



Driven by your expertise.

Summary of TRC Call Agenda for 6/29/20

The following is a summary of phone-based discussions for Change Requests (CRs) addressed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) for the week of 6/29/2020. 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>.

Due to the lack of a consensus for this call, the TRC discussed the CRs below and indicated a recommended vote for the absent TRC members. The votes were collected via email between 6/30 and 7/13.

Members Present: James Amburgey, Kevin Boyer, Cindy Marshall, Ellen Meyer, Joe Stefanyak, Amanda Tarrier, Miklos Valdez

Members Absent: Michele Hlavsa, Jodi Jensen, Joe Laco, Tina Moore, Chris Nelson, Jason Schallock

4.12.2.2-0001, 4.12.2.3-0001, 4.12.2.4-0001, 4.12.2.8-0001, 4.12.2.9-0001: The TRC members present in general were **leaning toward a Yes** vote on these CRs, as long as the sections or a similar discussion was included in the Annex, with some members unsure.

This CR and the following four CR propose to delete out sections with the rationale that they are adequately covered by ASTM slide standards, which are already required to be adhered to by 4.12.2.1.2. These CRs generated a lot of discussion along the following lines: 1) that there was a reason to include these sections originally, perhaps prior versions of the ASTM standards did not adequately address these items, 2) not all authorities having jurisdiction may have access to the ASTM standards, and these sections help highlight the more important aspects of slide design, 3) that if the CRs are approved these sections should be moved to the Annex instead of deleting entirely. The CR champion stated that the ASTM standards do cover all of the sections proposed to be deleted. The TRC in general was leaning toward Yes on these CRs but some members were unsure and felt that if there haven't been any issues with conflicting standards they don't see a problem with keeping the existing sections in the MAHC. The CR champion stated that there are no direct conflicts between these sections and the ASTM standards, but felt it was unnecessary to duplicate the requirements.

The specific sections to delete by CR were as follows:

4.12.2.2-0001 Flumes

4.12.2.3-0001 Flume Exits

4.12.2.4-0001 Exit into Landing Pool

4.12.2.8-0001 Slide Runouts

4.12.2.9-0001 Drop Slides

The TRC was unable to come to a consensus on these CRs and abstains.

4.6.1.3.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add a requirement “Where overhead lighting is adjustable to accommodate higher lighting levels for different activities, the minimum lighting level setting must ensure the minimum lighting levels are maintained as required at the pool water surface and deck whenever the lighting is on.” The TRC felt that although minimum lighting levels are already specified, the MAHC contains a similar requirement to the proposed for natural lighting, and it is important to ensure that when lighting is adjustable that the dimmest setting is adequate to meet the minimum required levels.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on these CRs.

4.6.4.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **No** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to change the performance-based requirement that measures be taken to prevent bather exposure to temperatures above 104 degrees F to specifically require a thermometer to be installed to in the piping to measure the temperature of the water returning to pool and a high temperature cutout to be installed in the piping to shut off the heater to prevent bather exposure to temperatures above 104 degrees F. The TRC felt that although this change would have a minimal impact as it is what is usually done, it is not the only means of preventing bather exposure to high temperatures and that requiring this specific design would not be in the spirit of the MAHC which is to allow for performance-based requirements where possible. In addition, several members noted that the water temperature in the piping may exceed 104 degrees F so that the water temperature when introduced into the aquatic venue is at 104.

The TRC recommends a No vote for this CR.

4.6.10.2-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **No** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to delete the section “When a spectator area or an access to a spectator area is located within the AQUATIC FACILITY ENCLOSURE, the DECK adjacent to the area or access shall provide egress width for the spectators in addition to the width required by MAHC 4.8.1.5.” The TRC did not agree with the CR submitter’s rationale and felt that the intent of this section was to ensure that spectator egress does not impede upon the required 4 foot clear deck space immediately surrounding the pool (perimeter deck/wet deck), which is necessary to be kept clear for use by pool patrons, supervisory staff, and for emergency response.

The TRC recommends a No vote for this CR.

4.8.1.1.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to delete the note at the beginning of the section that “Decks shall be constructed in accordance with all applicable provisions of this chapter.” The TRC felt that this change was editorial in nature and didn’t feel strongly about whether this introductory statement was included or not, as the section included more specific requirements that could be cited.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

4.8.1.6.1.2-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to require all wing walls or peninsulas to be constructed of slip resistant materials, not just those intended to be accessed by qualified lifeguards. The TRC felt that most wing walls and peninsulas are already constructed with material that’s the same as that around the aquatic venue, so it’s likely already slip resistant. Also, other staff, such as swim instructors and operators routinely access wing walls or peninsulas, so there is no reason why they shouldn’t be slip resistant for their sake too.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

4.8.1.6.7-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **No** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add a section that the design of a wing wall or peninsula ensure that 1. All areas of the pool from the water surface to the walls and bottom of the pool are readily visible from the deck or peninsula if the peninsula is used by lifeguards and 2. There is no abrupt depth change across the wall when the wing wall is used to separate areas used by young non-swimmers from other areas of the pool. The TRC felt that the first requirement was not practical as lifeguards may have zones of surveillance and it may be impossible to design a wing wall so that all areas of the pool can be seen. There are already supervision requirements that require a lifeguard to be able to view their entire zone and require sufficient lifeguards so that all areas of the pool can be seen. Also 4.8.1.1.2.3 requires the designer and owner to consider impact on BATHER zone surveillance when determining placement of structural, operational, and theming elements. For the second, wing walls are often used for depth change where there is not space to do a gradual slope, so this proposed language could limit their construction. There may also be other options, such as a railing on the wing wall, to keep young children from accidentally entering deeper water from a shallow area. The TRC would like to see this discussed more in the future but agreed that the proposed change would be too drastic.

The TRC recommends a No vote for this CR.

4.8.1.7.2-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to require the surface of all islands to be slip resistant, not just those intended for foot traffic. The TRC discussed that not all islands are intended for foot traffic but most are already likely built using the same surfaces as the areas surrounding the aquatic venue so are likely already slip resistant, and it shouldn't have any impact on the use of islands for aesthetic reasons.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

4.12.8.7-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to remove raised curbs as an option of how to keep interactive water play venues free of landscape debris (other options are 8 feet of deck area or raised planters), with the rationale that curbs are a tripping hazard. The TRC discussed use of curbs is allowed by section 4.1.2.2.3 as an option to surround entire aquatic venues, so it would not make sense that they not be an option here. In addition, there are ways to make the curbing visible (such as contrasting color) to make patrons more aware of them.

The TRC recommends a No vote on this CR.

4.12.9.2.2-0001: This CR proposes deleting the title "Shallow Water" from the code section that specifies that barriers are not required between wading pools near other wading pools. The TRC agreed that the title was not great, but were concerned that no alternative was proposed and that per MAHC convention each section has a title. The CR champion will check with the CR submitter on an alternate title such as "Multiple Wading Pools" or "Exception" and bring an agreed upon title to the TRC for voting. This CR is straightforward so it will likely not be revisited on a call and will be part of an email vote.

5.4.3-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add an operational requirement that the theoretical peak occupancy not be exceeded. The TRC agreed that even though this is an imminent health hazard in 6.6.3.1 it is currently not an operational requirement outside of having the operator have a plan to ensure occupancy is not exceeded. The theoretical peak occupancy is also required to be posted at the facility so it is something that can be checked during an inspection.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

5.5.2.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add an operational requirement that requires ladders, grab rails, and handrails be securely anchored. The TRC agreed that this operational requirement is needed to ensure that these appurtenances are maintained.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

5.6.6.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add the requirement for gates and doors that “Emergency exits shall be clearly marked in accordance with 4.6.6”. The TRC agreed with the submitter’s rationale that there is currently no operational requirement to maintain the labeling. They did feel that the added language should be numbered as 5.6.6.1 and the existing section 5.6.6.1 be renumbered to 5.6.6.2 to match the MAHC convention of having each section contain a single requirement.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

5.8.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to change the title of section 5.8.1 from “Spectator Areas” to “Deck Areas.” The TRC agreed and felt that the original title was probably an error. It also makes the section title more consistent with that of section 4.8.1 Decks.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

5.8.5.2.1.2-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **No** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add the statement “It shall be well marked and a sign shall be posted in accordance with 4.8.5.2.1.4.” to the operational requirements for an emergency telephone/communication system. The TRC agreed that this was necessary to maintain, but felt that it is already adequately covered by MAHC 5.8.5.2.3.2, which states “A permanent sign providing emergency dialing directions and the AQUATIC FACILITY address shall be posted and maintained at the emergency telephone, system, or device.”

The TRC recommends a No vote for this CR.

6.2.2.1-0001: This CR proposes to change the prerequisite amount of experience needed to take a lifeguard supervisor course from at least 3 months to at least 100 hours. The TRC discussed that although this may be a better measure of time (given various full or part time schedules lifeguards have) to standardize the requirement, the 3 months is intended to be at least one season of experience, and a lifeguard could work 100 hours in a few weeks at full time, and this would not give them the same breadth of experience as a guard working part time over an entire season. The CR champion will reach

out to various lifeguarding agencies and the CR submitter to determine if there is a better compromise to standardize the amount of experience needed but keep the intended duration of a season. This CR will be revisited on the July 13 TRC call.

6.3.2.1-0001: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **Yes** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to require a qualified lifeguard if the aquatic venue has a pool slide that discharges into greater than 5 feet of water. Currently pool slides are excluded from the requirement that any AQUATIC VENUE in which BATHERS enter the water from any height above the DECK including but not limited to diving boards, DROP SLIDES, starting platforms, and/or climbing walls have a lifeguard. The TRC agreed and even though section 6.3.2.1 already requires a lifeguard if the water depth is greater than 5 feet, they felt that there are cases where pool slides discharge into deep water and that modifying the current exclusion as the CR submitter proposed was appropriate.

The TRC recommends a Yes vote on this CR.

6.3.2.1-0002: The TRC members present recommended that the entire TRC recommend a **No** vote on this CR.

This CR proposes to add any aquatic venue that contains an underwater shelf to the list of aquatic venue types/characteristics which require a qualified lifeguard. The TRC discussed that underwater shelves are used at various water depths, some very shallow, and there was a recent CR where the TRC agreed in part to reduce the depth of water next to a shelf from 5 feet to 3.5 feet. There are also many other requirements for a where lifeguard is required that could apply to a pool with an underwater shelf. The TRC recommended that if there underwater shelves thought to pose a drowning risks at pools that otherwise would not require a lifeguard, then a proposal should be made to require lifeguards based on more specific underwater shelf characteristics, but requiring lifeguards at any pool with an underwater shelf was unnecessary.

The TRC recommends a No vote for this CR.

The TRC was unable to address the remainder of the CRs on the agenda; they will be moved future call agendas.