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Discussion
T.Gagliardi welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took
attendance. Eleven of the 17 voting members were present (65%) representing a quorum. T.Gagliardi presented
the agenda to the group and began the discussion.

Agenda Topic #1 – Revised Test Conditions – FE-2015-02
T.Gagliardi introduced the first item and A.Rose confirmed with the group that this issue was officially withdrawn and
replaced with issues 7i17 and 7i18 (FE-2016-01 and FE-2016-02 respectively). T.Gagliardi then asked the issue proponent for 7i17
and the issue proponent for 7i17 was not present on this call.

Agenda Topic #3 – No Load versus ASHRAE 72 – FE-2016-02
J.Brady explained his concern was with storage packages, and so pulled out requirements in ASHRAE 72 regarding
performance testing especially as it relates to ‘useable space’ and the load test for net usable volumes. He confirmed that
his issue paper included proposals for a couple new definitions and he read them off from the issue paper.

J.Brady then indicated that before going further, this group should decide where it stands on the topic of load versus no
load testing itself. He added that if an interest develops during this call to continue discussion, then he would move to
put this up for a straw ballot after this call in order to come up with topics of discussion for the next teleconference.
Regarding the test material itself if the group decided to develop a load test, he suggested it would make sense to get the lab technicians involved at some point for their expertise.

T.Gagliardi opened up floor for comments.

M.Kohler asked J.Brady if this issue was the result of something he saw in the field. J.Brady confirmed it was, describing there was a storage refrigerator he was setting up, which was loaded following the instructions from manufacturer. The test failed as a result of the airflow being discharged from the top of the unit, and was blocked in the back by the packaging. M.Kohler followed up by asking if there was a reason he didn’t simply reference ASHRAE 72 to being with, and J.Brady indicated he wanted to simplify the process, and didn’t believe all the other details in ASHRAE 72 were necessary.

M.Neshan indicated that if there are recommendations to be made with ASHRAE 72 as well, that committee is also open for suggestions. J.Brady confirmed his issue isn’t with ASHRAE 72, but rather simply that a loaded refrigerator case operates differently than a non-loaded case. He added that with the testing he did, there were 3 locations within the cabinet that had probes and the problem was found just with that many so adding more probes isn’t necessary. G.Maxon asked if J.Brady thought that adding the ASHRAE 72 recommendations of “load lines” would address the concern, to which J.Brady said yes.

Bob said he felt the proposal to take this to straw ballot was valid and made the following motion:

**Motion, G.Maxon:** Send J.Brady’s idea to straw ballot to see if there is interest in the idea  
**Second:** S.Schaefer  
**Discussion:** M.Kohler said if we have issues with the current language, then we definitely need to look at this, adding at the very least we should determine if this is a one-off situation, and if not we should update the standard. G.Maxon agreed. J.Brania asked if there is consensus on this call, do we even need a straw ballot. J.Brady said if there is consensus to look at this, then we can have a more detailed focus with words available during the next call, and use the straw ballot to ask for detailed comments.

**Vote:** All in favor  
**Motion** Carries

**Action Items:**  
J.Brady to clarify questions for a straw ballot after this call and share with A.Rose  
A.Rose to execute straw ballot

**Agenda Topic #2 – Multi-Zone Unit Revised Test Conditions – FE-2016-01**

T.Gagliardi confirmed that the issue proponent was not on the call, and briefly refreshed the idea with this topic and the discussions conducted in previous meetings. He suggested there is much to further consider with this topic adding that the issue proponent should be on hand for this and the group agreed to pick up discussion during the next teleconference.

**Agenda Topic #4 – Drains – FE-2016-08**

T.Gagliardi turned over the floor to the issue proponent J.Brania, and he explained this issue is one of inconsistency. He detailed that there are requirements for drains in every other standard, but not in for storage refrigerators, specifically regarding prepackaged versus non-prepackaged food, in storage and non-storage refrigerators. Simply changing the door
from glass to non-glass changes the requirements. J.Brania indicated this came up because some equipment suppliers are adding drains and some are not.

T.Gagliardi opened the floor for comments.

M.Kohler said display refrigerators have slightly different requirements because some models are allowed to be cleaned by flushing. He added that generally speaking drains are not a good idea, but if flushing criteria is allowed a drain is needed. B.Sickles questioned why flushing is ok in display models but not in non-display storage refrigerators as it relates to food safety. M.Kohler indicated the cabinet is visible to the public and users, so they can see foodborne issues better.

B.Sickles asked if there is an issue with simply having drains in all units and use a plug in a storage units. Sara suggested from an appearance standpoint, if there is no drain an inspector has a relative assumption that the unit is supposed to store prepackaged products. Jumalon asked if the drain exists to necessitate cleaning or for condensate drip, and M.Kohler confirmed these are intended only for cleaning where necessary, as with meat cases. J.Brania said the unit he saw was intended to be a beverage cooler, and it had a drain.

J.Brania restated to the group that if everyone was comfortable having drains in all refrigerator designs, that’s an acceptable approach as well; simply looking for consistency and removing ambiguity. This led to a brief discussion about floor drains, and the necessitation of complying with plumbing codes.

At this point, J.Brania indicated it appeared there was not a lot of support in removing drains, so he was inclined to withdraw this issue paper, adding that for the 2019 F2F meeting he would submit an issue paper to eliminate the first sentence of 5.1.6, such that:

5.16 Drains
There shall be no drains other than those from a condensate evaporator in a food zone. Drains utilized for condensate shall be fabricated or located to prevent their use as a general drain for a food zone.

Bob added that given the discussion, the issue paper should articulate the intent better, and maybe cite some examples. J.Brania agreed, and offered an example to the group today to finish discussion: considering an upright storage refrigerator, drains are not allowed. If one considers the same upright refrigerator, with the same food zones, and add a glass door it is now acceptable to have a drain in the unit. T.Gagliardi suggested the group consider clarifying where drains are allowable, rather than within the refrigerator itself. B.Sickles said the definition for display refrigerators does not included language about glass doors, so that may be a consideration.

T.Gagliardi thanked everyone for their thoughts and closure of discussion on this subject.

Action Items
A.Rose to withdraw Issue Paper

Agenda Topic #4 – Seams in Section 6.3.1 – FE-2016-08
J.Brania is the issue proponent and read off the language in 5.4.1 and seemingly redundant and conflicting language in 6.3.1:
He emphasized that 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 require the following for all commercial refrigerators and freezers:

**5.4.1** Permanent joints and seams in a food or splash zone shall be sealed and smooth. Seams formed by the attachment of breaker strips shall be exempt from this requirement.

**5.4.2** In addition to conforming to 5.4.1, permanent seams located below the liquid overflow level of a food storage compartment shall be filled and made flush with the adjoining surfaces.

But then in 6.3.1 requires the following, specifically for storage refrigerators, storage freezers, and refrigerated food transport cabinets:

**6.3.1** Seams within 3.0 in (75 mm) of the interior bottoms of dry, chest-type refrigerators and freezers shall be filled and made flush with the adjoining surfaces.

He suggested that 6.3.1 is unnecessary as this requirement is already covered by 5.4.2., adding that if one is reading these sections side-by-side, section 6.3.1 states only 3.0 inches and these statements don’t work well together. M.Kohler confirmed 6.3.1 is intended for special chest type refrigerators, and is more of an exception. There is no indication where the value of 3.0 inches was derived, but the idea is that moisture would never go above that mark. J.Brania said with clear understanding of the how and why of this, does it make sense to rearrange the words to make it clear this is for dry chest type units, and the language of ‘sealed’ for 3.0 inches can be an exception?

At this point, the group briefly discussed the option of moving section 6.3.1 as an exception under 5.4.2, and B.Sickles indicated that the context and titles of each section were actually different and thus not redundant. J.Brania indicated that maybe a word-smith adding the term ‘only’ to replace ‘in addition to’ might help.

J.Brania said in light of this discussion, this might actually be short straightforward to write up slightly differently in section 5. Said he appreciated the discussion here today, and would attempt to rewrite this for the next agenda discussion.

**Action Item**

J.Brania to rewrite suggested language for discussion during next teleconference.

T.Gagliardi asked if there was any other comments; there were none and the meeting adjourned.