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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. Ten of the 16 voting members were present (62%) representing a quorum. T.Gagliardi presented the agenda to the group and began the discussion by accepting motions for the agenda and the previous meeting summary.

Motion, S.Schaefer: To accept the September 25, 2018 meeting summary
Second: J.Murray
Discussion: J.Brania indicated the report summarized that he wished to withdraw the issue paper regarding drains, but in fact he would like to move forward. Since last meeting provided additional material to A.Rose which was sent to straw ballot. He then requested the summary be accepted with this understanding and asked if the members who moved and seconded would agree; both did

Vote: All in favor
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Motion, J.Brania: To accept today's agenda
Second: S.Schaefer
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor

Agenda Topic #1 – Drains – FE-2016-08

T.Gagliardi turned the floor over to the issue proponent J.Brania. J.Brania explained the revision done after the previous meeting’s discussion, the straw ballot conducted and indicated there was additional information he pulled together to explain during this call. A.Rose presented the additional information.

FE-2016-8 - NSF 7 Drains - Additional Information from Proponent.docx

T.Gagliardi opened the floor for questions and comments.

M.Kohler asked J.Brania to explain what refrigerator B picture was and J.Brania indicated it was a service display refrigerator, not one used for customers but rather for store employees to service other refrigerators. He confirmed receipt of a model like this from one of his customers seeking approval.

M.Kohler said the language as written in the Standard is for self-service display refrigerators for customers. The way it’s written does not include service display refrigerators. D.Melaragno suggested that section 6 states storage refrigerators so technically people shouldn’t be looking at section 6. J.Brania agreed adding this is why he wrote up the second revision for Section 9 as things have evolved with pre-packaged foods.

M.Kohler said if we look at this from a “Design and Materials” standpoint, each zone are spelled out in each section, for example splash zone requirements for display refrigerators. Drain requirements are Design requirements. J.Brania agreed and added the confusion here is that food stored in each type of refrigerator is the same.

B.Sickles said that during the last conference call, we agreed that display refrigerators are typically cleaned out more aggressively and that’s the only difference. M.Kohler said that essentially, refrigerators designated for pre-packaged products only are allowed to have drains. The concept of wanting to minimize when drains are allowed, was discussed and decided when this language was developed. The ‘golden rule’ now as it is written, is that drains are not allowed, then there are exceptions added later in the standard to modify when they can be allowed and how they are to be handled when they are allowed.

T.Gagliardi asked the manufacturers on the call why they would want to put in a drain for the type of refrigerator we are discussing, to which J.Murray indicated more and more they are seeing users of the equipment utilize power washers to clean and drains are the only way to accomplish this. He added that he agreed with J.Brania on this that there needs to be clearer description.

B.Corrao posed the general question about revising the language to simply allow drains in every type, however depending on what type of food is stored (pre-packaged, etc.) then plugs may or may not be required. M.Kohler stated that might be a reasonable compromise, and added why not then simply always require a plug when the equipment is in use in every refrigerator. T.Gagliardi suggested that would make this an operational issue, not a standards issue and not in control by the JC, to which M.Kohler confirmed the way it is currently written would prevent this. If the design is changed to always include a drain, then it would become a design issue.
J. Murray asked if the main concern creating an access point for vermin. M. Kohler suggested there are a few things. Of course the vermin is one, but also an opening into a general food zone where airborne contaminants are possibilities, as well as the issue of extra piping leaving this drain hole, as this is downstream, not even part of the drain and would be difficult to clean.

B. Sickles said this topic has been discussed a lot and there seems to be many concerns and the other uses to the exception should be sorted out, separate than condensate drain. He then agreed with the simple approach previously suggested about the group simply writing language that when used, drains must be used in a certain way, in this case plugged. T. Gagliardi asked for clarity, in that the language would ultimately states there wouldn’t be a requirement for a drain, but when it exists, there will be certain requirements for use. J. Brania said in principle the only issue immediately in question would plugs disappearing, which would influence temperature performance.

J. Murray agreed with the simple approach previously suggested about the group simply writing language that when used, drains must be used in a certain way, in this case plugged. T. Gagliardi asked J. Brania if he agrees, which he did and said he would modify the language for the next teleconference.

**Agenda Topic #2 – Seams in Section 6.3.1 – FE-2016-08**

T. Gagliardi turned the floor over to the issue proponent J. Brania who explained background, including the recent straw ballot language, then opened the floor for comments.

B. Sickles was the only negative commenter and indicated he had concerns over the differences between seams in each section. After some conversation with J. Brania offline however, and with some minor revision to the proposed language, confirmed he was good with the update. J. Brania agreed and spelled out the changes he and B. Sickles discussed:

The following supplements or modifies in addition to the requirements specified in 5.4:

J. Brania added there was another affirmative comment from J. Brady, which maintains language consistency in other Standards, specifically to add the word ‘applicable’ such that:

The following supplements or modifies in addition to the applicable requirements specified in 5.4:

So if everyone is in agreement, this is done.

**Motion, B. Sickles:** To send this to straw ballot with this TG
**Second:** J. Brania
**Discussion:** None
**Vote:** All in favor

**Action Item**

A. Rose to update language into Revision 2 and send to Straw Ballot with this TG.

**Agenda Topic #3 – Multi-Zone Unit Revised Test Conditions – FE-2016-01**

T. Gagliardi turned the floor over to the issue proponent J. Murray who explained background and intent. This was really the result of seeing the different ways that storage refrigerators are now being used, specifically having supplemental storage going directly adjacent the front display, but within the same unit. Thus we now have storage refrigerators not
in use in a 100F kitchen, and with the government tightening energy requirements, he felt an issue paper was in order to discuss language revisions.

T.Gagliardi opened the floor for comments

B.Corrao reminded the group this topic was briefly discussed some time back during a previous teleconference, and one of the concerns illustrated was that if you’re an operator in the market to purchase a refrigerator you’re likely to default to the cheapest unit. The topic of the secondary market also came up, whereby all there units look the same to them. M.Neshan suggested with respect to the end user taking the cheapest unit, the unit ultimately won’t work no matter what they do if used in the wrong ambient conditions, so at the end of the day they will have to replace the unit. He added with respect to the testing conditions, if we test a combination case in 100F ambient, and it complies, the front display case won’t comply. Conversely, if we take the display and test to 75F, then the storage won’t perform properly.

J.Murray suggested this is already an issue today. Any customer can already take a unit into a zone that it is not designed to be operated within. The first question we ask when we get a trouble-shooting call is “what is the ambient temperature”

M.Kohler suggested there were 2 things going on here, and some confusion has been created. First, the multi-zone performance language has already been approved and in the current publication:

9.14.1 Performance requirement

Display refrigerators shall be capable of maintaining a product temperature of 41 °F (5 °C) or lower when tested in accordance with 9.14.2. This requirement shall not apply to display refrigerators that are not intended for the display of potentially hazardous foods and that are labeled in accordance with 9.13.3. This requirement shall not apply to display freezers.

Display refrigerators that conform to the performance requirements for storage refrigerators in 6.10 shall be considered acceptable in meeting this requirement.

A storage compartment in a Type I or Type II display refrigerator shall be tested in accordance with 6.10 with the ambient conditions described in 9.14.2. Compressor run time requirements shall not apply.

A refrigerated buffet section or refrigerated food preparation section in a Type I or Type II display refrigerator shall be tested in accordance with 7.5 with the ambient conditions described in 9.14.2. Compressor run time requirements shall not apply.

NOTE — This test is not required for remote refrigerators not supplied with refrigeration or beverage coolers labeled in accordance with 9.13.1.

Second, this current issue paper is strictly for the labeling requirements in section 6, thus what we need to discuss here is the feasibility of the approach.

J.Murray said he wasn’t opposed to various suggestions, he just wanted to get this discussion started. T.Gagliardi stated from a public health perspective, he has no issue with this approach adding that additions to the cut sheets for new restaurants would help a Public Health Plan Reviewer to catch this as well when the space is being designed.
With time running out, T.Gagliardi indicated this topic will have to be addressed during the next teleconference, along with the 4th agenda item involving the no load versus load.

Motion, M.Neshan: Adjourn
Second: J.Bania
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor