

**Task Group on Food Shields
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 9, 2013**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Participating members:

Michael Perez (Baring Industries)
Amy Cashen (Delfield)
Chris Cummings (Premier Brass)
Tony Gagliardi (Consultant – Public Health)
Mike Kohler (NSF)

Pep Matus (Versa-Guard)
Andrew Padden (BSI)
John Scanlon (Hatco)
George Zawacki (CAD Solutions Groups, Inc. (CGS)

Absent members:

Anthony Carotenuto (Navy and Marine Corps
Public Health Center)
Randy Lines (Duke Manufacturing)

Thomas McNeil (U.S. Army)

Participating observers:

Jeff Differt (Hatco)
Monica Leslie (NSF)

Supplemental Materials Referenced

2i20r1; 01-01-13
Figure 16C (5.35.5) Cafeteria Food Shield (x+y=24); 01-01-2013
Figure 16G (5.35.9) Food Shield for use on Roller Grills; 01-01-2013
December 19th e-mail to C. Dickson
Issue paper FE-2010-1; 2-22-10
Doug English February 21, 2008 e-mail

Action Items:

1. M. Perez will update the draft per the discussion below and distribute it to the task group for review.
2. M. Perez will complete the first draft of the annex.
3. M. Perez will draft a response letter to Mr. English and send him the updated draft with all of the most recent changes.

Discussion

M. Perez welcomed the group called the meeting to order. M. Leslie took attendance and read the NSF antitrust statement. It was noted that a quorum had been reached.

Draft 2i20r1

M. Perez reviewed the latest modifications made to section 5.35.5.1 of the draft. At the last meeting, the group agreed to revise the X + Y compliance criteria requirement from 32” to 24”. This brings it more in line with what is being specified in the real world and has been determined to be more than adequate for protection. M. Perez asked the group for any comments regarding this revision. None were noted.

Task Group on Food Shields
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 9, 2013

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.
--

A question was raised regarding section 5.35.4.1. The discussion was tabled until after the review of the revised Figure 16C and 16G.

Figure 16C

M. Perez explained that the diagram shows a much smaller food shield than before. He also noted that the figure on right shows how no top glass is required if the requirements of 5.35.4.1 are met. There were no questions, comments or objections from the group.

Figure 16G

M. Perez stated that at the December teleconference, task group members suggested that it would be helpful to have a figure to accompany the new requirements for roller grills under section 5.35.9.2. The purpose is not to prevent exposure to biological contaminants, but to prevent exposure from falling debris and dirt from the ceiling above. J. Scanlon agreed that it was what the task group had intended during that discussion. Several other members also stated their approval of the figure. T. Gagliardi stated his objection to the requirements in section 5.35.9. M. Perez stated that this is in response to a specific issue that a manufacturer had with a client wanting NSF certification for a food shield used above a roller grill. He added that roller grills keep the food at a higher temperature than needed for the bacteria to survive. This is less of a concern than falling debris from above. T. Gagliardi disagreed and cautioned that a lot of assumptions are being made. For example, the group is assuming that the food has been heated long enough to prevent the bacteria. M. Perez asked if there were any other comments. None were noted.

5.35.4.1

It was stated that the intent of the requirements under 5.35.4.1 is confusing. C. Dickson stated that they would typically measure 60" from the floor and that the height of the countertop doesn't matter. Concerns were raised that the proposed language in the draft was not what was actually intended. A couple of options had been previously been presented to the group. The group reviewed the language in the drafts from April and May 2012. A statement had been added so that 60" from the floor was the total vertical height required. M. Perez read from the April 11th and May 9th meeting summaries. The group had selected option 2 from the April 25th draft at the May 9th teleconference. M. Kohler pointed out that if one has a solid wall and the top part is see-through glass, the wall is still the barrier. M. Perez agreed. M. Kohler stated that stated that the way section 5.35.4.1 is currently written, it appears that one would have to have a 24" counter on top of the wall from the floor that then will exceed the 60" requirement. M. Perez stated that it appears that this revision may have inadvertently been missed when updating the draft. He stated that he will revise the draft to reflect the language in option 2 from the April 25th draft.

December 19th e-mail to C. Dickson (Cafeteria Food Shields)

The group reviewed the two issues that C. Dickson raised in her original issue document (FE-2010-1) and summarized in December 19th e-mail to C. Dickson. M. Perez stated that the current draft resolves the first issue. The second issue (operator reach above a cafeteria food shield), prompted the reach study currently in

Task Group on Food Shields
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 9, 2013

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.
--

work. The task group has recommended changing this requirement to reflect the industry standard and the current draft reflects this change. There was general agreement among the group that both issues have now been resolved. C. Dickson agreed that these issues have been addressed in a “served” situation. The other situation that can occur is the reach to the food at a self-serve food shield. M. Perez explained that a risk analysis study is being conducted separately from this task group between FCSI and NSF. The results of this study will be reported back to this task group. The task group can then determine if additional changes need to be made to the draft. The group agreed that they would leave this issue open until such time they can evaluate the results of the risk analysis. M. Kohler suggested moving forward with a JCFE ballot on the parts of the draft that have been addressed to this point. It will probably take multiple ballots to get all of the revisions approved by the JC.

The group discussed the implementation of these changes once the ballot passes. M. Kohler explained that the certifier will review the new requirements with manufacturers and determine how quickly implementation can take place. Additional time is usually allowed redesign or recertification is needed. Once the revised standard is published, however, products can be certified to the new requirements immediately if the product meets the requirements. It was noted that portable food shield products will need evaluation and recertification.

Doug English February 21, 2008 e-mail

The group discussed multiple comments submitted by Doug English in an email to M. Perez.

Comment #1: (M. Perez noted 5.35.4 is now 5.35.1.5). D. English is opposed the allowance of a channeled edge. M. Kohler stated that he did not believe that there is an issue with the channel edge – it’s simply one option. D. English stated that the term “rounding” is inaccurate and should be replaced by the term “polishing of the edges”. Multiple members agreed that that current term “rounding” is appropriate and sufficient for this application.

Comment #2: D. English stated that only tempered glass or acrylic should be permitted. Use of laminated glass should not be allowed. M. Perez stated that the standard is currently silent as to the type of glass required. M. Kohler stated that the requirement currently referenced in the standard (5.35.1.5 and 5.43.3) is the impact test in NSF/ANSI 51. Perhaps D. English is not aware of that requirement because it is unlikely that laminated glass wouldn’t pass the impact test anyway.

The group discussed that the reference to 5.43.3 in section 5.35.1.5 should be changed to state “...shall conform to the requirements in NSF/ANSI 51.” The task group agreed and M. Perez will update the language for this section. The question was raised as to whether anyone has subjected laminated glass to the impact test. M. Kohler stated that NSF usually depends on the documentation from manufacturers to verify that glass used is compliant. They don’t typically have to run the test. The manufacturers present on the call each stated that they were using tempered glass, which meets the impact test in NSF/ANSI 51. It was noted that if laminated glass did meet the impact test, there was no objection to its use. There was a general agreement among the group they were comfortable with the requirements as currently written.

Task Group on Food Shields
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 9, 2013

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.
--

Comment #3: (5.35.6 is now 5.35.1.6). M. Perez reviewed the comment regarding end panels. It was noted that by adding requirements for portable products, the task group has addressed many of D. English's concerns here. The one issue left is D. English's comment regarding end panel height. The current method for determining the required height of an end shield is to measure the height of the food shield that has been adjusted into compliance. The group discussed the fact that many times these would be adjustable. M. Perez asked the group if they had any additional comments. None were offered.

Comment #4: (5.35.6 is now 5.35.1.6). The group discussed D. English's comment regarding the requirement of the location of the food shield in relation to the wall. He questioned why an end shield would be required in certain specific applications. A. Cashen stated that one cannot describe every possible scenario, but remembered that the group had previously begun discussing an appendix to cover the intent of this requirement. M. Perez noted that the task group agreed that an appendix would help provide guidance for determining compliance criteria in unusual and non-traditional applications. A draft has been started but has been completed. This appendix wouldn't be part of the requirements in the standard, but would provide guidance for use in the field. Certifiers certify the shield but have no control over the end use.

Comment #5: (5.35.7.1 is now 5.35.2.1). D. English suggested that the maximum vertical distance for self service shields be conditional upon whether a tray slide is included or not. M. Perez noted that there is an annex that explains the rationale for how the requirements were made. The task group had decided to use the more stringent condition of having a tray slide.

Comment #6: (5.35.7.2 is now 5.35.2.2). D. English suggested that an absolute value be given for the minimum horizontal distance from the front inside edge of displayed food and the bottom leading edge of a food shield – not the use of a formula that states $0.75 \times$ the maximum vertical distance. M. Perez explained that the vertical opening of 13" is a maximum requirement, not an absolute value and therefore the reason for the formula based criteria. This gives manufacturers some flexibility. There was agreement among the group that it should allow for an adjustable amount, and the requirement should be left as it is currently stated.

Comment #7: (5.35.7.3 is now 5.35.2.3). D. English submitted a comment regarding the X + Y criteria for self-serve food shields. M. Perez stated that this criteria was developed on vector-intercept diagrams. The rationale is explained in the published annex.

Comment # 8: (5.35.7.4 is now 5.35.1.8). D. English questioned the need to be able to see the food if it is inaccessible. M. Perez stated that this comment is rhetorical in nature and can't really be addressed here. It was noted that it was important for a customer to be able to see the food without having to duck under the food shield.

Comment #9: (5.35.7.5 is now 5.35.1.7). D. English stated that gaps shouldn't be allowed. M. Perez stated that the task group had addressed gaps during multiple teleconferences (issue documents FE-2007-5, FE-2007-6, FE-2007-7 and FE-2007-8). He read the language from the current draft. M. Perez recalled that permitting small gaps provided enough flexibility to make adjustable food shields possible and still provides a reasonable amount of protection. Several members of the group stated their agreement.

Task Group on Food Shields
Teleconference Meeting Summary
January 9, 2013

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.
--

Comment #10: (5.35.9.2 is now 5.35.3). D. English suggests that the “exact wording of the label” be required to avoid any confusion. M. Perez stated that currently the actual wording up is left up to the manufacturer and the certifier. The group agreed to leave this as it is currently written.

Comment #11: M. Perez reviewed the comment regarding the need for protection from particles from the ceiling above and asked the group for feedback. No one in group agreed with this statement and it was determined that no action should be taken.

M. Perez stated that he will draft a response letter to Mr. English and send him the updated draft with all of the most recent changes.

The next teleconference is scheduled for Wednesday, February 13, 2013 at 2:00 pm ET. The meeting was adjourned.