

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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:**

Mike Kohler (NSF)  
Derick Taylor (Kona Ice)  
Thomas Jumalon (NC Dept of HHS)  
Bob Corrao (Gordon Foodservice)  
Kaylyn Brunskole (Dominos Pizza)

Tony Gagliardi (Consultant)  
Tom Vyles (Town of Flower Mound, TX)  
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America)  
Jonathan Brania (UL Solutions)  
Beth Glynn (Starbucks)

**Absent Members:**

Tom Ramsey (Snappy Snacks)  
Marianne Miranda (Prime Design Food Trucks)

Richard Gomez (AA Cater Truck)  
Daniele Nanni (Carpigiani)

**Participating observers:**

Al Rose (NSF)  
Audra Bildeaux (NSF)

Michael Perez (Baring Industries)  
Rob Wagner (Public Health, King County)

**Supplemental Materials Referenced**

- 1) Agenda - Mobile Food Units - TG - 2023-07-18
- 2) Meeting Summary - TG on Standard 174 – 2023-07-18
- 3) 174-20XX - Title, Scope, Purpose – Description and Straw Ballot
- 4) NSF 174-20XX - Title, Scope, Purpose Straw Ballot Comments
- 5) JCFE Meeting Summary - 2022-10-05 – Mobile Food Units
- 6) 174i1r4-0-with-comments.doc

**Discussion**

M.Kohler is the TG Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Ten of the 14 voting members were present (7%) representing. M.Kohler recapped the previous meeting summary, quickly explained the process to all the new people and opened the floor to accept a motion for the previous meeting summary and today's agenda.

<b>Motion, B.Corrao:</b>	Accept minutes from previous meeting
<b>Second:</b>	T.Vyles
<b>Discussion:</b>	None
<b>Vote:</b>	Ten in favor, zero opposed, zero abstentions
<b>Motion:</b>	Carries

M.Kohler went over today's agenda and asked for a motion to accept:

<b>Motion, B.Glynn:</b>	Accept today's agenda
<b>Second:</b>	B.Corrao
<b>Discussion:</b>	None
<b>Vote:</b>	Ten in favor, zero opposed, zero abstentions
<b>Motion:</b>	Carries

M.Kohler indicated the action item from the previous meeting was for the group to focus first on the title, scope and purpose of the Standard, before turning attention on the language itself. To begin this process, a straw ballot was recently completed and the discussion today would be on the feedback received.

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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.

Ballot language was presented:

**1 General**

**1.1 Purpose**

This standard establishes minimum food protection and sanitation requirements for the materials, design, fabrication, ~~and construction~~, and performance of mobile food units.

**1.1 Scope**

Equipment covered by this standard includes, but is not limited to, ~~This standard includes requirements for mobile food units that include but are not limited to trucks, vans, and trailers that which are used to prepare and/or serve food~~ prepare or serve or prepare and serve food; including those ~~that which~~ sell individually prepackaged ~~potentially hazardous~~ TCS food items. This standard does not contain requirements for equipment such as hot dog carts covered under NSF/ANSI 59.

Equipment components and materials covered under other NSF or NSF/ANSI standards or criteria shall also comply with the requirements therein. This standard is not intended to restrict new unit design, provided such design meets the minimum specifications described herein.

M.Kohler explained this is the typical language found in all NSF Standards for purpose and scope, adding that the highlights and ~~strikeouts~~ represent updates from the original language from 20 years ago.

M.Kohler presented B.Glynn's comment and opened the floor for discussion:

Glynn, REHS, Beth - Starbucks Coffee Company	Yes	<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NSF 170 contains a definition for mobile food cart (3.135). Should we add a definition for mobile food unit?</li><li>• Local health jurisdictions tend to distinguish mobile carts from mobile trucks/trailers based in whether or not people work inside it (since there are typically separate L&amp;I requirements for units that people work inside).</li><li>• Note: the FDA Food Coode uses the term "Mobile Food Establishment" but it is not defined and is inclusive of trucks, trailers, carts, and other portable units designed for the service of food.</li></ul> <p><b>Suggested edit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "This standard does not contain requirements for <u>mobile food carts</u> <del>equipment such as hot dog carts</del> covered under NSF/ANSI 59."</li></ul>
--	-----	--

B.Glynn was in attendance and explained her rationale, suggesting the underlined part to be added and moving away from the specific term hot dog cart and something defined in Standard 170.

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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.

D.Taylor indicated “*non-occupied*” would be something else we can discuss. M.Kohler suggested that although that’s worth discussing, it may not necessarily fall within the scope. M.Kohler and B.Corrao agreed with B.Glynn’s suggestion and the following motion was put to the floor:

**Motion, D.Taylor:** Update the language as suggested by B.Glynn.  
**Second:** B.Glynn  
**Discussion:** T.Jumalon asked the group if the word “carts” should not also be removed. B.Glynn indicated that is the term defined in 170 and B.Corrao added it is also consistent with Standard 59. M.Kohler confirmed that is all correct; what we’re trying to clearly state is what is NOT covered in this standard. All of which is detailed in 59.  
**Vote:** Ten in favor, zero opposed, zero abstentions  
**Motion:** carries

Next regarding B.Glynn’s comments, should a new definition be created. M.Kohler presented current definition for mobile food cart from Standard 170, and asked if a new definition is needed:

**3.135 mobile food cart:** A food service unit intended for manual, nonmotorized transport from an area where the unit is serviced to another area where the food is served. This term applies to units intended for the preparation of food, as well as those that are intended for the display and service of prepackaged food in its original container without further preparation.

M.Kohler recalled from the work many years ago, there were some definitions loosely proposed. This included some typical mobile food units, but illustrated that temporary units might also fall in this arena. At the time these special temporary event units would have to apply for a permit each time it went somewhere new. Not sure how this exists today and maybe regulatory people here today can discuss this.

B.Corrao asked if special events include carnivals and if so he recalled those not including warewashing. M.Kohler said one of the bigger issues we ran into were the countertop materials used. For instance Formica, which are not allowed in typical kitchens, but was going to be allowed here. Also, drop in sinks were considered to be allowed. M.Perez posited that another allowable item included hook ups for utilities.

T.Jumalon added that in North Carolina there are a set a rules that govern both mobile food units, as well as push carts. When it comes to carnivals and fairs, you can get a permit for any type of unit as long as there’s a means for hand-washing and dishwashing. The biggest difference in the end is the fresh water utilities and waste water removal. Some discussion about permit and timing with the bottom line being a plan review for mobile food units.

M.Kohler said it sounds like we do indeed need to maintain and now define both types of equipment. B.Corrao asked the manufacturers how they would like to see this written. D.Taylor suggested these would fall into 2 classifications, specifically indoor units would be Standard 59, other units would be this new standard. From a health and safety standpoint, as these events are huge, these definitions should be packaged together.

M.Kohler asked B.Glynn if the suggestion is to exclude the temporary use from this standard and she confirmed yes a the food code already covers this.

Jumalon said food traffic is higher at these events, and regulations are based on bare minimums. Anyone attending as a vendor for food prep, gets a permit to operate as long as they have the bare minimum.

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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.

J.Brania posed the following to the group: there are also out there things known as ‘*emergency kitchens*’. These are usually in the form of a few semi trucks which show up at emergency locations and turn them into kitchens. Is that equipment intended to go in this standard as well? M.Kohler said that was not the initial intent of this document but up for discussion. Tony indicated that these equipment are for disaster type settings which isn’t about selling food, but giving away food and would not fall under North Carolina rules and regulations.

M.Perez asked if these would be certified as a single piece of equipment, or would each piece be certified separately. M.Kohler said that originally it was discussed as one piece of equipment, but that never moved forward back when this Standard was first written. Now we’re talking about pushing that off and work on focusing just the mobile food unit part to get the standard published and improve later.

M.Kohler confirmed the group has agreed a definition is needed for mobile food unit, and maybe after this discussion one is also needed for “*temporary food unit*”. B.Corrao agreed suggesting this will help people not falling into one or the other intentionally or otherwise.

T.Vyles indicated if you look at the FDA food code regarding establishments it actually doesn’t say anything about money being transferred so this group should keep that in mind while developing the language. He then added regarding temporary versus mobile food units as the group described here (trucks, etc. driving around), he would not be in favor of distinguishing between temporary and non-temporary.

B.Glynn pointed back to the food code stating it does not define mobile, but does define “*in conjunction with a single event*”. Thus a new permit is required every 14 days, and which breaks up the use. This is clearly distinguished between the two and by trying to include clearly inferior equipment (for instance tents used as kitchen) would add confusion.

M.Kohler finished this section by asking the group if there was any interest in also developing a definition for ‘*temporary unit*’. There was none expressed so he confirmed the group will concentrate energy developing a definition for ‘*mobile food unit*’ and asked for volunteers. He verified that even though the food code doesn’t define this either, it doesn’t mean we cannot as long as we are not in conflict with FDA food code.

**Action Item:**

**M.Kohler, D.Taylor, B.Glynn, J.Brania and T.Jumalon volunteered to work on this together.**

**A.Rose to sort out the Ad Hoc group details.**

B.Glynn confirmed that took care of her comments.

Tony suggested the group keep in mind individual jurisdictions vary all over the country and there will likely be temporary food establishments that NSF Standards cannot address.

M.Kohler asked if there were any comments; there were none and the group moved to the next ballot comment.

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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.

Brania, Jonathan - UL Solutions	Yes	<p>According to the first paragraph, the equipment is the truck, van, or trailer. For the purpose of discussion, I would propose two commas be added to the second paragraph and rely on other applicable standards to cover foodservice equipment that will be in the mobile food unit. It would be a stretch to consider certified foodservice equipment to be a component of a mobile food unit. If revising a boilerplate sentence is not agreeable, then a separate sentence is recommended to acknowledge that existing equipment standards will provide the foundation for the evaluation of tables, sinks, ovens, griddles, refrigerators, hoods, etc.</p> <p><i>Proposed Solution:</i></p> <p>First two commas are added. Not sure that they will be visible or noted as additions.</p> <p>Equipment, components, and materials covered under other NSF or NSF/ANSI standards or criteria shall also comply with the requirements therein. This standard is not intended to restrict new unit design, provided such design meets the minimum specifications described therein.</p>
------------------------------------	-----	---

J.Brania explained his intent. Ultimately, we shouldn't have to call out over and over and over the other standards that will be referenced against. To correct for this, 2 commas can be added at the beginning of the language:

**Equipment, components,** and materials covered under other NSF or NSF/ANSI standards or criteria shall also comply with the requirements therein. This standard is not intended to restrict new unit design, provided such design meets the minimum specifications described herein.

The group agreed.

M.Kohler asked if there were any comments; there were none and the group moved to the next ballot comment.

Brania, Jonathan - UL Solutions	Yes	<p>Trailers will include tow-behind products where the operator is outside (currently certified to NSF/ANSI 59) and towable products where the operator is inside the trailer. The term trailer may need to be revisited and possibly refined because NSF/ANSI 59 has been adequate for trailers where the operator is outside. Alternatively, language from NSF/ANSI 59 may provide a baseline for NSF 174, and all trailers will be evaluated to UL 174. This needs to be addressed.</p>
------------------------------------	-----	--

J.Brania indicated there were more things even discussed here today such as '*not occupied*'. Just want to get an understanding of what the guard rails are. M.Kohler agreed adding the definition bleeds into how we define mobile food units. Maybe we will go back to the current definition of carts and make them overtly distinct.

The group agreed.

M.Kohler asked if there were any comments; there were none and the group moved to the next ballot comment.

Brania, Jonathan - UL Solutions	Yes	<p>Suggest deleting TCS. This is a very specific example sentence. If an MFU will only sell non-TCS food items, then it should be eligible for certification, in which case it may still be noteworthy that an MFU holds only prepackaged foods.</p>
------------------------------------	-----	--

**Task Group on Mobile Food Units  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
December 19, 2023**

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.

Explained removing this because there are equipment that might only sell non TCS foods like popcorn. M.Kohler said this is standard language throughout the FE Standards but removal here makes sense.

The group agreed.

M.Kohler asked if there were any comments; there were none.

M.Kohler added a topic not brought up on the ballot but worth pointing out here. Specifically, we should be focused primarily on the inside hygienic design of the inside of the equipment. There can be other areas that we don't need to evaluate on the unit (tires, etc.). Maybe we should consider adding language for exception in the standard and that might need some explanation in the scope as well.

B.Corrao agreed adding language should focus where the food resides.

M.Kohler added this might actually be better explained in the design requirements to keep the scope from getting messy. After today's discussion that seems like the best approach

M.Kohler reiterated the action items.

M.Kohler asked if there were any comments; there were none and the meeting was adjourned.