

Michael Perez

From: Michael Perez
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 10:39 AM
To: 'Tony Gagliardi'
Subject: RE: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

At present, there is no requirement in any NSF standard that requires a food shield in any application. The FS requirement is left up to the local health official having jurisdiction. Some manufacturers offer a vacu-formed acrylic cover that is hinged at the back but has an opening at the front. The opening at the front of the cover is in violation of the barrier between food and mouth requirement. A customer can serve themselves by either reaching through the opening with tongs or lifting the hinged cover. Once the hinged cover is lifted, it too is in violation of the barrier requirement.

Kevin Smith is not a part of this TG so he has not yet seen any of the materials in this draft. I agree that cost issues are not a concern for and not taken into consideration by the TG.

Since the TG has been working on this portion of the draft, I have made it a point to stop in at many C-store and gas station locations to take an informal, non-scientific survey. About 2/3 of the roller grills I have seen are equipped with the hinged acrylic cover and the other 1/3 have no cover at all. Approximately 95% of all locations surveyed are self-service. 7-eleven C-stores are the only locations where I have seen non-self-service roller grills. This being the case, at least here in the South Florida area, it seems that many local health officials may be ignoring this type of self-serve application.

Thanks, m perez/23 January

From: Tony Gagliardi [mailto:gagliardi@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 8:49 AM
To: Michael Perez
Subject: Re: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

I don't understand the "nothing at all" idea. The equipment by code must have a guard if it is to be used in a self-service setting. If the equipment is used by employees only and is not positioned where containment by the public is possible or probable, then no guard would be required. Roller grills do not lend them easily to self-service settings, that I will admit. Where I see the TG going is in a direction that will not be deemed to be acceptable to public health officials. Again, has Kevin Smith seen this and what is his input? The issue that I see is providing a guard that establishes a barrier between the food and customer (which is what code requires) yet is usable and accessible. Sneeze guards have always and will always be a challenge. What I see in the photos is a poor attempt to comply. Cost issues are irrelevant in a way and design dependent to a large degree.

I can tell you that even if the task group were successful in rewriting the standard in this manner, many health folks would look at it and deem the set up to be unacceptable due to the fact that there will not be a barrier between the customer and the food. The proposed change would lower the respect given to the NSF mark. I just do not think this is the way to go.

Tony Gagliardi
gagliardi@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Perez <Michael.Perez@Baring.com>
To: Tony Gagliardi <gagliardi@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Jan 21, 2013 1:17 pm
Subject: RE: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

This is the issue document driving the change. The section for roller grills was added because the TG felt it is better to have something than the current condition which is no protection at all.

Regards, m perez/21 January

From: Tony Gagliardi [mailto:gagliardi@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 1:06 PM

To: Michael Perez
Subject: Re: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

It seems that I am dictating to the TG and I don't want to do that. I was not dissatisfied with how the standard existed and I don't remember what the issue was that needed to be addressed. What is driving the proposed change?

Tony Gagliardi
gagliardi@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Perez <Michael.Perez@Baring.com>
To: Tony Gagliardi <gagliardi@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Jan 21, 2013 11:45 am
Subject: RE: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

Tony, I value your opinion and do not want to send this to JCFE ballot without your support. I will add this to the agenda for our February meeting for further review and discussion by the TG. In the meantime, I'd like to come up a few options for consideration. What do we need to change in order to satisfy your concern?

Thanks, m perez/21 January

From: Tony Gagliardi [<mailto:gagliardi@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 8:17 AM
To: Michael Perez
Subject: Re: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

Michael

I must admit that I have thought about this several times since the teleconference. I have not changed my opinion and I am reasonable sure that it will not change. My mind just will not accept that there will be no barrier between a customer and the food display. In fact with this change there is little or no attempt to provide a barrier at all. No one more that I understands the difficulty of setting up guards so that it is possible (difficult but possible) to access food displayed therein. It has always been my belief that you did all you could to protect the food from contamination from all sources. Even knowing that you can't prevent it in every situation, you did what you could. I question if this even jibs with the food code, I don't think so.

Is the food safe, possibly after a certain amount of time the heat present may kill anything present or deposited. That being said, it repulses me to know that the likelihood of the presence of such contaminants. I mean I like you but there is just so far I am willing to go if you know what I mean. (ha-ha)

If this notion I have is wrong then it is just a few sentences in an argument to substantiate that there is no need for guards anywhere. Hot foods and cold foods will be kept at a temp that will kill or inhibit growth of bacterial and viral contaminants. So in the end, you are starting down a path that will in the end do away with all guards. Why have any guards if they do so little. In fact do you have any scientific evidence where a sneeze guard prevented an illness. Further, do you of any disease that was proven to be passed from one person to another because there was no sneeze guard provided above the foods. I can hear Tom Johnson making this very argument sometime in the future, you just need to find someone willing to pay his fee and it will happen. Science is not the answer to everything, common sense and common decency should come into play as well.

I just cannot buy this proposed change, sorry. Maybe I am getting too old for this mess. Oh well enough of my ramblings. Have a good day.

Tony Gagliardi
gagliardi@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Perez <Michael.Perez@Baring.com>
To: Tony Gagliardi (gagliardi@aol.com) <gagliardi@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Jan 21, 2013 7:40 am
Subject: Food Shields - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

Tony, have you given this anymore thought? I am uncomfortable with moving forward with the present draft without your support. If you have questions it is likely other will as well. What do we need to change in the draft to resolve your objections?

Thanks, m perez/21 January

From: Michael Perez
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 4:59 PM
To: 'Tony Gagliardi'
Subject: RE: [fs] Groups - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

A good portion of the discussion on roller grills was during the July 11th teleconference. I've attached the meeting summary from that meeting. The discussion on roller grills begins on page 3. Also attached is an e-mail follow-up from the October meeting. I am told that micro-organisms of the type that can cause food borne illness cannot survive at temperatures above 135°F. Manufacturers of roller grills tell me that the roller temperatures are between 150°F and 175°F. At those temperatures, a roller grill is consider to be cooking equipment even though they are typically used only to rethermalize food that has already been cooked. I can think of no other piece of cooking equipment that is also used for self-service.

I agree with you that even if rendered sterile by high temperature, I don't want someone's saliva on my food. With the cooking surface at 42" to 54" above the finished floor, I do not see a way to provide a barrier between mouth and food and still maintain self-service. Are we better off to do nothing and leave the status quo or require something that does not protect from cough and sneeze? I continue to wrestle with this question and have found no answer that I am comfortable with and can fully support.

Even with the risk study currently in work, it is my opinion that food shields will not be eliminated even if the study proves there is 0% risk of contamination by cough or sneeze. I do know there is a serious movement among specifiers and users to increase a customer's access to food at self-serve stations. With FCSI's support, the movement has gathered significant momentum and is something I feel we ought not ignore. Some specifiers have gone as far as advocating that food shields be eliminated completely. It is fine line on which we balance.

As always, I really appreciate your participation and contribution to this task group. Your thoughts carry a lot of weight in my view.

Thanks, m perez/9 January

From: Tony Gagliardi [<mailto:gagliardi@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 4:05 PM
To: Michael Perez
Subject: Re: [fs] Groups - 2i20r1; 01-01-2013 uploaded

Michael

As I stated in the comment that I made today, I am greatly bothered by the change in the guards above a roller grill. I think that the presumptions made in this change are not well founded and a bit misguided. I will admit that with sufficient time and temperature elevation of the contaminated product surface that the contaminant can be rendered inert. There is no guarantee that such a time or temperature will be attained. While I can accept that sneeze guards are not 100% effective, I believe that this design will be lets just say 98% ineffective.

Even if the contaminant is rendered harmless, I would want every reasonable effort to be taken to keep someone else's saliva, (etc.) off my food. Again, this design will not do that.

Listening to the remainder of the teleconference, time and again I wondered, with the perceived attitude of the TG, why any guards were being required or considered for any hot foods. Scientifically the temp requirements will keep biological contaminants from multiplying and there are very few "contaminants" that will infect at very low dosages. Since a low dose of "contamination" is what you are talking about here, why guard foods at all.

I think this direction will prove to be a bad direction to take and I would discourage it.

Tony Gagliardi
gagliardi@aol.com