

OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

**RESIDENTIAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA TECHNICAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM

2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 82

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2026 – 9:00 A.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jayme Austin, Todd Booze (arrived at 9:05 a.m.), Austin Horton, Bob Kolibas, Clayton Thomas and Michael Zimmerman

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robin Allen and Rusty Britton

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Ryan Russell

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Caleb Lester

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES:

None

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Austin Horton called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the April 16, 2026, technical review committee meeting minutes

MR. MICHAEL ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE THE APRIL 16, 2026, TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayme Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

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 reviewed code change proposals CSPSTC-11 and CSPSTC-12, defining "Pool Sharing Facility" and "Home Sharing Facility". There was discussion on distinguishing between the two. It was explained that a "Pool Sharing Facility" involved a residential swimming pool or aquatic amenity being rented independently for short term use without overnight lodging, while a "Home Sharing Facility" involved rental of a residence that included access to a pool. The committee discussed the need for clear definitions to eliminate ambiguity regarding whether a pool remained residential or became subject to public pool requirements.

There was discussion about concerns associated with "Pool Sharing Facilities" including lack of restroom access, parking limitations within residential neighborhoods, turnover rates, sanitation concerns, and life safety requirements. It was noted that individuals utilizing a pool sharing service would not necessarily have access to amenities typically required at commercial pools. The committee agreed that a clear distinction between the two was necessary and the proposals would provide code officials with a clear basis for determining when a residential pool was being operated commercially.

MR. MIKE ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-11

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayne Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

There was discussion whether Home Sharing Facilities should be treated similarly to apartment pools, condominium pools, hotels, motels, and homeowner association pools. It was noted that homeowner association pools had already been included in prior Class C revisions. Several members expressed concern that Airbnb-style rentals differed significantly from facilities originally intended to be regulated as public pools.

The committee discussed code change proposal CSPSTC-14 amending the definition of “Public Pool, Class C semi-public pool” to include home sharing facilities. There was discussion about potential Americans with Disabilities Act implications if short term rental pools were classified as public pools, such as accessibility requirements, lifts, ramps, and other accommodations that could apply if the pool became classified as a public facility. Questions were also raised regarding enforcement responsibility and whether health departments would be required to inspect such

facilities. It was noted that classification within the code could establish a clear standard that could be referenced during litigation involving injuries that occurred at short term rental properties. There were also concerns broad public pool classification could impose more requirements than necessary that go beyond life safety concerns. The committee agreed that a separate classification tailored to home sharing facilities would be more appropriate than applying the full range of Class C public pool requirements.

MR. TODD BOOZE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. JAYME AUSTIN TO DENY CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-14

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayne Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

The committee reviewed Section 401 "General", making sure that reclassifying the different types of pools would not conflict with other codes. The committee discussed whether a separate classification should be created specifically for home sharing facilities, with tailored safety requirements rather than applying all Class C public pool requirements such as lifesaving equipment, safety ropes, and other basic life safety measures without imposing the full range of public pool standards. The committee reviewed Section 409.4 "Lifesaving Equipment" and it was noted that the CSPSTC had previously approved modified language to require lifesaving equipment be located within 50 feet of the pool perimeter. There was discussion about similar requirements such as shepherd's hooks and safety ropes, that would be appropriate for home sharing facilities and whether those requirements should be applied through a separate classification rather than by putting home sharing facilities in Class C. The committee generally agreed that basic lifesaving equipment requirements were reasonable.

After discussion, it was shared that the committee's binders had incorrect numbering on the code change proposals compared to the presentation and it may have affected the committee's vote as the CSPSTC-11 and CSPSTC-12 were similar. To ensure the minutes accurately reflected the committee's intent, another vote was taken to approve the definition of "Pool Sharing Facility."

MR. MIKE ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. JAYME AUSTIN TO APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-12 DEFINING "POOL SHARING FACILITY"

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayne Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

MR. MIKE ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-11 "HOME SHARING FACILITY"

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayne Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

The committee reviewed code change proposal CSPSTC-10 amending the definition of "Public Pool/Class B Public Pool" to include Pool Sharing Facilities. Discussion centered on whether a residential swimming pool associated with a short term rental property should be classified as a semi-public pool. The committee discussed the potential consequences of reclassifying residential pools serving short term rental properties. There were concerns regarding requirements that could be necessary if reclassified including pool covers, safety ropes, lifesaving equipment, circulation systems, turnover rates, signage requirements, certified pool operator requirements, and other public pool provisions. There were questions regarding the cost of bringing existing residential pools into compliance and whether such costs would be practical for property owners.

MR. JAYME AUSTIN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-10 AMENDING CLASS B PUBLIC POOLS TO INCLUDE POOL SHARING FACILITIES

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayne Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Discussion and review of commercial code change proposal forms RSPSTC-1 defining "Pool/Spa Surface," RSPSTC-2 modifying the definition of "Repair," and RSPSTC-3 defining "Resurfacing"

It was shared that during discussion at the ad hoc meeting, it was agreed that the code change proposals were duplicative and no longer necessary. Code change proposals RSPSTC-1, RSPSTC-2 and RSPSTC-3 were withdrawn by the submitter.

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

Due to an oversight, this code change proposal was inadvertently skipped and will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 2

Approval of Chapter 2

MR. JAYME AUSTIN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND FROM MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CHAPTER 2 WITH AMENDMENTS

VOTING AYE:	Robin Allen	Bob Kolibas
	Jayme Austin	Clayton Thomas
	Todd Booze	Michael Zimmerman
	Austin Horton	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Ms. Allen left the meeting at 10:12 a.m.

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

Discussion and review of code change proposal form 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. There was concern about enforceability of the term "slip resistant" and the difficulties inspectors may have determining compliances. The committee discussed the use of stamped concrete, sealed concrete, different concrete finishes, and other common residential deck materials. The committee discussed the differences between traction and slip resistance and there was concern the term "slip resistant" may cause disagreements between contractors and code officials because there wasn't a universally accepted field test available for residential inspections. It was noted that swimming pool environments inherently involve water and that some degree of slipperiness would always be present. The committee reviewed the existing definition of "Slip Resistant" and discussed abrasiveness, different testing standards, coefficient testing, and maintenance considerations associated with deck coatings and sealers, and the comfort level of different finishes when people walked on them.

MR. TODD BOOZE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL RSPSTC-8 R1 WITH AMENDMENT TO SECTION 306.2.1 TO INCLUDE "PROVIDE FOR TRACTION" AND MAINTAIN THE REMAINING PROPOSED LANGUAGE AS PRESENTED

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin Todd Booze Bob Kolibas	Clayton Thomas Mike Zimmerman
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSTAIN:	Austin Horton	
ABSENT:	Ryan Russell	

Discussion and possible action on residential code change proposal form RSPSTC-15 adding Sections 307.2.6 "Protection of structures," 307.2.6.1 "Walls and footings," 307.2.6.2 "Retaining walls," and 307.2.6.2.1 "Two Pools"

The committee reviewed code change proposal RSPSTC-15 that addressed placement of swimming pools near foundations, footings, bearing planes and retaining walls. It was explained that the proposal originated from concerns regarding excavation occurring too close to existing structures and the potential for undermining foundations or retaining walls. The intent was to establish language that would prevent encroachment into the bearing plane of foundations while avoiding unnecessary restrictions on pool construction. The committee discussed situations involving existing retaining walls, pools constructed adjacent to retaining walls, and pools proposed between structures or within confined courtyard areas. The committee reviewed similar requirements in the International Plumbing Code® and the International Building Code® to avoid conflicting codes.

There was discussion on whether a fixed minimum setback should be required in addition to maintaining separation from the bearing plane of a foundation. There was concern that a 48 inch setback could unnecessarily restrict construction of tanning ledges, shallow shelves, courtyard pools, and other residential pool features where excavation depths are limited. It was noted that trench installations are typically backfilled, whereas swimming pools create a permanent excavation condition.

The committee reviewed examples involving stem-wall foundations, pier-and-grade-beam foundations, basements, retaining walls, and courtyard installations. Concerns were raised regarding the practical application of the proposal without figures illustrating the intended measurements and relationships.

The committee discussed whether retaining wall provisions should remain in the proposal. It was noted that retaining wall concerns could often be addressed through plan review, engineering review, permitting requirements, and existing code provisions governing structural design. There was discussion about the role of registered design professionals and discussed whether engineering review should be required when unusual structural conditions exist. The committee generally agreed that retaining wall language added unnecessary complexity and that the proposal should focus on bearing-plane protection.

There was discussion about steel reinforcement, structural design, soil conditions, frost considerations, ACI standards, and the degree to which pool construction requirements are governed by referenced standards rather than prescriptive code language. There was discussion

about changing the proposed language for Section 307.2.6.1 from "48 inches" to "36 inches" and denying adding a definition for retaining walls.

MR. MIKE ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL RSPSTC-15 WITH AMENDMENTS TO CHANGE THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR SECTION 307.2.6.1 FROM "48 INCHES" TO "36 INCHES" AND STRIKE PROPOSED SECTIONS 307.2.6.2 AND 307.2.6.2.1

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin	Bob Kolibas
	Todd Booze	Clayton Thomas
	Austin Horton	Michael Zimmerman

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Discussion and possible action on code change proposal form CSPSTC-3 amending Section 314.4 "Location"

The committee reviewed CSPSTC-3 amending access and clearance requirements for pumps and motors. The proposal would have required pumps and motors to be provided with access for inspection and servicing in accordance with manufacturer specifications or a minimum clear space of 18 inches, whichever was greater. It was shared that the ad hoc committee had considered recommended withdrawing the proposal but it was not reviewed at the CSPSTC meeting. There was concern that residential equipment areas often have limited space and that manufacturer specifications already address required service clearances and airflow needs. It was noted that a blanket 18-inch clearance requirement could create unnecessary restrictions for residential installations. The committee agreed that manufacturer instructions generally provide adequate guidance for installation and servicing requirements.

MR. MIKE ZIMMERMAN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO DENY CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL CSPSTC-3

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin	Bob Kolibas
	Todd Booze	Clayton Thomas
	Austin Horton	Michael Zimmerman

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

The committee referred back to RSPSTC-15, Section 307.2.6.1 "Walls and footings" and the language previously approved. There was concern that "registered design professional" could permit an architect to approve structural matters that should be reviewed by an engineer instead. The committee discussed the distinctions between architects, engineers, structural engineers, and other licensed professionals, and whether the language should specifically reference a registered professional engineer rather than a registered design professional. The

committee agreed that the proposal language should more clearly direct structural matters to a registered professional engineer.

MR. TODD BOOZE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO AMEND THE EXCEPTION IN RSPSTC-15 FROM “REGISTERED DESIGN PROFESSIONAL” TO “REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER”

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin	Bob Kolibas
	Todd Booze	Clayton Thomas
	Austin Horton	Michael Zimmerman

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Call for any further comments regarding Chapter 3

Approval of Chapter 3

MR. TODD BOOZE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. CLAYTON THOMAS TO APPROVE CHAPTER 3 AS AMENDED

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin	Bob Kolibas
	Todd Booze	Clayton Thomas
	Austin Horton	Michael Zimmerman

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Discussion and possible action to approve the Residential Swimming Pool and Spa Technical Code Review Committee (RSPSTC) presentation to the OUBCC

It was shared that the presentation would be updated with the changes reviewed and approved at the next meeting. The presentation would be sent to the committee before the next meeting for review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: (11:47 A.M.)

MR. JAYME AUSTIN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. RUSTY BRITTON TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE:	Jayme Austin	Bob Kolibas
	Todd Booze	Clayton Thomas
	Austin Horton	Michael Zimmerman

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Ryan Russell

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 18th day of June, 2026.

Austin Horton

Austin Horton, Chairman

Residential Swimming Pool and Spa Technical Code Review
Committee

PREPARED BY: Caitlin Redding Taylor

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