



*Driven by your expertise.*

## Summary of TRC Call Agenda for 8/10/20

The following is a summary of phone-based discussions for Change Requests (CRs) addressed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) for the week of 8/10/2020. A link the recording of the call can be viewed at the CMAHC's Youtube channel by visiting our website at <https://cmahc.org/technical-review-committee.php>.

Members Present: James Amburgey, Kevin Boyer, Michele Hlavsa, Jodi Jensen, Joe Laco, Cindy Marshall, Ellen Meyer, Tina Moore, Chris Nelson, Jason Schallock, Joe Stefanyak, Amanda TARRIER, Miklos Valdez

Members Absent: none

8/7 Email Agenda CRs: 6 CRs were pulled from the email agenda for discussion (4.6.1.4.2-0001, 4.8.1.1.2.1-0001, 4.8.5.3.1-0001, 5.6.1.2.1-0001, 5.6.1.2.1.1-0001, 5.6.1.2.2-0001). The remainder were voted on in a single vote for what the CR champion had recommended in their email summary; the TRC reached consensus for recommended votes were as follows:

**4.9.1.7.3.1-0001 No**

**4.8.6.3.6-0001 Yes**

**4.8.6.3.4.1-0001 No**

**6.3.3.1.1-0001 No**

**6.6.3.1-0007 Yes**

**4.5.4.6.1-0001 Yes**

**4.6.1.3-0001 Yes**

**5.7.4.3.4-0001 No**

**6.5.3.6.1-0002 No**

**4.6.10.3-0001 Yes**

**4.8.2.2.4-0001 Yes**

**4.8.5.3.2-0001 Yes**

**4.12.7.11-0001 Yes**

5.6.3.6.1-0001 Yes

5.8.5.4.5-0001 Yes

6.4.2.2.3.4-0001 Yes

4.7.3.3.3.1-0001 Yes

4.7.3.3.4.2-0001 Yes

**4.6.1.4.2-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes to add the following lighting requirement: “4.6.1.4.2.1 Scientific testing shall be performed by the swimming pool contractor, before the AQUATIC VENUE is turned over to the owner, to ensure that lighting is sufficient and properly positioned to allow a QUALIFIED LIFEGUARD or other person to determine whether a BATHER is on the floor of the AQUATIC VENUE.” TRC members generally agreed with the intent of the CR, but were concerned by the vagueness of the term scientific testing and what it would consist of. It also appeared that the CR submitter was recommending a specific product. The TRC felt that the existing lighting requirements for sufficient lighting so that the pool bottom is always visible from the deck were adequate. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.8.1.1.2.1-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes the following changes to the deck clearance section: DECKS shall have a minimum of (4 feet (1.2 m) of clearance from AQUATIC VENUE edge to fencing or other obstruction to allow for patrons to circulate around the aquatic venue. A 6 foot (1.8 m) deck shall be provided at facilities with lifeguards and the deck shall extend at least 4 feet (1.2 m) beyond the diving stands, lifeguard chairs, swimming pool slides, or any other deck equipment to allow QUALIFIED LIFEGUARD transit, roaming, or change of positioning to maximize viewing of the zone of BATHER surveillance as well as execution of water extrication and emergency care as needed. The TRC felt that the MAHC already covered requiring an adequate 4 foot clearance around the perimeter deck to be maintained in section 5.8.1.3. It was discussed how some state/local codes require a larger clearance, but there was concern about the added cost, especially for indoor facilities, of the added perimeter space around the pool. In addition, it does not take into account restricted areas that could be used for emergency response. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.8.5.3.1-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes to add the following: “The designer shall coordinate with the owner and/or an aquatic consultant to consider the impact on BATHER surveillance zones for placement of chairs and stands designed to be permanently installed so as to provide an unobstructed view of the BATHER surveillance zones. 4.8.5.3.1 Scientific testing shall be performed to ensure, based on the height and location of the permanent chair or stand, that the lifeguard has an unobstructed view of the entire assigned BATHER surveillance zone. 4.8.5.3.2 Testing shall be documented.” Similar to CR 4.6.1.4.2-0001 the TRC was concerned about the use of “scientific testing” and how that would be interpreted, and that the CR appeared to be recommending a

specific product. The TRC felt that the existing language in this section was adequate, and recommended a No vote on this CR.

**5.6.1.2.1-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes to add the following to the section on assessments for glare: *“Assessments* The AQUATIC FACILITY owner shall ensure that glare conditions are thoroughly assessed under various loading and lighting conditions throughout the operating season to determine if the AQUATIC VENUE bottom and objects in the POOL are clearly visible throughout operating hours.” The TRC felt that the word “thoroughly” was vague and open to interpretation, and that the added language was describing how to test instead of just having the performance based outcome of being able to see the pool bottom that needs to be assessed. They felt that how to do the assessment should be left up to the facility. The TRC felt the existing language in this section was adequate and recommended a No vote on this CR.

**5.6.1.2.1.1-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes to add the following to the section on assessment: “Lifeguard Positions If the AQUATIC VENUE requires lifeguards, the AQUATIC FACILITY owner shall ensure that glare conditions are thoroughly assessed under various loading and lighting conditions throughout the operating season from each lifeguard position as identified in the Zone of Patron Surveillance to determine if the AQUATIC VENUE bottom and objects in the POOL are clearly visible to QUALIFIED LIFEGUARD staff throughout operating hours per MAHC 6.3.3.1.1.” The TRC has the same discussion/rationale as for 5.6.1.2.1-0001 and recommended a No vote on this CR.

**5.6.1.2.2-0001:** This CR was pulled from the 8/7 email agenda for discussion. It proposes to add the following to the section on glare reduction: Windows blinds shall be installed or ~~and lighting equipment shall be adjusted and lighting adjusted to meet minimum required lighting levels,~~ if possible, to minimize glare and excessive reflection on the water surface. The TRC felt that this was too prescriptive and suggested that blinds should always be used. They felt that the proposed additions did not improve the existing language. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.5.1.3-0001:** This CR proposes to add the following requirement for bumpers: “Swimming Lane Bumper: A bumper at the end of the swimming lane is required for a minimum of one lane per aquatic venue when used for lap swimming.” The TRC felt that this was a good idea in general but were concerned that the submitter represented a company who made the product recommended and they were not sure that any other similar products existed. There was also concern that there were no specifications for use or removal when not being used and that they could present an entrapment hazard or impact water circulation. Finally, the TRC felt that there was no data shown that proved that there was a need for this type of product. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.8.3.2-0001:** This CR proposes to change the minimum required water depth for installation of starting blocks from 4 to 5 feet. The TRC discussed what current competition guidelines recommend and whether this would cause any impact on competitive swimming. They discussed that this would only be for new construction/substantial alteration and that starting blocks installed in shallow water is a real injury hazard. They looked at data recommending installation in 6 feet water depth and decided to propose to the submitter that 5 feet be changed to 6 feet. They will reach out to the submitter but recommended a Yes vote on this CR for 5 or 6 feet.

**5.6.10.3-0001:** This CR proposes to add the following annex language about starting block use to the Code: 5.6.10.3 Starting Platforms The profile and surface of steps shall be maintained to reduce the likelihood of slips, trips, falls, and pinch hazards. 5.6.10.3.1 Starting Platform Use Deterrence Starting platform use shall be posted as being prohibited by unqualified BATHERS by signage, covers, or other BARRIERS/deterrents. 5.6.10.3.2 Starting Platform Removal If starting platforms are removable without tools, they shall be removed and stored at whenever they are not being used during competition or during competition practice. The TRC agreed with the intent of the CR but there was concern that the second proposed requirement may be difficult for operators with starting blocks designed to be removable but in reality not all that easy to remove, or ones with limited storage space. The TRC proposed to modify the CR to keep the content of 5.6.10.3.2 in the annex and only add that in 5.6.10.3.1 to the code. The CR submitter will be consulted to see if they agree to this. The TRC recommended a Yes vote on the modified CR.

**5.8.2.1-0001:** This CR proposes the addition of the following requirement for competitive diving board/platform use: “Competitive Training and Competition- Diving Boards and platforms designed for competition shall only be used under the direct supervision of a diving coach or instructor.” The TRC discussed that although the intent was good there was concern about use of the diving boards by other groups, such as ROTC and the Coast Guard for training, and even though they would have an instructor, the CR is too prescriptive and does not allow for the facility to self-regulate. It was discussed that most facilities with this type of equipment have standard operating procedures in place for use and during non-use times. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**5.8.2.2-0001:** This CR proposes to add the following requirement for diving board use: “Diving boards and platforms designed for competition shall have a chain or gate with signage closing and restricting access to the diving board or platform when a diving coach or instructor is not present to provide direct supervision.” The TRC felt that although they approved a similar CR for starting blocks (5.6.10.3-0001), this required more than signage and like the previous CR most facilities with this equipment have procedures in place for use and non-use. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**3.2-0029:** This CR proposes the following modification to the definition of interactive water play aquatic venue: **“Interactive Water Play Aquatic Venue”** means any indoor or outdoor installation that includes sprayed, jetted or other water sources contacting bathers and not incorporating standing or captured

water as part of the bather activity area. These aquatic venues are also known as splash pads, spray pads, wet decks. ~~For the purposes of the MAHC, only those designed to recirculate water and intended for public use and recreation shall be regulated.~~ The TRC discussed that this statement was necessary as it was the intent of the MAHC not to regulate single pass designs; however, it would be useful to add the proposed language to the annex to recognize these designs and that the AHJ may want to consider regulating them, as some do. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR but recommended annex changes.

**5.12.1.2.1-0001:** This CR proposes to change the requirements for spa draining and refilling as follows: “A spa containing 500 gal of water or less shall be drained, cleaned and refilled a minimum of once a week. A spa containing over 500 gal to 2000 gal of water shall be drained, cleaned and refilled a minimum of one time every two weeks. A spa with a water volume greater than 2000 gal shall be drained, cleaned and refilled a minimum of one time every three weeks. ~~The water replacement interval (in days) shall be calculated by dividing the SPA volume (in gallons) by 3 and then dividing by the average number of users per day.~~” This CR generated a lot of discussion. The TRC agreed that calculating average users was not easy but felt that the formula should be kept in for those who want to use. They proposed modifying the language in the previous section to specify that the spa needs to be drained and cleaned as needed and to add a minimum frequency or that determined by the formula. They were concerned that even in a large spa 3 weeks was too infrequent, and were unsure what the proposed frequencies were based on, so they proposed a 1-2 week minimum. The CR submitter will be contacted regarding the proposed modifications. The TRC recommended a Yes vote on the CR as modified.

**1.0-0001:** This CR proposes to move MAHC chapters 1 and 2 after the Acknowledgments section to make them not Code sections, and to renumber the existing chapters. There was concern about whether this would impact jurisdictions that have already adopted the MAHC and about unknown consequences. The TRC discussed that most AHJs would either adopt by reference or place sections of the MAHC into their existing code; neither of which would be impacted by this renumbering. They agreed with not having non-enforceable code language numbered, and recommended a Yes vote on this CR.

**3.0.1-0001:** This CR proposes to add an applicability section to the MAHC as follows: “Applicability These rules apply to all AQUATIC VENUES and the associated AQUATIC FACILITY including both public and private owned or operated facilities with the exception of a residential swimming pool or spa at a single family residence.” The TRC discussed that although having an applicability section makes sense it should really fall to the AHJ to determine what they will regulate, and chances are they would be adopting the MAHC into their existing regulatory framework. Therefore, it would not make sense to have a prescriptive section on applicability. They did agree that having language in the annex about the importance of an applicability statement was warranted. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**3.0.2-0001:** This CR proposes to add an intent section to the MAHC as follows: “Intent The purpose of this code is to establish minimum safety and sanitation criteria for the construction, operation, and use of AQUATIC VENUES and to establish minimum qualifications for operators and lifeguards to provide a reasonable level of safety and protection of health and public welfare.” The TRC discussed that although having an intent section makes sense it should really fall to the AHJ develop this type of statement, and that some of this is already captured in section 1.1.3 user responsibility. However, they did agree that having language in the annex about the intent and the code providing a minimum standard was warranted. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**3.2-0011:** This CR proposes to remove part of the definition for CT Inactivation Value. The TRC discussed that they had recommended a No vote for other definitions that were proposed to be shortened and that the extra language provides helpful context and belongs in the MAHC. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.7-0001:** This CR proposes adding standards for Natural Swimming Pools into the MAHC. The TRC was concerned that the language largely deferred to another set of guidelines that were unfamiliar to the TRC, and that this type of operation should have a CMAHC Ad Hoc to take an in-depth look at this type of venue and develop language for their regulation, similar to that of Artificial Lagoons and Surf Pools. The changes should not come from a single entity. In addition, there was concern that only design standards were proposed and nothing regarding operation of these facilities. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

**4.12.10-0001, 5.12.10-0001:** These CRs propose to move the design and operational requirements for flotation tanks into a new MAHC Chapter 7. The TRC discussed that although sections 4.12 and 5.12 address specific requirements for other types of aquatic venues, they are largely additional requirements and not a set of unique requirements with a few references to the rest of the MAHC. Therefore they felt that it was warranted for flotation tanks to be in a separate Chapter entirely. The TRC recommended a Yes vote on these CRs.

**4.1.2.3.5.1-0001:** This CR proposes the following change: “The THEORETICAL PEAK OCCUPANCY for an AQUATIC VENUE shall be used for designing systems that serve BATHERS and PATRONS. ~~(Note: The specified density factors are the lower limits for determining THEORETICAL PEAK OCCUPANCY.)~~” The TRC felt that the subsequent section 4.1.2.3.5.3.1 already captured this statement and agreed it was not necessary as a Note. The TRC recommended a Yes vote on this CR.

**4.10.1.4-0001:** This CR proposes the following modification: The minimum number of toilets, urinals, and other HYGIENE FIXTURES provided, ~~excluding SHOWERS,~~ shall be the greater of the following two options: 1) In accordance with applicable state and local CODES, or 2) Based upon maximum THEORETICAL PEAK OCCUPANCY of each AQUATIC VENUE. The TRC felt that this exclusion needed to

remain because there are specific requirements for rinse and cleansing showers in sections 4.10.4.2, 4.10.4.3 and 4.10.4.4 and that required numbers are not calculated in the same manner as toilets and sinks. The TRC recommended a No vote on this CR.

The TRC was unable to address the remainder of the CRs on the agenda; they will be addressed on an additional final call scheduled for Friday August 14<sup>th</sup>.