

**Task Group on Food Equipment Materials**  
**Teleconference Meeting Summary**  
June 24, 2025

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:**

Dipak Negandhi (A.O. Smith Corporation)  
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America, Inc.)  
Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)  
Burl Finkelstein (Kason Industries)

Mike Kohler (NSF)  
Robert Sudler (FDA)  
Syed Rizvi (Marmon Foodservice)

**Absent Members:**

Michèle Samarya-Timm (NEHA)  
Joe Wallace (A.O. Smith Water Products Co.)  
Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.)

Massoud Neshan (Southern CaseArts)  
Swati Bhatt (Los Angeles County)

**Participating observers:**

Al Rose (NSF)  
Danielle Escolas (Intertek)  
Patrick Blad (Nemco)  
Robert Dunn (ITW Food Equipment Group)  
Larry Levine (NSF)  
Thomas Jumalon (N.C. Dept of HHS)

Michael Perez (MGP Foodservice Engineering)  
Darrin Dimmitt (Hill Phoenix)  
Jim Godiska (Follett Corp)  
Scott Smith (JM Smucker)  
Elizabeth Gray (NSF)  
Skeeter Tanner (Cambria)

**Supplemental Materials Referenced**

- **Ad Hoc Meeting Notes - 2025-05-01.docx**
- **Joint Committee Issue Paper - Standard 51 (Bisphenols and PFAS edits)**
- **Issue Paper NSF-51 Wood Requirement Clarification – Rev 040425**

**Discussion**

D.Negandhi welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Seven of the 12 voting members were present (58%), which represented a quorum. He then presented the agenda and turned the meeting over to D.Negandhi.

**Topic #1 – Glasslike Material Requirements**

A.Rose presented the progress on the glass-like material requirements for cooking surfaces, noting that the proposal had passed all necessary approvals and was set for publication. Specifically, this et al ballot triggered publications for Standards 2, 4 and 51 all now due by the end of December 2025.

Dipak thanked the task group for their hard work in getting the proposal approved, highlighting the collaborative efforts that led to its successful passage.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Materials**  
**Teleconference Meeting Summary**  
June 24, 2025

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.

**Topic #2 – PFAS and Bisphenols**

Dipak provided an update since the previous meeting, shared ad hoc meeting notes, and newly revised language suggesting that PFAS be made optional:

**4.1.3** Food zone materials with formulations reviewed and verified to contain no intentionally added Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) may be designated as having “no added PFAS”.

Also new definition to 170 is being proposed

**3.xxx PFAS:** Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances. Any chemical with at least a perfluorinated methyl group (-CF<sub>3</sub>) or a perfluorinated methylene group (-CF<sub>2</sub>-) without any H/Cl/Br/I atom attached to it (OECD 2021<sub>1</sub> definition). Chemicals considered to be PFAS can be found in the OECD database of PFAS chemicals.

Dipak and Mike elaborated on the discussions regarding PFAS and bisphenols proposals, highlighting the work completed by the Ad Hoc group and the development of the optional requirement for manufacturers to claim no added PFAS in food contact materials. This will allow manufacturers to meet various state requirements without mandatory testing.

Danielle suggested the group consider extending the optional requirement to bisphenols, noting the similarity in FDA guidelines for both PFAS and bisphenols.

Dipak highlighted the varying state regulations on PFAS, with some states maintaining status quo while others are considering restrictions, and the ongoing EPA proposal for PFAS in water.

The group discussed the importance of clear labeling for PFAS-free claims, emphasizing that the term "no added PFAS" should be used to avoid confusion and ensure compliance with state requirements. Danielle proposed that the PFAS-free designation be visible in public listing directories and product literature, ensuring transparency and compliance.

The group spent considerable time discussing the various food zones implications and the following motion was put to the floor:

<b>Motion, Mike:</b>	Add the words “ <i>in food zone materials</i> ” and send to straw ballot with this TG
<b>Second:</b>	Burl
<b>Discussion:</b>	None
<b>Vote:</b>	Seven in favor, zero opposed, zero abstentions
<b>Motion:</b>	Carries

**Action Item**

As described above with the following language:

**Task Group on Food Equipment Materials**  
**Teleconference Meeting Summary**  
June 24, 2025

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.

**4.1.3** Food zone materials with formulations reviewed and verified to contain no intentionally added Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) may be designated as having “no added PFAS in food zone materials”.

Dipak asked if there were any other comments or questions; there were none.

**Topic #3 – Wood Requirement Clarification**

New issue paper from D.Escolas proposing revisions to clarify the wood requirements in NSF 51, including specifying that coatings are not sufficient to encapsulate wood and that decorative wood should be limited to splash and non-food zones. She presented the full proposal and the group discussed use of terms like “completely laminated” or “completely covered”.

Danielle recommended limiting decorative wood to splash and non-food zones, specifying that it should not be used in areas exposed to condensation or steam. She emphasized that the proposed changes aim to clarify the original intent of the standard without altering the existing requirements, ensuring consistent interpretation and application.

The group debated the appropriate terminology for encapsulating wood, considering terms like "completely laminated" and "completely covered" to ensure clarity and compliance with the standard.

The group highlighted the need for materials that provide impact resistance, noting that coatings alone may not offer sufficient protection against damage or deterioration. The proposal includes a suggestion for adding a definition for decorative wood to NSF 170, ensuring clear guidelines for their use and compliance.

With time running out, the group agreed to form a subgroup to further refine the language and address the wood requirements in NSF 51, with the goal of presenting a more definitive proposal at the next task group meeting.

**Action Item**

Form an Ad Hoc group to discuss and refine the wood requirements clarification proposal.

Dipak asked if there were any other comments or questions; there were none and the meeting adjourned.