

OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

COMMERCIAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA TECHNICAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTES

UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM

2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 82

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2025 – 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeff Birdwell, John Gill, and Pamela Searcy

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jarrett Hughes

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Aboutanaa Elhabti, Dan Favata, Geary McMillon, Kyle Melson

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Gary Hornsby and John Treadwell

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Adcock (OUBCC Staff), Kathy Hehnlly (OUBCC Staff), Caitlin Redding Taylor (OUBCC Staff), John Moore (City of Piedmont) and Roger Roth (Tulsa Health Department)

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES:

None

CALL TO ORDER:

The committee met but a quorum was not present, so there was not an official Call to Order. It was acknowledged that no formal actions could be made but discussion could proceed, so the committee present decided to meet to continue reviewing the ISPSC®.

Mr. Adcock shared an update regarding House Bill 3338 which, if passed, would establish licensing requirements for swimming pool contractors under the Construction Industries Board, including authority to create rules, set qualifications, and implement continuing education requirements. It was explained that a future committee would likely be formed to oversee these processes, including enforcement, approvals of educational programs, and disciplinary actions.

Discussion, review and possible action on Chapter 3 of the 2024 edition of the ISPSC®

Discussion, review and call for any comments regarding Chapter 3

The committee began their review at Section 325. There was discussion about Section 325.2. Roger Roth of the Tulsa Health Department shared that he planned to submit a code change proposal for the section to replace “adequate distance” with a defined maximum distance, specifically “not more than 50 feet.”

Section 325.10 “Gaseous chlorination systems” was discussed. The term “substantial alteration” was identified as undefined in Chapter 2, which could lead to inconsistent enforcement. The committee discussed removing the term to improve clarity so that any alteration would require removal of gaseous chlorine systems. A distinction was made between maintenance and alterations in that maintenance, such as replacing components with identical parts, was not considered an alteration, while system changes were considered alterations.

Discussion and possible approval of Chapter 3

Approval of the chapter was postponed until a quorum was present.

Discussion, review and possible action on Chapter 4 of the 2024 edition of the ISPSC®

Discussion, review and call for any comments regarding Chapter 4

The committee began reviewing Chapter 4. It was agreed that many provisions, particularly those related to diving envelopes and safety standards, were based on established engineering criteria and should not be modified without strong justification. There was discussion about deck access requirements, specifically the requirement for unobstructed access to at least 90 percent of the pool perimeter. It was noted that the code did not clearly define “unobstructed access,” which could lead to varying interpretations.

The committee discussed deck construction, specifically separation joints on cantilevered coping. Mr. Birdwell shared that he planned to submit a code change proposal addressing the matter, as failures can occur when decks and pool shells are not allowed to move independently, particularly in cantilever deck designs. He emphasized the importance of separation joints or bond breakers as best practice to prevent cracking and structural issues. It was noted that responsibility for proper installation may vary depending on whether the pool contractor or a separate concrete contractor performs the work.

The committee discussed emerging design trends, including tanning ledges and beach entry pools. It was noted that some jurisdictions define pool configurations in ways that may restrict such features, requiring amendments or special approvals. There was discussion about the classification of residential pools used for commercial purposes, such as short-term rentals or hourly pool rentals. It was noted that the residential committee had proposed language defining pools used for commerce as commercial pools. Concerns were raised about enforcement, liability, and unintended consequences, including accessibility requirements and regulatory burdens. It was acknowledged that classification decisions would ultimately affect local jurisdiction authority and enforcement practices. There was discussion about liability considerations for pool builders when residential pools are later used commercially. It was suggested that contractual language could clarify intended use as residential to provide protection. It was also noted that enforcement of commercial classification would depend heavily on local jurisdiction adoption and implementation.

There was discussion addressed ventilation and exhaust requirements for chemical storage areas, including concerns about discharge locations near occupied areas such as parking lots. It was shared that current language primarily addresses air intake separation rather than exposure

to individuals outside the building. Upon completing review of the chapter, the committee adjourned.

Discussion and possible approval of Chapter 4

Approval of the chapter was postponed until a quorum is present.