements it will be suitable for use in all zones without the need to choose the correct product for the given application. A requirement for the material to be uniform throughout eliminates the possibility of multilayered, dissimilar materials that may be more prone to separation and failure.

3.xxx solid surface material: a food zone compliant material composed of a uniform mixture of ingredients, and material commonly used in the manufacture of countertops, tabletops or other equipment surfaces. Solid surface materials include, but are not limited to, polyester, acrylic, engineered stone and quartz/resin based materials.

Action items
M.Kohler to wordsmith
A.Rose to set up meeting with K.Smith, B.Sickles and M.Kohler
A.Rose to send updated language to TG as straw ballot before next meeting

Topic #2 - 170i22 – Heated Organic Coating

B.Sickles recapped work completed already by the TG, and presented the approved language

6.2.2.4 Heated Organic coatings used on heated splash zone surfaces shall meet the heat resistance requirements in 11.

Rationale: The term heated splash zone is undefined and may cause confusion when used in its current context. Changing the term to heated organic coating is more appropriate in identifying a particular coating application and eliminates confusion that may currently exist with defined zones.

Then explained the development of the definition to support this, specifically the work completed after the last teleconference by a small ad-hoc group:

3.xxx Heated Organic Coating: An organic coating applied to a surface where operating temperatures of the appliance may result in blistering, softening, or other heat-related degradation of the coating.

M.Kohler said the definition is simply lagging behind what’s already been created in Standard 51. M.Perez asked the authors if this was ready for straw ballot with the TG, and they said yes.

Motion, T.Gagliardi: Send this to straw ballot with this TG
Second: M.Perez
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor, zero opposed, zero abstention
**Action item**

A. Rose to send to straw ballot with this TG

---

### Topic #3 – FE-2018-07 – Glass in bi-metal

B. Sickles – recapped the discussion during the 2018 JC Face-to-Face meeting, adding that it isn’t really clear where the group should go with the discussion, as the proponent is suggesting the current thermometers don’t meet the requirements. M. Kohler also recapped his explanation during the face-to-face, specifically concerning how glass is typically evaluated. The manufacturer supplies documentation from material supplier as proof, and the finished product is not performance tested. What this proponent is proposing isn’t needed in most applications, but this is certainly worth discussion by this group. M. Perez confirmed the proponent’s presentation illustrated the performance test they developed.

M. Kohler said as he pointed out during the meeting, this is not currently part of the performance testing, to which B. Sickles added it’s similar to aluminum meeting specific raw material requirements in the product documentation, but not by testing with the finished product. M. Kohler indicated the issue proponent keeps reverting to this as a performance test, and we look at this as a documentation test.

This led to a brief discussion about manufacturing limitations, the thickness of safety glass in this application, and to the current details of ANSI/UL 197 impact testing. As the group was running out of time for discussion today, M. Perez suggested there’s not enough information here to make a decision, but that someone on this group should look at the current performance testing methods and report back at the next meeting.

D. Melaragno pulled up ANSI Z97.1 and read off the exemption, suggesting that glass used in this application seems to fall in that exemptions. M. Kohler confirmed we often get questions about normative reference exemptions, and made it clear that these are not within the scope of Standard 51. K. Fall added that the NSF FE Standards state that they have to comply with the impact testing of these standards, and not the exceptions, so exceptions are off the table.

---

### Action items

B. Sickles and J. Murray to speak with their suppliers of safety glass

M. Perez to ask J. Brania about sharing a copy of the UL Standard