

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, MAY 20, 2026 – 1:00 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dan Favata, John Gill, Geary McMillon, Kyle Melson and Pamela Searcy

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Hornsby, Jarrett Hughes (arrived at 1:08 p.m.) and John Treadwell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Jeff Birdwell and Aboutanaa Elhabti

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Adcock (OUBCC Staff), Kathy Hehnly (OUBCC Staff), Caitlin Redding Taylor (OUBCC Staff), Kim Koyle (Okana) and Roger Roth (Tulsa Health Department)

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES:

None

CALL TO ORDER AND RECORDING OF MEMBERS PRESENT AND ABSENT

Mr. Kyle Melson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and requested the roll be called.

CONFIRMATION OF ALTERNATES

Ms. Taylor confirmed after the roll call that Mr. Hornsby could motion and vote as Mr. Elhabti was not present.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of April 15, 2026, technical review committee meeting minutes

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. JOHN GILL TO APPROVE THE APRIL 15, 2026, COMMERCIAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA TECHNICAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:

Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

Discussion, review and possible action on Chapter 2 of the 2024 edition of the ISPSC®

Discussion and review of code change proposal forms CSPSTC-11 defining “Home Sharing Facility”, CSPSTC-14 amending definition of “Public Pool/Class C semi-public pool”, CSPSTC-12 defining “Pool Sharing Facility”, CSPSTC-9 defining “Pool Sharing” and amending definition of “Public Swimming Pool/Class C Semi-Public Pool”, and CSPSTC-10 amending definition of “Public Pool/Class B Public Pool”

The committee discussed the grouping of related proposals, as well as some that were developed following the Ad Hoc meeting with the residential committee representatives. The discussion focused on distinguishing between residential pools associated with overnight lodging and residential pools rented independently on an hourly basis. Mr. Jarrett Hughes arrived at 1:08 p.m.

The committee explained that the intent was to create separate classifications for “Home Sharing Facilities” and “Pool Sharing Facilities” because different operational and safety concerns existed between the two uses. Concern was expressed regarding pool sharing rental companies that allowed hourly rental of residential pools without granting access to the dwelling. It was noted that these facilities could have significantly higher user turnover than traditional residential pools, potentially resulting in multiple groups using the same pool throughout the day. It was further noted that these facilities often lacked access to restroom facilities, showers, and other amenities normally associated with overnight lodging accommodations. There was discussion whether CSPSTC-9 became redundant after the revised language was developed for through the ad hoc process. It was agreed that the revised language provided a straightforward definition.

The committee discussed enforcement concerns associated with both “Home Sharing Facility” and “Pool Sharing Facility,” how such facilities would be identified, how change of use determinations would occur, whether permits would be required when residential pools were converted to commercial uses, and whether pool contractors would be liable if a residential pool was later operated as a commercial facility. It was stated that contractors building pools according to the approved permit and applicable code requirements would generally not be responsible for later changes in use by the property owner. It was noted that enforcement would likely occur through complaints, licensing requirements, inspections, or incidents involving injuries.

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-11 defining “Home Sharing Facility”. The definition described a residential dwelling unit made available to transient users for short term overnight lodging in exchange for monetary compensation or commercial consideration pursuant to a posted fee schedule, where sanitation facilities within the dwelling remained accessible during the rental period. The committee discussed the use of the phrase “posted fee schedule” and explained that the language was intended to distinguish commercial rental activity from informal arrangements. The definition was intended to apply to facilities offering overnight accommodations with access to dwelling amenities.

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-14 and the proposed changes to the definition of “Public Pool, Class C semi-public pool”. The proposal added “Home Sharing Facilities” to the Class C

classification and modified existing language addressing hotels, motels, condominiums, and similar lodging uses. The committee agreed that home sharing facilities functioned similarly to traditional lodging establishments because users maintained access to sanitation facilities and other amenities within the dwelling.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO ACCEPT CSPSTC-11 AND CSPSTC-14

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell Aboutanaa Elhabti

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-12 defining "Pool Sharing Facility," described as a residential swimming pool or aquatic amenity made available to transient users in exchange for monetary compensation or commercial consideration pursuant to a posted fee schedule on an hourly or short term basis where no overnight lodging was provided. The committee discussed the distinction between "Pool Sharing Facility" and "Home Sharing Facility" uses. It was noted that pool sharing facilities generally did not provide access to dwelling units and therefore did not provide restroom facilities, showers, or other amenities. The committee expressed concern that residential pools rented through pool sharing applications could experience substantial user turnover and occupancy levels exceeding those contemplated by residential design standards.

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-10 amending the definition of "PUBLIC POOL, Class B Public Pool". The amendment added "Pool Sharing Facility" to the Class B definition. The committee determined that placement in Class B would ensure that restroom facilities and other public pool requirements would apply to pool sharing operations. It was discussed that compliance could be achieved through a pool house or other approved facilities, but public restroom access would be required.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO ACCEPT CSPSTC-12 AND CSPSTC-10

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell Aboutanaa Elhabti

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-9 and discussed whether the proposal was necessary after approval of the CSPSTC-11 and CSPSTC-14 and determined that the concepts addressed had already been incorporated into the previously approved definitions. The submitter agreed with the committee and withdrew the proposal.

Discussion and possible action on residential code change proposal form RSPSTC-12 modifying the definition of "Residential Swimming Pool"

The committee reviewed RSPSTC-12, amending the definition of "Residential Swimming Pool". It was explained that the proposal appeared to follow from the ad hoc meeting discussion and was related to alterations, repairs, and classification language for residential pools. The committee discussed that the earlier CSPSTC-11 and CSPSTC-12 language came from the ad hoc committee in response to RSPSTC-12. Since the other two definitions already addressed the classification concerns, the committee felt this proposal was no longer needed.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MS. PAMELA SEARCY TO DENY RSPSTC-12

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSTAIN:	None	
ABSENT:	Jeff Birdwell	Aboutanaa Elhabti

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 2

There was no further discussion.

Approval of Chapter 2

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GEARY MCMILLON TO ACCEPT CHAPTER 2 AS AMENDED

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSTAIN:	None	
ABSENT:	Jeff Birdwell	Aboutanaa Elhabti

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

Discussion and review of residential code change proposal form RSPSTC-4 adding on Section 311.2 “Existing residential pools and spas alterations and repairs”

The committee reviewed RSPSTC-4, intended to bring existing residential pools and spas into compliance with the requirements of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act. They had substantially reviewed the proposal before and there was continued discussion at the ad hoc committee meeting. The committee indicated that the proposal had been debated extensively and that the remaining language reflected the consensus reached during those earlier discussions.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. JOHN GILL TO ACCEPT RSPSTC-4

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

Discussion and review of residential code change proposal forms RSPSTC-8 R1 amending Section 306.2 “Slip resistant” and adding Section 306.2.1 “Public pools”

The committee reviewed RSPSTC-8 R1, which was a revision to proposal RSPSTC-8, addressing slip resistant surface requirements. It was shared that because the original proposal raised concerns regarding enforcement, testing documentation, construction costs, and restrictions on common decking materials, the ad hoc committee reviewed and discussed revised language intended to address those issues. The committee discussed concerns raised during the ad hoc meeting regarding the practicality of enforcing testing requirements for residential installations. There was discussion about relocating specific testing and performance criteria so that they applied only to public pools rather than both residential and public pools.

It was stated that the original language required compliance with specific slip resistance testing standards and that enforcing those standards on residential pools would create difficulties for builders, inspectors, and code officials. There was discussion regarding whether inspectors would be expected to obtain testing documentation for every residential project and how compliance would be verified in the field. The committee expressed concern that such requirements would create unnecessary burdens without producing meaningful safety benefits in residential settings.

The committee discussed the testing standards referenced in the code. It was noted that one of the referenced standards originated from Australia and another was an ANSI standard. There was discussion whether domestic manufacturers routinely test products to the referenced standards and whether alternative testing methods existed. It was explained that the code language

allowed multiple testing methods rather than requiring compliance with a single standard. The committee stated that retaining the testing requirements for public pools remained appropriate because of the increased public safety concerns associated with commercial facilities. The committee agreed that residential pool surfaces should continue to be slip resistant but agreed that the detailed testing and documentation requirements should not apply to residential installations, and the revised proposal limited those requirements to public pools while maintaining general slip resistance expectations for residential pools.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO ACCEPT RSPSTC-8 R1 WITH AMENDMENTS

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:	Jeff Birdwell	Aboutanaa Elhabti
---------	---------------	-------------------

Discussion and review of code change proposal form CSPSTC-8 amending Section 325.2 "Requirements"

The committee discussed existing residential code requirements and noted that many properties already have hose bibs located within the required distance. The committee agreed the proposal would provide flexibility for existing installations while preventing situations where water service points were installed in locations that were impractical for pool operation and maintenance.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GEARY MCMILLON TO ACCEPT CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-8 AS WRITTEN

VOTING AYE:	Dan Favata	Geary McMillon
	John Gill	Kyle Melson
	Gary Hornsby	Pamela Searcy
	Jarrett Hughes	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:	Jeff Birdwell	Aboutanaa Elhabti
---------	---------------	-------------------

Discussion and review of code change proposal form CSPSTC-13 adding Section 327 "Water Chemistry Standards"

Kim Koyle, co-submitter of CSPSTC-13, introduced herself and discussed Oklahoma water chemistry requirements, specifically combined chlorine levels and alkalinity standards. She explained that maintaining a maximum combined chlorine level of 0.2 parts per million was extremely difficult in large aquatic facilities, particularly indoor water parks, that other states permit maximum combined chlorine levels of 0.4 parts per million, and the Model Aquatic Health

Code also recognizes a 0.4 limit. Ms. Koyle requested consideration of adopting a 0.4 maximum combined chlorine level and reducing the minimum alkalinity requirement from 80 to 60.

The committee discussed the difference between free chlorine, total chlorine, and combined chlorine. There was discussion about how combined chlorine levels are measured and why elevated combined chlorine levels occur. It was explained that combined chlorine results from reactions between chlorine and contaminants introduced by bathers, including perspiration and bodily waste. There was discussion about super chlorination, ultraviolet treatment systems, potassium monopersulfate treatment systems, and the challenges associated with maintaining very low combined chlorine levels in heavily used facilities.

There were questions regarding whether water chemistry requirements were contained within the ISPSC or whether they remained under the authority of the Oklahoma State Department of Health. The committee discussed previous legislation directing adoption of swimming pool codes and how operational requirements would be handled after adoption of the construction code, and whether the committee should address water chemistry requirements within the construction code or whether they should be addressed through a separate operator guide or operational standard instead.

The committee discussed differences between indoor and outdoor aquatic facilities. It was noted that indoor facilities often experience greater challenges with combined chlorine because chloramines accumulate within enclosed environments and cannot dissipate as easily as they do in outdoor pools. The committee acknowledged the Ms. Koyle's concerns and expressed interest in further coordination with the Oklahoma Department of Health regarding operational standards, which would be necessary before pursuing any future changes related to water chemistry standards. Ms. Koyle withdrew the proposal.

Discussion and possible action on code change proposal form CSPSTC-4 amending Section 303.1.3 "Covers"

Ms. Taylor shared that CSPSTC-4 was on the agenda by accident; the committee approved it at a previous meeting.

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 3

There were no further comments.

Approval of Chapter 3

MR. GEARY MCMILLON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO ACCEPT CHAPTER 3 AS AMENDED

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

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

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 4

The committee reviewed each section of the chapter. Reviewing Section 403 "Bather Load", there was discussion about bather load calculations, and how those calculations work with occupant load requirements contained in the International Building Code and International Plumbing Code. Questions were raised about whether pool bather loads should be combined with deck occupancy when determining restroom and plumbing fixture requirements. It was explained that the bather load provisions primarily relate to water circulation, turnover rates, and the number of people permitted within the water, while building code occupant loads are used to determine egress and plumbing fixture requirements. The committee discussed examples involving clubhouses, decks, pools, and associated amenities and concluded that the plumbing fixture requirements would continue to be determined through the applicable building and plumbing codes rather than the pool bather load calculations alone.

The committee discussed how conflicting occupant load calculations sometimes occur within building code applications and noted that different occupant load methods are frequently used for different code purposes. No amendment was proposed to Section 403.

The committee reviewed Section 404 "Rest Ledges". Discussion focused on whether rest ledges should be required to include visual identification and slip resistant markings similar to stair requirements, the purpose of rest ledges as safety features and whether swimmers could inadvertently collide with them if the ledges were not visually identified. There was concern that the leading edge of a rest ledge may not be readily visible to swimmers and that visual contrast similar to stair markings would improve safety.

The committee reviewed Section 407.2 "Turnover" and there was discussion about the relationship between bather load calculations and circulation system design. It was explained that the bather load provisions are intended to support water quality and turnover requirements rather than plumbing fixture calculations. The committee reviewed the turnover requirements applicable to various pool classifications and discussed circulation system design considerations, including inlet locations and water movement.

The committee reviewed Section 411.2.5 "Outlined Edges" and discussed whether the language should be incorporated by reference into the rest ledge requirements. Several wording options were considered, including creating a new subsection and directly referencing the stair marking requirements. The committee ultimately determined that the simplest approach was to amend Section 404.1 by adding language requiring compliance with Section 411.2.5. There was discussion about whether the marking should apply only to the leading edge or to both horizontal and vertical surfaces. The committee concluded that the existing outlined edge provisions would adequately address both visibility and slip resistance concerns.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO AMEND SECTION 404.1 TO ADD “AND SHALL COMPLY WITH SECTION 411.2.5” AT THE END OF THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE SECTION

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell
Aboutanaa Elhabti

The committee reviewed Section 409 "Specific Safety Features". There was discussion about the requirements for depth markers and "No Diving" markers. The committee reviewed the provisions requiring depth markers at maximum and minimum depths and at points where floor slopes change. Requirements regarding marker size, placement, visibility, and slip resistance were discussed. The committee determined that the language was consistent with existing safety practices and required no modification.

The committee discussed Section 409.4.1 "Accessory Pole", which require life-saving accessory poles. There was concern that the proposed minimum length of 12 feet would not be sufficient for some larger pools. It was noted that previous State Department of Health requirements often utilized a 16-foot pole and that some commercial pools could not be adequately reached with a 12-foot pole. There were questions whether the requirement should be based upon pool width, whether a fixed minimum should be retained, and whether the requirement should vary based upon the presence of lifeguards. Several alternatives were considered. The committee ultimately decided that the pole should be capable of reaching the center of the pool when lifeguards were not present while also establishing an upper limit of 16 feet. The amendment was viewed as more performance based and better suited to varying pool designs.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO AMEND SECTION 409.4.1 TO READ: “A SWIMMING POOL ACCESSORY POLE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 12 FEET (3658 MM) IN LENGTH, OR HALF THE WIDTH OF POOL AND POOL LENGTH, AND INCLUDING A BODY HOOK SHALL BE PROVIDED. AT POOLS WITH NO LIFE GUARD ON DUTY, THE ACCESSORY POLE SHALL BE SIZED TO REACH THE CENTER OF THE POOL BUT NOT GREATER THAN 16 FEET (4876.8 MM).”

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

The committee discussed Section 410 "Sanitary Facilities" and how those requirements work with clubhouse facilities and other associated structures. There was question whether clubhouse plans must be submitted concurrently with pool plans in order to verify compliance with plumbing fixture requirements. The committee discussed plan review practices and noted that some jurisdictions already require occupant loads from pool facilities to be incorporated into the occupant load calculations for associated clubhouses. The committee discussed apartment complexes, common area facilities, and phased developments where pools and support structures may be permitted separately. It was stated that sanitary facility requirements remain necessary within the pool code because plumbing fixture requirements cannot be verified without considering the pool occupancy. The committee discussed practical challenges associated with coordinating pool permits and clubhouse permits and acknowledged that enforcement practices may vary by jurisdiction.

Approval of Chapter 4

MR. GEARY MCMILLON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. GARY HORNSBY TO APPROVE CHAPTER 4 AS AMENDED

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

Discussion, review and possible action on Chapter 5 of the 2024 edition of the ISpsc®

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 5

The committee discussed turnover-rate requirements for exercise spas and whether larger exercise spas should continue to utilize the turnover requirements applicable to traditional spas; operating temperatures of therapy pools, hot tubs, and exercise spas; and whether larger exercise spas functioned more similarly to Class A, B, and C pools than traditional spas.

The committee discussed adding a footnote to Table 407.2 to address larger exercise spas and establishing a square-footage threshold above which public spas and public exercise spas would be required to meet the turnover-rate requirements for Class A, B, and C pools. There was question whether exercise spas classified as Class A, B, or C pools should be required to comply with the turnover requirements already established for those classifications.

The committee discussed modifying Section 501.2 to reference Table 407.2 rather than creating additional language within the table itself. Discussion occurred regarding simplifying the proposed language by deleting redundant references to Chapter 3 and adding a direct reference

to Table 407.2. The committee agreed the language should require compliance with Chapter 3 and Table 407.2.

MR. DAN FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MS. PAMELA SEARCY TO AMEND TABLE 407.2 TURNOVER RATE BY ADDING "PUBLIC SPAS AND PUBLIC EXERCISE SPAS" TO THE SWIMMING POOL CATEGORY ROW AND ADDING ".5" TO THE CORRESPONDING TURNOVER RATE IN HOURS ROW, TO ADD A FOOTNOTE TO READ "EXERCISE SPAS CLASSIFIED AS TYPE A, B OR C SHALL MEET TURNOVER REQUIREMENTS OF THIS TABLE," AND TO MODIFY SECTION 501.2 TO INCLUDE AT THE END OF THE SECTION AFTER CHAPTER 3 "AND TABLE 407.2"

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill
Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson
Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

The committee reviewed Section 504.1 "Pumps and Motors". There was discussion about the distinction between "access" and "ready access" and how the definitions affected the location of emergency shutoff switches. It was noted that "access" permitted equipment to be located behind an access panel while "ready access" required immediate accessibility. The committee discussed existing requirements for emergency shutoff switches to be located within the prescribed distance from the spa and the associated signage requirements.

The committee discussed make-up water temperature provisions and whether temperature measurements should be taken at storage tanks or at the spa itself. It was noted that provisions addressing water temperature regulating controls referenced water temperature within the spa and provided clarification regarding the intended point of measurement. The committee reviewed temperature requirements contained within Chapter 5 and discussed the applicability of the provisions to storage tanks, make-up water systems, and spa water temperatures.

The committee discussed the process for presenting approved amendments to the Commission. It was explained that staff would make changes to the presentation based off approvals from today's meeting and it would be available at the next meeting for review by the committee. The committee was informed that the review process remained ahead of schedule and they agreed to meet again next month for continued review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: (3:57 P.M.)

MR. JOHN GILL MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. DAN FAVATA TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE: Dan Favata
John Gill

Gary Hornsby
Jarrett Hughes

Geary McMillon
Kyle Melson

Pamela Searcy

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jeff Birdwell

Aboutanaa Elhabti

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 15th day of July, 2026.

Jeff Birdwell

Jeff Birdwell, Chairman
Commercial Swimming Pool and Spa Technical
Code Review Committee

PREPARED BY: Caitlin Redding Taylor

Caitlin Redding Taylor, Commercial Swimming Pool and Spa Technical Code Review Committee
Secretary

Official copy: Original with signature in office file.