

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2013

DateRun: 10/17/2013

Experimenters: Junhee Cho, Loc Nguyen

ClientType: Cleaning Equipment Mfr

ProjectNumber: Project #1

Substrates: Stainless Steel

PartType: Coupon

Contaminants: Food

Cleaning Methods: Manual Wipe

Analytical Methods: Gravimetric

Purpose: To evaluate the supplied products for general cleaning application on a second soil

Experimental Procedure: The supplied cleaning products were used at the recommended operating procedures. The supplied unit was run through two process cycles using 1 gram salt and 1.5 liter water. Water also was included.

Prewriteghed stainless steel coupons were coated with a hydration soil mixture containing pancake mix, barbeque sauce, chocolate syrup and water (35 g, 50 g, 45 g and 10 g). The mixture was applied to the surface using a hand held swab, followed by using a pull down bar skimmer to generate a uniform thickness across the entire surface. Once all tiles for the soil were coated, tiles were placed in a convection oven at 100 °F (37.8 °C) and aged 18-20 hours. Once cooled, dirty weights were recorded.

Three coupons were placed into a Gardner Straight Line Washability unit. A Kimberly-Clark Wypal reinforced paper towel was attached to the cleaning sled and and soaked with a three second spray duration on each coupon. This was equivalent of the typical 2 squirts used for conventional cleanser bottles. The units were held at a 6-8" distance from the test coupons. In addition tap water was used and Seventh Generation All Purpose cleaner (RTU). The cleaning unit was run for 20 cycles (~33 seconds). At the end of the cleaning, coupons were wiped once with a dry paper towel. Final weights were recorded, efficiencies were calculated and recorded.

ChemistriesEvaluated: Toucan Cleaner (1 g salt/1.5 L - pH 8-9; Free Chlorine 100 ppm); Proforce Multipurpose 3.125%; Zep All Purpose 100%; Water

Results: The original technology system on stainless steel had successful removal of the hydration soil using manual wiping. The table lists the amount of soil added, the amount remaining after cleaning and the calculated efficiency for each coupon cleaned.

| Cleaner | Initial wt | Final wt | % Removed |
|-----------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Toucan | | | |
| | 0.5399 | 0.1320 | 75.55 |
| | 0.5436 | 0.1356 | 75.06 |
| | 0.7746 | 0.287 | 62.95 |
| Proforce | | | |
| | 0.4259 | 0.2097 | 50.76 |
| | 0.5053 | 0.4339 | 14.13 |
| | 0.7026 | 0.4731 | 32.66 |
| Zep All Purpose | | | |
| | 0.3766 | 0.0435 | 88.45 |
| | 0.3661 | 0.0704 | 80.77 |
| | 0.3398 | 0.0383 | 88.73 |
| Water | | | |
| | 1.2307 | 0.7661 | 37.75 |
| | 1.6378 | 1.1350 | 30.70 |
| | 1.7929 | 1.1950 | 33.35 |

Summary:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Substrates: | Stainless Steel | | | | |
| Contaminants: | Food | | | | |
| Company Name: | Product Name: | Conc.: | Efficiency: | Effective: | Observations: |
| Toucan | Toucan Eco | 100 | 71.18 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| ZEP Manufacturing Company | Zep Industrial Purpose Cleaner | 100 | 85.98 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

| | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------------|--|
| Water | Water | 100 | 35.05 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| EcoLab | Proforce Multipurpose Pine Cleaner | 5 | 32.52 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Conclusion:

The hydration soil was not easily removed using three of the four cleaning methods. The Zep All Purpose product removed more than 85% of the soil and Toucan Eco removed about 70%. Water and ProForce removed less than 40%.