

**Task Group on Food Shields  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
July 16, 2019**

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:**

Pep Matus (Versa-Gard)  
Tony Gagliardi (Consultant – PH)  
Andrew Padden (BSI LLC)  
Tom Johnson (Qlean Tech Enterprises)

Mike Kohler (NSF International)  
Randy Lines (Duke Manufacturing)  
Michael Perez (Baring Industries)

**Absent Members:**

Chris Cummings (Premier Brass)  
John Scanlon (Hatco Corp.)

Tom McNeil (U.S. Army)

**Participating observers:**

Al Rose (NSF International)  
Jon Murray (Structural Concepts Corporation)

Al Alderman (Advance Tabco)

**Supplemental Materials Referenced**

- 1) [Agenda - Food Shields - 2019-07-16.pdf](#)
- 2) [FE-2018-10 - Food Shields.pdf](#)
- 3) [JCFE Meeting Summary - 2018-08-22 - Food Shields Excerpt.pdf](#)

**Discussion**

P.Matus welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Eight of the 11 voting members were present (73%) which represented a quorum.

P.Matus indicated there was only one agenda item, specifically an issue paper presented to the JC during the 2018 Face-to-Face meeting. He asked the issue proponent J.Murray to recap the background.

Jon indicated this interest is coming from users of the equipment who cannot reach the back of the food pans at food bars. Confirmed that end users are having trouble reaching the food, as well as the restaurant workers needing to reach and mix the food. The proposal here is to go back a bit in time, somewhere between the old regulations and those adopted a few years back.

P.Matus opened the floor for comments

T.Johnson asked if simply going from 13 to 14 inches as indicated on the diagram would solve the issue, and J.Murray confirmed it does. He added that the setback was important as well and that his design team presented this to customers who found it much easier to use this equipment properly.

M.Kohler indicated this proposal is very similar to what the language was many years ago. When the group decided to transition from the vector base to the formula base, that's what started the current concept change. At the time, we received feedback from various health departments that food was not protected as intended by the food shield and thus, these adjustments were made intentionally to where they are today.

J.Murray posed the general question to the group of “*What did this accomplish?*”

**Task Group on Food Shields**  
**Teleconference Meeting Summary**  
**July 16, 2019**

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

M.Perez confirmed the TG back then used 6-7 dozen vector diagrams to develop these diagrams. He added there is also historical data, which was used to create the formulas as well.

T.Johnson indicated his position hasn't changed, and that he doesn't see any data indicating a connection between the vectors of the foodshield and transition of foodborne illness. He added that actually, the risk factors here are now creating the misuse of the equipment such that the hands are a risk not the mouth. Thus, what the IP is asking is completely acceptable. Don't suggest getting rid of food shields, simply think the current criteria makes it more difficult to access the food and thus mishandling of food.

T.Gagliardi said that it appears nobody on this TG has changed his/her opinion. Doing all the added anthropometric studies means nothing, because we are never going to get data that points directly to source of potential contamination.

J.Murray confirmed that is exactly the point of the issue paper. We are suggesting that data to drive the design, and thus the rationale used in the past is no better than what is proposed today. In the end, we want the food protected from the mouth, but in doing so not make it more difficult to access the food and create a new hazard of food contaminated by the hands.

M.Perez reminded the group that the work accomplished a few years ago had to be based on something. He added to J.Murray that if there is now better information to allow relaxed requirements, then he should present it.

J.Murray presented the video which was also presented during the JC Face to Face meeting in 2018.

M.Kohler stated that what is needed here is general support for a change back in time. He added that the regulatory community will need this support for consideration, along with supporting data to either make the change or keep the current. He said this is why food shields has its own TG. The subject can be very controversial and time consuming to find the right balance. Previously, the group had difficulty when the formula was originally proposed. It took time and thought for the regulatory community to agree, so going back the other way will require support and data.

P.Matus then asked the TG how they would like to proceed. M.Perez confirmed the TG would need a motion for action or inaction.

**Motion, J.Murray:** To open this topic back up and look at other opportunities to support the language revision

**Second:** A.Padden

**Discussion:** M.Perez suggested that many food shields on the market today are adjustable already and the reality is the operators adjust in the field anyway. J.Murray agreed adding the food shield in the video could indeed be adjusted out of compliance. P.Matus said that in many cases in the field there has been rejection of equipment from regulators. M.Perez said if there is a chance there is hard

**Task Group on Food Shields  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
July 16, 2019**

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.

data, we should at least consider working on this. P.Matus asked what sort of data are we referring to, and who can provide it. M.Perez suggested we could include the anthropometrical data from J.Murray's paper, to either prove what we have or substantiate a relaxation of the requirements. J.Murray agreed and will supply updated clear diagrams to the group.

**Vote:**

All in favor

**Motion:**

Carries

**Action Item:**

**J.Murray to provide documentation that will be compared to the current data**

Clerical question was then asked:

**5.36.2.3** The sum of a food shield's protected horizontal plane (X) and its protected vertical plane (Y) shall be greater than or equal to 21 in (533 mm). **Either X or Y may equal 0 in (0 mm). X may only equal 0 in (0 mm) if Y is equal to 0 in (0 mm).**

What does this added sentence mean?

With a short discussion, the group agreed this meant a perfectly horizontal plane and M.Kohler added the real issue is changing the other numbers, not the use of the zeros.

P.Matus asked, and A.Rose confirmed there would not be time to set up another call prior to the JC meeting next month, and that TG priorities would be established at that time.

P.Matus asked if there were any other questions; there were none and the meeting adjourned.