Discussion
D.Negandhi 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.

D.Negandhi recapped the work completed thus far including general results for the straw ballot since the previous meeting. He added from the agenda that today would be a discussion of the various comments collected from the straw ballot, and began with the first.

5.11.1 Covers protecting a food zone shall overlap the opening and shall be sloped to provide drainage from the cover surface. Inset covers for stackable pans are exempt from the slope requirement. Areas of handles and knobs of covers are not required to be sloped.

Gagliardi, Tony - Consultant - Public Health/Regulatory

Yes

Let me start this with the statement that I do not have a problem with the grey highlighted textual changes.

However, in 5.2.11 this section does not need to remain in this proposed revision or the standard. This section refers to slotted openings in lids to allow serving utensils to remain in the foods. This seems to be provided in standard 2 for an employee service situation not a vending machine. This section should be removed. Since this poll is a draft copy under a straw poll ballot, I can see no reason for it to remain in this document.

T.Gagliardi explained the intent of his comment, understanding that this is not within the scope of this issue, but that this subsection is so obviously out of place that it should simply be removed. A couple members openly agreed.
Al explained there are no rules against adding this to the ballot, the group needs to capture this for the record via a motion, the meeting summary and a rationale statement for posterity.

**Motion, T.Gagliardi:** Remove section 5.11.2 from the standard

**Second:** J.Brania

**Discussion:** J.Brania, this is an obvious one; let’s do it but let’s also be sure to keep on scope after this. M.Kohler agreed adding this is an outlier but we must stay on task. If we stay on task today with the comments, we will be good.

**Vote:** Eight in favor, zero opposed, zero abstentions

**Motion:** Carries

**Action Item:**

A.Rose to add the removal of this statement to the next revision ballot

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none

**Comment #2**

5.19.5 *Kick plates on floor-mounted equipment shall be removable.* If kick plates are provided on machines, they shall be readily removable to permit access to the space beneath for inspection and cleaning. Kick plates shall be capable of being opened or removed without opening the machine cabinet door.

5.19.5.1 All vending machines, other than those intended for counter, table, wall or pedestal mounting, shall meet the applicable requirements governing stability contained in Underwriters Laboratories (UL) Standard 541 or UL Standard 751.

**Rationale:** Additions based on gaps between NSF 25 and NAMA standard.

Ballot comments indicate a discussion is needed regarding kick plate removability. NAMA requires readily removable, while NSF standards (25 and others) require it only to be removable.

| Negandhi, PE, A.O. | Yes | 1. Section 5.19.1.1 should be 5.19.5.1 |

Al confirmed this is editorial and has already been corrected

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none
Comment #3

5.29.4 Backflow prevention

5.29.4.1 Units intended to be connected to a water supply system under pressure shall have one of the following:

— an air gap at least twice the diameter of the water supply inlet but not less than 1.0 in (25 mm);

— a vacuum breaker that conforms to ANSI/ASSE 1001, Atmospheric Type Vacuum Breakers (for intermittent pressure conditions); or

— a vacuum breaker that conforms to ANSI/ASSE 1020, Pressure Vacuum Breaker Assembly (for continuous pressure conditions); or

— a backflow prevention device that conforms to ANSI/ASSE 1022, Backflow Preventer for Beverage Dispensing Equipment; or

— a backflow prevention device that conforms to ANSI/ASSE 1024, Dual Check Backflow Preventers; or

— a backflow prevention device that conforms to ASSE 1032, Performance Requirements for Dual Check Valve Type Backflow Preventers for Carbonated Beverage Dispensers – Post Mix Type; or

— a statement in the installation instruction and on a label permanently affixed to the equipment that clearly indicates that the equipment is to be installed with adequate backflow protection to comply with applicable federal, state, and local codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eils, Larry - NAMA</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.29.4 Backflow Item 5.29.4.1 Need to add Air Break as an option for backflow. This was agreed to during an earlier discussion but never followed through. See below for proposed wording.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested wording: Air break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In conformance with ASME A112.1.2-2001 a minimum of 39 mm (1 1/2 inches) between the supply line opening and the top level of the receptacle's overflow standpipe shall be provided as long as the overflow standpipe has a cross-sectional area of five (5) times that of the supply pipe and shall terminate above the top rim of the waste container, water bath or other receiving container.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L.Eils explained the term ‘air break’ is used in coffee machines, and is considered another method of backflow prevention. Confirmed his discussion with K.Fall before, and it seems to not have been added. D.Negandhi asked if this in the NAMA construction Standard already, and L.Eils said it was.

Group asked for an explanation of the difference between this and an ‘air gap’, and discussed this for a few minutes. M.Kohler indicated the reason it was left out was because an air break is already listed, and an air break is the commonly accepted term.

L.Eils suggested this term is used to describe the inlet side, not the drain to which M.Kohler said the concept of ‘air gap’ is used for backflow prevention on the drain side, not the front plumbing side of the
equipment. B.Laird agreed with drain comment suggesting he’s never seen an air break on the inlet side, but rather double check valves and RPZ valves (Reduced Pressure Zone).

S.Schaefer asserted the bullet including the boilerplate language of air gap is more than adequate. M.Kohler indicated the concept of ‘air break’ has never come up on any other pieces of equipment in any other Standard, so before moving on it would be good to see a schematic.

L.Eils thanked everyone for the discussion, and decided to withdraw his comment until more information was gathered.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none

Comment #4

5.32.2 All water tubing and melt water tubing in the ice making system shall be removable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gagliardi, Tony - Consultant - Public Health/Regulatory</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rationale statement below section 5.32.2 seems to be misplaced. This statement is a partial duplication of the statement below 5.26.7. The two paragraphs below 5.32.2 should be removed from this location and replace the single paragraph currently shown below 5.26.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T.Gagliardi explained his comment was strictly related to the first paragraph of the rationale statement, specifically looks like a copy/paste issue:

Rationale: NSF 25 does not currently specifically state the use of a fan filter in this application, however if there is one blowing directly on a chute or into a bag this would be considered a food zone and is already addressed in a general sense. Nevertheless, the addition of this new section adds specificity and clarity.

A negative vote was indicated on 5.32.2 suggesting that this be added to standard 12. However, this requirement is not being proposed for ALL ice makers. It is only being proposed in standard 25. A separate issue would need to be raised to the Standard 12 task group, along with supporting information, if the group feels it should be added to standard 12.

The second paragraph is correct, but the first belongs with section 5.26.7. The group quickly agreed and the first paragraph was removed.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none

Next 3 comments

The next 3 comments were all related to the same section, 5.35:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negandhi, PE, Dipak</td>
<td>A.O. Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1. Section 5.35.1? Field test procedures (and its verification for certification) for hot cold and frozen foods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Section 5.35.2.3 If Alternate Test Method is demonstrated, does it exempt the unit from 6.4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sections numbered 5.35.2.3 (after 5.35.3.1) &amp; 5.35.2.3.1 appear to be incorrectly numbered. Should they be 5.35.4 and 5.35.4.1 respectively?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eils, Larry          | NAMA                  |        | 5.35.2.3.3 Alternate methods 5.35.2.3.1 is not complete, an item was left off the list when transcribed of the list of things to be met. After the word ";and" there should be another sentence. See below for correction. This should be added to this item:
|                      |                       |        | "All components needed to gain access to test procedures are readily removable."                                                      |
| Brania, Jonathan     | Underwriters         | No     | From NAMA?s Construction Standard, this appears to be a mash up of 701.3(B)(1) and 701.3(B)(2). The proposed 5.35.1 already requires that ?the manufacturer shall provide a written procedure to permit field-testing of the automatic shutoff control.?  |
|                      | Laboratories, Inc.    |        | Revise with language from NAMA?s Construction Standard: Replace 5.35.3.1: A visual output for testing the automatic sensor temperature shall be provided. New 5.35.3.2: To demonstrate that the automatic shutoff control will disable the vending mechanism or otherwise prevent consumer access to potentially hazardous foods, disconnect the sensor from the control. Access to disconnecting the sensor from the control shall be readily accessible and without having to open the door to the food storage compartment. |

First of the 3
D Negandhi confirmed the numbering has been fixed, and he is ok now.
Second of the 3
L.Eils was suggesting the term “and” is missing from behind each of the bulleted statements. A.Rose explained that this is the typical format when there are several bulleted options for and requirement, adding the statement in the leading paragraph “if all of the following are met” covers it:

5.35.4 Alternative methods (Mechanical and Electronic Controls)

5.35.4.1 The manufacturer may demonstrate alternative methods of testing the automatic control other than those described here. Such methods shall be deemed acceptable, if all of the following are met:

— the temperature output of the sensor can be verified;

— the automatic shutoff control disables the vending or otherwise prevent consumer access to potentially hazardous foods;

— the test procedure requires opening the door to the food storage compartment and the entire procedure does not exceed 10 min (see open door test); and

— all components needed to gain access for the test procedure are readily removable.

The group agreed; L.Eils confirmed his understanding and removed his negative vote.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none

Third of the 3
J.Brania clarified his point, stating it looks like there were some mashing together of clauses, and the result is language that is a bit confusing and redundant:

5.35.3.1 A written procedure for testing the automatic sensor temperature shall be provided to demonstrate that the automatic shutoff control will disable the vending mechanism or otherwise prevent consumer access to potentially hazardous foods, disconnect the sensor from the control. Access to disconnecting the sensor from the control shall be readily accessible and without having to open the door to the food storage compartment.

He then suggested it be split into 2 statements, specifically:

5.35.4.1: A visual output for testing the automatic sensor temperature shall be provided.

5.35.4.2: To demonstrate that the automatic shutoff control will disable the vending mechanism or otherwise prevent consumer access to potentially hazardous foods, disconnect the sensor from the control. Access to disconnecting the sensor from the control shall be readily accessible and without having to open the door to the food storage compartment.

He finished by reminding the group that main statement in 5.35.1 is not going away, but there’s no reason to repeat it here. There was some discussion regarding the miss-numbering, and J.Brania asserted that cleaning this up was the crux of his vote and comment. The group agreed with the new statements.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none
Comment #8

5.36 Lobster Habitat Machines
Procedures for the care and monitoring water conditions shall be included. They shall contain at least the following:

— Preparation of the water before adding lobsters to the tank.
  o De-chlorination
  o Temperature
  o Salinity and essential mineral content

— Proper use of test kits and acceptable limits.
  o Salinity
  o Ammonia
  o Nitrate
  o Nitrite
  o pH

— Water and filter maintenance.
  o How and when to add or change all or some of the water.
  o How to maintain a viable biofilter.

— Loading limit (number of lobsters that can be supported).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No technical comments regarding the proposed requirements for lobster habitats in NSF/ANSI 25. However, it's unclear if it's necessary to have this coverage in the standard. Molluscan shellfish life-support system display tanks are covered in the FDA Food Code and are exceedingly more prevalent in retail settings when not associated with a vending machine. Meanwhile the NSF food equipment standards provide no specific requirements for these types of products. Consider deleting this section from NSF/ANSI 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.Brania confirmed his abstention of this topic, adding he has no objection to the concept itself as these have been out there for some time, but the issue here is now we are going to add this only to 25 and this type of language is nowhere in any other FE Standard. Doesn’t make sense to me so I abstain. M.Kohler agreed, but would like more explanation from the issue proponent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.Eils verified this language hasn’t been relevant for a very long time, and maybe should simply be drop from the standard. M.Kohler agreed and added this should really start with the boilerplate standards first if this were going be consider in the first place. After a short discussion, the group agreed to simply remove, but to add rationale statement at the beginning of the ballot indicating why section 803.2 of NAMA was not added. It was considered, but not added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment #9

6.2.1.3 Acceptance criteria

The air temperature at each thermocouple location shall not exceed 41 °F (5 °C) for the duration of the test (excluding defrost cycles).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eils, Larry - NAMA</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Temperature performance 6.2.1.3 Acceptance criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| There is a difference between Standards on acceptance which has never been discussed. NSF states "the air temperature at each thermocouple location shall not exceed 41 F (5C) for the duration of the test (excluding defrost cycles)." NAMA states "the average temperature of any point monitored must meet the required temperature in Table 700.1 for the 24 hour test (excluding defrost cycles)."

The problem here is one considers the direct temperature whereas the other considers the average temperature.

There is a difference between Standards on acceptance which has never been discussed.

I suggest this item be placed on the agenda for discussion during the next Task Group conference call.

L.Eils further explained, in NAMA they take the average temperature. M.Kohler confirmed with the NSF FE standards there is a thermocouple map placement, which in essence is also an average. He added that in practice any time there is an air temp measurement it’s done using a brass slug. In other standards where averages are taken, they still state absolute measurements.

L.Eils thanked everyone for the group discussion and agreed to remove this negative comment.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other comments; there were none

Comment #10

6.4 Automatic cut-off control (abnormal operations test) 6.4.1.1 Performance requirements. In all the abnormal operation tests 5 minutes is being cited as the time being measured. The vending industry has experienced many false shut downs because of electrical and electronic problems caused by such things as dirty power, power surges, etc. which cause false readings resulting in the automatic cut-off control shutting down machines when no failure has actually occurred. A longer time period allows the machine to determine if a true problem is present and then can react as required. A longer time of 15 minutes has been found to be adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eils, Larry - NAMA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.4 Automatic cut-off control (abnormal operations test) 6.4.1.1 Performance requirements. In all the abnormal operation tests 5 minutes is being cited as the time being measured. The vending industry has experienced many false shut downs because of electrical and electronic problems caused by such things as dirty power, power surges, etc. which cause false readings resulting in the automatic cut-off control shutting down machines when no failure has actually occurred. A longer time period allows the machine to determine if a true problem is present and then can react as required. A longer time of 15 minutes has been found to be adequate.

NAMA would like to suggest this time be changed to 15 minutes.
L.Eils indicated that NAMA has allowed 15 minutes for a very long time, and although this section was not part of the original ballot, it is relevant to the process and warrants a discussion.

M.Kohler explained the performance test in more detail, suggesting if we add a good rationale statement, the change in time would be proposed on the ballot and see what kind of feedback was received. B.Laird added that the statement ending in “30-min filling and servicing” already includes that. After a detailed discussion D.Negandhi said it sounded like this Task Group doesn’t seem to have an issue with making this change.

Ultimately, the group decided to make the adjustment within the 4 locations in section 6.4.1 for cold food vending machines performance requirements.

D.Negandhi confirmed this was the last comment from the straw ballot and asked if there were any other comments; there were none. He then briefly described the chart sent in by J.Brania the other day regarding terms to consider for this project as well. J.Brania added that there were 63 terms on this chart, reminding the group he had volunteered for this task at the beginning of the project, but held this back because until now it was uncertain the detail that would be needed.

With time running out for the meeting today, A.Rose quickly presented the draft and the group suggested this be shared with the TG via straw poll requesting feedback. D.Negandhi suggested each row of the chart be numbered which will make feedback more obvious.

D.Negandhi thanked everyone for the efforts and the meeting was adjourned.

Action Items:
A.Rose to add the removal of section 5.11.2 and 5.36 (lobster Habitat) to the next revision ballot
All comments addressed today will be added to the next revision ballot
Terms developed by J.Brania will be sent in a separate straw poll for consideration
Doodle poll will be sent for next teleconference sometime after early December