

bbwilbur@frontier.com

From: "Dan'l Jones" <dan_serv@hotmail.com>
Date: Sunday, February 10, 2013 11:34 PM
To: "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>; <tdahl@shorelinefire.com>; <cedars@olympen.com>; "Gwyn Staton" <gwynstaton1@msn.com>; "Susie Petterson" <bspetterson@earthlink.net>
Cc: "Cathie" <cathianne@aol.com>; <whshed@live.com>; <htrain4@gmail.com>; "Maria Chamberlain" <hermitanamaria@gmail.com>; "Jean Salls" <jean_salls2000@yahoo.com>; "Suzy Palmer" <suzy Palmer1@me.com>
Subject: RE: American Red Cross Guideline

Well Mr. Wilbur, you are right.

Most of the things in which you seem to be interested are indeed handled primarily by the Pool O&S committee and are not within the scope of duties assigned to the Pool M&I committee. Please feel free to browse through the millions of videos, news stories, statistics, etc. that are available on the web to answer or address your questions and concerns. There are sites that cover every aspect of every issue from every point of view imaginable.

Slides are inexpensive and safe, but I agree with you, first things first. Slides are a bit of a luxury and an unnecessary but fun add-on. The Pool M&I committee is charged with finding a way to bring the pool facility up to code, recommending any improvements to the facility, and estimating the costs associated with any proposed projects. That would include slides and ADA lifts.

If we are interested in adding something new, we should not hesitate to research the costs, safety, and feasibility and collaborate with the Long Range Planning Committee or Budget and Finance Committee to get the ball rolling, even though it may have a lower priority, which I think we must assign every project or proposal.

A slide is something for the Pool O&S committee to review if we were ever to consider adding one, so as not to complicate the management plan. ACBC would probably want to station a lifeguard near the slide and it should probably be open for only limited time periods.

I am thrilled to see that we are thinking things forward, thus fulfilling the purpose of our Pool M&I committee. It has been a long time since this much work has been accomplished.

I wasn't talking about cannon balls or belly flops; they are fun (albeit painful at times); the depth of water is less critical as you pointed out; and fear is less of a factor. I was only referring to head first diving. Whether or not it would be prudent to allow head first diving is a decision for the Pool O&S committee, but it would require some consultation with the Pool M&I committee to be sure that the facility can legally accommodate that activity if it is desirable or even in demand.

Release forms? Do you mean have someone sign a release form to swim in our pool? Yes, the Pool O&S committee would be the one to review that suggestion, but I have never seen any pool institute such a policy, even hotels, where drownings and injuries are high. I think it sends the wrong message and would not relieve us from any liability caused by violations of the laws regarding pool operations or the safety of the facility or its equipment.

There is no legal council committee, meidocre or otherwise. Voting to secure an attorney for legal advice is the exclusive duty of the Board of Directors. Consulting with legal council by necessity is the responsibility of the Club's Officers, usually the President. We don't have to take everything to an attorney for advice.

Attorneys make great advocates and are of great value in an adversarial legal battle. However, statistics (which do not prove anything) have indicated that the advice attorneys provide is almost as useful, good, or reliable as any other reasonably informed person. Under no circumstances should we operate by word of mouth when it comes to an attorney's advice as has happened in the past, but only written decisions. We need to have a clear question that needs to be answered, not just extended, general conversations.

As advocates, attorneys are better at writing contracts, but if the other party also has an attorney, I can't help but suspect the two attorneys get together and agree to make their sides as outrageous as possible so that they can keep the negotiations going. It pays the bills, and I am not certain most attorneys are concerned with anything above the money.

Yes, there are many studies regarding lifeguard effectiveness. It is not a topic for the Pool M&I committee, but as you correctly surmised, the Pool O&S committee. Some drownings and major injuries do occur each year when incompetent and poorly supervised lifeguards are in charge. When poorly managed, motivated, or trained, they are no more effective than parents accompanying their children, whose record is dismal. Please watch this! (Ctrl + Click should work, otherwise copy and paste into your browser) <http://video.today.msnbc.msn.com/today/48145228#48145228>

If you ever think any lifeguard anywhere is goofing off, please say something. Someone's life might depend upon it.

That is why lifeguards must be prohibited from being assigned menial tasks that distract their attention and must be prohibited from having cell phones, computers, books, or chatting with friends while on duty. Lifeguards should be in elevated chairs where they can better scan the pool and must remain alert. Scanning the pool complex is their most important duty, not cleaning bathrooms, sweeping, scraping the sides of the pool, or other duties that take them away from the job they are trained to perform. They can do those things before the pool opens or after it closes. That is why the law requires us to conduct regular drills at least twice a season.

Despite the reporter's statement at the end of this video, which obviously neither she nor her writers researched, the vast majority of pool drownings and serious injuries (90%) occur in unguarded pools. Child drownings most often occur within only yards or feet of their parents; so parental presence has not proven to be a statistically significant factor in keeping children safe, only discovering the tragedy after it is too late. Parents in ten percent of these cases watched their child drowning and had no idea what was happening, because it usually happens silently.

Please read: <http://www.ziggityzoom.com/content/parents-drowning-doesn-t-look-drowning>

Please read: <http://www.swimmingpoolsafetynews.com/child-pool-accident/child-drowns-in-community-pool-surrounded-by-fifty-other-children/>

Please read: <http://www.swimmingpoolsafetynews.com/apartment-pool-accident/boy-dies-in-georgia-apartment-swimming-pool-accident/>

Please read: <http://www.swimmingpoolsafetynews.com/child-pool-accident/murky-apartment-pool-causes-phoenix-swimming-pool-accident/>

Please read: <http://www.safetyturtle.com/water-safety-news/child-drowning-stats.html>

Please read: <http://www.wainjurylaw.com/library/kid-diving-accidents-pool-jumping-accidents-seattle-injury-lawyer.cfm>

A well managed pool with supervised lifeguards save untold injuries and lives every year. There are far more serious, permanent injuries than there are deaths that occur at swimming pools. They are prevented or their severity lessened by vigilant lifeguards. This pool was created with the intention that it always have lifeguards; and it always has. Lifeguards are the only employees, other than officers, mentioned specifically in the Bylaws. Questions about their necessity arise every year. To me, it's a no-brainer.

According to the latest CDC statistics I could find, among children five and under, most drownings occur in home swimming pools. Drowning is responsible for more deaths among children under five than **any other cause** except congenital anomalies (birth defects). Among those 1-14, fatal drowning remains the second-leading cause of unintentional injury-related death behind motor vehicle crashes, the number one killer of teens period.

Sadley, the third leading cause of death from all causes for teens is suicide. All the more reason for our Club to reach out to and include these age groups in healthy, productive activities that encourage positive social interaction. Teen suicide is another topic close to my heart, for reasons that I still cannot share easily without experiencing a lot of grief and tears.

The video in the link above is one of many that are in the news every year. You can find them just by Googling, Binging, Yahooing, etc. Continual vigilance is required to keep our members safe, and we should not leave that duty to untrained and unsupervised parents. My father was a commercial diver, and I worked as his tender and assistant from the time I was in the fourth grade until I graduated high school. I have seen more than my share of drowning victims, which he helped find without charge. I do not want to ever have a victim of drowning or serious injury in our pool!

The overwhelming number of drownings and serious injuries at pools are at unguarded pools (90 %) with the parents only feet or yards away from the child. They drown silently, within minutes (not seconds as the video states). A momentarily distracted parent is all it takes. On average, our guards make approximately two physical saves per month while open. They continually scan and count heads. They also prevent unsafe behavior. Our guards made two saves of small children the first week we were open last year, much to the chagrin of the adults accompanying them. Drowning is the number one cause of death for children five and under. <http://www.foxnews.com/health/2012/05/17/drowning-still-top-cause-death-for-kids-under-4/> For some reason the latest CDC statistics always seem to be three to four years old and are difficult to access.

As you correctly assessed, this topic is of concern to the Pool O&S committee, and there are written rules and job descriptions in place to cover your concerns. Considering the magnitude of the current project, it does not appear likely that the pool will open this year, so the Pool O&S committee will have a lot of time to re-research this topic.

Lifeguards and pool safety are very close to my heart. I am passionate about those topics, if you cannot tell. I take them seriously and have done a lot of investigation and research in those areas over the years. It is difficult for me to be flippant about pool safety, although I always try to be open minded and rational. I was saved by a lifeguard at the age of seven. Surprisingly, my poarents never taught me to swim. I was going to die and knew it; but I couldn't do anything about it on my own.

- I expect ACBC and its employees or contractors to abide by all laws related to safety of the pool facilities and it's operation.
- I will protest any attempts to have work done by unlicensed, untrained, or inexperienced individuals or companies. (I haven't been very successful in the past.)
- I will check the credentials of every one of the proposed contractors diligently. (A commonly ignored practice in past years.)
- I will insist that we operate in the safest manner possible, and that includes lifeguards on duty at all times that we are open.
- I am a proponent of swimming lessons like those offered by the Lion's Club, and believe ACBC should do everything in its power to accommodate such lessons, even if we lose money, but never when it is unsafe.

As I said, I have seen a lot of drownings in my lifetime, and I don't intend to be lax in this area. Although this experience may be anecdotal, I is none-the-less powerful evidence supported by reams of statistics. I recognize that everyone is not aware of all of the factors, and I try to be considerate but informative.

I will not put a price on permanent brain damage or death of a child or anyone for that matter, just to get around a safety regulation. I am always open to saving money or new and improved technologies, provided they are lawful and safe.

Here are some 2007 statistics for unintentional injuries leading to death. . . Like I said, it's hard to get more current information for some reason. The CDC web sites seem to be broken. Yhese do not even touch upon the serious injuries, including permanent brain damage which are ten times as great or more. Death rates in general are declining in the US, but the causes as a percentage in this category remain relatively unchanged.

Age Group 1-4

1,588 Deaths for Ages 1-4 = 0.07 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	
1 Drowning	458	28.84% of Group
2 Motor Vehicle Traffic	428	26.95% of Group
3 Fire/burn	204	12.85% of Group
4 Suffocation	149	9.38% of Group
5 Pedestrian, Other	124	7.81% of Group
6 Struck by or Against Misc. Object(s)	44	2.77% of Group
7 Fall	36	2.27% of Group
8 Poisoning	34	2.14% of Group
9 Natural/ Environment	27	1.7% of Group
10 Firearm	18	1.13% of Group
11 Other Land Transport	16	1.01% of Group
12 Unspecified Cause	14	0.88% of Group
13 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	13	0.82% of Group
14 Other Transport	9	0.57% of Group
15 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	7	0.44% of Group
16 Machinery	4	0.25% of Group
17 Pedal cyclist, Other	2	0.13% of Group
18 Cut/pierce	1	0.06% of Group

Age Group 5-9

965 Deaths for Ages 5-9 = 0.04 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	Deaths
1 Motor Vehicle Traffic	456	47.25% of Group
2 Fire/burn	136	14.09% of Group
3 Drowning	122	12.64% of Group
4 Suffocation	42	4.35% of Group
5 Other Land Transport	40	4.15% of Group
6 Pedestrian, Other	32	3.32% of Group
7 Firearm	20	2.07% of Group
8 Struck by or Against Misc. Objects	20	2.07% of Group
9 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	17	1.76% of Group
10 Unspecified Cause	16	1.66% of Group
11 Natural/ Environment	12	1.24% of Group
12 Poisoning	12	1.24% of Group
13 Fall	11	1.14% of Group
14 Other Transport	11	1.14% of Group
15 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	7	0.73% of Group
16 Machinery	5	0.52% of Group
17 Pedal cyclist, Other	5	0.52% of Group
18 Cut/pierce	1	0.1% of Group

Age Group 10-14

1,229 Deaths for Ages 10-14 = 0.05 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	Deaths
1 Motor Vehicle Traffic	696	56.63% of Group
2 Drowning	102	8.3% of Group
3 Other Land Transport	80	6.51% of Group
4 Fire/burn	78	6.35% of Group
5 Poisoning	69	5.61% of Group
6 Suffocation	60	4.88% of Group
7 Firearm	26	2.12% of Group
8 Fall	21	1.71% of Group
9 Pedestrian, Other	17	1.38% of Group
10 Other Transport	16	1.3% of Group
11 Natural/ Environment	15	1.22% of Group
12 Pedal cyclist, Other	12	0.98% of Group
13 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	10	0.81% of Group
14 Struck by or Against Misc. Object(s)	10	0.81% of Group
15 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	8	0.65% of Group
16 Unspecified Cause	5	0.41% of Group
17 Machinery	3	0.24% of Group
18 Cut/pierce	1	0.08% of Group

Age Group 15-24

15,897 Deaths for Ages 15-24 = 0.66 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	Deaths
1 Motor Vehicle Traffic	10,272	64.62% of Group
2 Poisoning	3,159	19.87% of Group
3 Drowning	630	3.96% of Group
4 Other Land Transport	310	1.95% of Group
5 Fall	233	1.47% of Group
6 Fire/burn	196	1.23% of Group
7 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	156	0.98% of Group
8 Firearm	155	0.98% of Group
9 Pedestrian, Other	139	0.87% of Group
10 Other Transport	135	0.85% of Group
11 Suffocation	133	0.84% of Group
12 Natural/ Environment	92	0.58% of Group
13 Unspecified Cause	92	0.58% of Group
14 Struck by or Against Misc. Object(s)	64	0.4% of Group
15 Machinery	62	0.39% of Group
16 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	37	0.23% of Group
17 Pedal cyclist, Other	21	0.13% of Group

18 Cut/pierce 11 0.07% of Group

Age Group 25-34

14,977 Deaths for Ages 25-34 = 0.62 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	Deaths
1 Motor Vehicle Traffic	6,842	45.68% of Group
2 Poisoning	5,700	38.06% of Group
3 Drowning	381	2.54% of Group
4 Fall	334	2.23% of Group
5 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	244	1.63% of Group
6 Other Land Transport	233	1.56% of Group
7 Fire/burn	225	1.5% of Group
8 Suffocation	193	1.29% of Group
9 Other Transport	138	0.92% of Group
10 Pedestrian, Other	120	0.8% of Group
11 Unspecified Cause	118	0.79% of Group
12 Firearm	94	0.63% of Group
13 Natural/ Environment	89	0.59% of Group
14 Struck by or Against Misc. Object(s)	87	0.58% of Group
15 Machinery	81	0.54% of Group
16 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	62	0.41% of Group
17 Pedal cyclist, Other	26	0.17% of Group
18 Cut/pierce	8	0.05% of Group
19 Overexertion	2	0.01% of Group

Age Group 35-44

16,931 Deaths for Ages 35-44 = 0.7 % of All Deaths

Cause of Death	Deaths	Deaths
1 Poisoning	7,575	44.74% of Group
2 Motor Vehicle Traffic	6,135	36.24% of Group
3 Fall	593	3.5% of Group
4 Drowning	417	2.46% of Group
5 Fire/burn	313	1.85% of Group
6 Suffocation	289	1.71% of Group
7 Other Specified Cause, Classifiable	251	1.48% of Group
8 Other Land Transport	227	1.34% of Group
9 Unspecified Cause	195	1.15% of Group
10 Other Transport	162	0.96% of Group
11 Pedestrian, Other	157	0.93% of Group
12 Natural/ Environment	148	0.87% of Group
13 Struck by or Against Misc. Object(s)	135	0.8% of Group
14 Other Specified Cause, Not Elsewhere Classifiabl	109	0.64% of Group
15 Firearm	91	0.54% of Group
16 Machinery	87	0.51% of Group
17 Pedal cyclist, Other	32	0.19% of Group
18 Cut/pierce	14	0.08% of Group
19 Overexertion	1	0.01% of Group

These statistics are the reasons I am an advocate for the Lion's Club swim program (or any other swimming lessons for kids and teens).

That is why I made sure my children learned to swim at an early age. That is why my youngest daughter began teaching swimming in the Lions Club Program. That is why my wife and I began volunteering at the pool when we first moved here (and she was asked to manage it five or six years later). That is why I read the laws about pools and insist that we not cut corners in meeting regulations. That is why my daughter is now a certified lifeguard, licenced water safety instructor, certified lifeguard training instructor, and became an accredited member of the Professional Association of Dive Instructors (PADI is for SCUBA diving).

It seems as though some Pool O&S committee members come up with these same questions about lifeguards year after year. The statistics from the Washington State Health Department are sobering, and are presented by the aquatics director of the State Health Department at annual pool management training courses offered at no charge by Northwest Hot Spring Spas to its clients and staff. I recommend that members of both pool committees attend this training at least once if they have the time and of course, the information is a keystroke away for most people.

The Reserve Study will help us estimate that portion of the operating costs attributable to facilities use and maintenance, and ensure that we have sufficient dues to maintain, upgrade and improve our recreational facility well into the future. Our committee is charged with researching and proposing upgrades, repairs, replacements, improvements and providing costs to effect those jobs. The Long Range Planning Committee is the keeper of the Reserve study.

I think that ACBC should do what we can to continue to accommodate the swimming lessons offered by the Lions Club. The Reserve Study will provide a much clearer picture of the costs associated with that program. We do not have to make money on the Lion's Club Swim; we don't even have to break

even. We simply need to be able to afford it. The study will tell us what it costs.

New Technology Sue Corless has been conducting some good research into the alternatives that will become available to us for water circulation and sanitation in the future. We have that covered for a few years into the future, since we replaced that equipment and the related plumbing less than a year ago. It may be beneficial to install or make allowances for the installation of some of the more innovative ideas. It is a shame that the state laws are not keeping up with these advances. We may want have Jean appoint someone on the Government Relations committee to contact the State to encourage changes to the laws that would recognize and allow us to incorporate some of the safer and less expensive alternatives now available.

Thanks for participating, my friend. You do have some valid questions and concerns, even though they may not be particularly relevant to the Pool M&I committee. I encourage you to continue to pursue these matters if you believe them to be beneficial to ACBC members, but through the appropriate committees.

Kindest regards,
Dan'l

From: bbwilbur@broadstripe.net
To: dan_serv@hotmail.com; tdahl@shorelinefire.com; cedars@olympen.com; gwynstator1@msn.com; bspettersen@earthlink.net
CC: cathieanne@aol.com; whshed@live.com; htrain4@gmail.com; hermitanamaria@gmail.com; jean_salls2000@yahoo.com; gwynstator1@msn.com; suzypalmer1@me.com
Subject: Re: American Red Cross Guideline
Date: Sat, 9 Feb 2013 18:03:28 -0800

All,

Since most agree we face a tough funding vote, consideration of slides and similar embellishments probably need to go into phase 2 or 3 or be funded creatively after the nuts and bolts are actually paid for and in place. Might that be a long-range planning item?

But turning to safety, has there been any sort of analysis done on release forms and liability matters. That is, is one release form as good as another in court and how do life guards influence matters (that being a question for which committee, Pool Op and Safety or maybe our Committee of Mediocre Legal Council)?

Dan, I must disagree re your diving-dampening sub-thesis and the bold assertion that most people are naturally poor divers. Although I never possessed great swimming talent, I perfected quite readily and with little to no practice the highly acclaimed double-reverse cannonball belly flop, which I can safely perform in 1 foot of water followed by a flip turn out of the pool. And should the opportunity present itself....bob

From: [Dan'l Jones](#)
Sent: Saturday, February 09, 2013 8:31 AM
To: [tdahl@shorelinefire.com](#) ; [cedars@olympen.com](#)
Cc: [Cathie](#) ; [whshed@live.com](#) ; [htrain4@gmail.com](#) ; [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Maria Chamberlain](#) ; [Jean Salls](#) ; [Gwyn Stator](#) ; [Suzy Palmer](#)
Subject: RE: American Red Cross Guideline

I don't think that whether or not a pool allows diving has much impact on where an individual chooses to swim, unless they are training for competition. Most people cannot and do not dive well anyway. The overwhelming number of children are afraid to enter the water head first. Diving head first is contrary to our natural instincts. As a child, I admired those who could use a diving board, but like most, was afraid to try it. Now, put a slide in the pool, and everyone wants to try it. They are fun.

Let's not rule out things before we investigate them thoroughly. I have always been a proponent of a pool slide over a diving board, but people wrongfully assume that they are inherently unsafe and dismiss the idea. The old diving well is an excellent location for a slide, not because of the depth, but because it provides a somewhat sheltered area to enter the water without having to slide on top of other swimmers. Depth is not a significant factor when it comes to slides anyway, and the location of the slide is not that big a consideration as long as behavior of the users is controlled. I would vote yes for a slide and here's why:

WE HAVE LIFEGUARDS

I think everyone is forgetting why our pool has never had a single claim filed against it since it first opened; we have a well-managed pool with lifeguards. Lifeguards are the single greatest safety feature any pool can have and overcome a multitude of what are otherwise unsafe conditions or situations.

We had a diving board for all except the last six years the pool was opened. There were no diving accidents, because we had lifeguards. No one was allowed to make a running start on the diving board. No one was permitted to dive until the diving area was clear.

Lifeguards maintain order, prevent running, keep alcohol out of the compound, make sure babies are properly attired to prevent accidental contamination, and ensure there is no horse play.

Lifeguards are one of two kinds of employees mentioned in our bylaws, and are automatic (non-voting because the decisions affect their jobs) members of the Pool Operation and Safety Committee. They are the ONLY committee members that do not have to be appointed by the president.

SLIDES ARE FUN AND SAFE

Slides are a fun and wonderful attraction, much more so than a diving board, starting blocks, or allowing diving from the deck. Slides are inexpensive and safe. Anyone ever been to a water park? Slides are the most used feature. These parks have no diving boards.

A slide is actually a much safer device than a diving board, because it directs the angle of the entry into the water, avoiding the dreaded consequences of the "spinal wall" in a pool, the gradual slope from the diving well that can injure tall people or those who make high-speed, head-first dives. Pool slides have to meet strict standards of the code of federal regulations, and because of these design standards, water depth is not a great concern (usually 3 to 3 1/2 feet is adequate). <http://law.justia.com/cfr/title16/16-2.0.1.2.37.html#16:2.0.1.2.37.0.1.5> http://www.ehow.com/info_8697440_deep-pool-slide.html

WE HAVE ORDERLY, WELL-BEHAVED SWIMMERS

Our swimmers are orderly and well behaved, because we have always had lifeguards. Our swimmers have been conditioned to be safe and considerate of others, because they have not only had posted rules to guide them, but those rules have been enforced by management and competent, well-trained lifeguards.

With that in mind, let's try not to wander off into the realm of safety speculation without recognizing the safety feature above all other safety features, the people we pay to protect our patrons. Let's not rule out a feature that is relatively inexpensive, easy to maintain, a huge attractin, and one of the safest fun devices a pool can have installed.

Please consider these factors before ruling out a slide.

Thanks,

Dan'l

From: TDahl@shorelinefire.com
 To: cedars@olympen.com
 CC: dan_serv@hotmail.com; cathieanne@aol.com; whshed@live.com; htrain4@gmail.com; bbwilbur@broadstripe.net; hermitanamarca@gmail.com; jean_salls2000@yahoo.com; gwynstator1@msn.com; suzypalmer1@me.com
 Date: Sat, 9 Feb 2013 00:28:46 -0800
 Subject: RE: American Red Cross Guideline

Further clarification,

While I certainly didn't mean to imply that the committee was charged with making the final decisions, we will have to develop consensus and *decide* what recommendations that we ultimately make (such as pool depth). Reality, practicality and legal requirements will make many of our decisions for us.

As I stated safety is an obvious priority. Safety concerns with any equipment or design considerations are valid and worthy of reasonable discussion.

I did not mean to represent myself as promoting a slide, I simply was adding it to one of the considerations to take into account regarding pool depth should the committee or anyone else in the future want to consider the option. As I stated in the meeting, I am trying to make sure we give consideration to potential future uses and not make (unintentional) decisions that would limit future possibilities (when feasible).

The report will likely address many of these issues, and certainly we will need to review it and other pieces of information to guide us on making our recommendations. I hope that doesn't preclude us from sharing ideas and information that we find along the way. I'm encouraged at the level of consensus that I feel we're already developing in many of these areas.

Thanks for the discussion,

Tim

From: Sue Corliss [mailto:cedars@olympen.com]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2013 11:37 PM
To: Dahl, Tim (BC)
Cc: Dan'l Jones; Cathie; whshed@live.com; htrain4@gmail.com; Bob Wilbur; Maria Chamberlain; Jean Salls; Gwyn Stator; Suzy Palmer
Subject: Re: American Red Cross Guideline

Good Evening All

I don't think the purpose of our committee is to make ANY decisions, only recommendations. But if we are worried about any kind of diving, putting a SLIDE in is really putting us in harms way. A slide has height and shallow walls. We then have the kids that don't wait their turn, very possibly the same kids that would break any other rules set down. Hopefully the consultant's report will be ready soon so the committee can review it and then we can have a meeting and discuss what options may be available.

See you at the Board meeting tomorrow (2PM)

Sue Corliss
 360 678 3731
cedars@olympen.com

On Feb 8, 2013, at 1:50 PM, Dahl, Tim (BC) wrote:

Clarification: As Dan'l stated most of the users are adults...what I meant to say was the "the major users are kids"... which I based on Dan'ls statement.

Thanks,

Tim

From: Dahl, Tim (BC)
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2013 1:45 PM
To: 'Dan'l Jones'; Cathie; whshed@live.com; cedars@olympen.com; htrain4@gmail.com; Bob Wilbur; Maria Chamberlain; Jean Salls; Gwyn Stator; Suzy Palmer
Subject: RE: American Red Cross Guideline

All,

I think it's important to make sure that we identify consensus where we can:

Clearly, ANY decisions regarding any of the design elements will follow State law. This should not preclude consideration of additional information when considering decisions that are WITHIN the standard(s) established under RCW. (Discretionary)

Also, construction requirements and practical considerations (including cost) will also dictate depth feasibility to some extent.

If we are talking about wanting to ALLOW edge diving, then these issues might deserve consideration. A bridge only to be crossed based on the results of the above. The issue of allowing "edge diving" may be moot. I believe the concern expressed is that IF someone does break the rules and dives in, can we somewhat mitigate the likelihood of injury.

I think it's safe to say that no one is talking about putting in a diving board, so let's not bog ourselves down with any discussion regarding diving from greater than 12" above water.

The depth of the pool relative to the tidal level is a real issue that I believe everyone is aware of and should be discussed in the consultant's report. This may require a cost/benefit discussion being part of any final decision.

Having said all that, given that a majority of the pool users are kids:

bsolute compliance with the rules is improbable at best, irrespective of how well our lifeguards enforce them.

is important to remember that a pool is a RECREATIONAL facility (read that "fun"). While legal compliance and safety are obvious priorities, let's not miss opportunities to keep it fun – or even make it more fun. (And yes, functional for those who want to use it strictly for exercise.)

Many kids (and adults) like the added recreation of swimming in the deep end (ie: swimming to the bottom or diving for sunken objects.)

ne issue that came up was the ability to rent out the use of the pool for SCUBA classes that has a depth requirement of (I think he said) 6' – This may be a year round possibility for a small amount of income.

ne issue that I'm not sure we have considered is the idea of a slide. I know that the Klahaya pool faced a similar issue on their project and installed a slide where the diving board had been.

My limited research hasn't found any requirements other than "manufacturer's requirements". But I believe in discussion with one of the players in that project that it was considerable less depth required (more research needed).

It's LIKELY that the deep end will be getting shallower. Time (study, feasibility, cost and reasoned discussion) will likely dictate how much shallower.

I look forward to receiving more information and our reasoned discussion to guide us towards the best result. Thanks to all for your passion and involvement.

Tim

From: Dan'l Jones [mailto:dan_serv@hotmail.com]

Sent: Friday, February 08, 2013 12:27 PM

To: Cathie; whshed@live.com; cedars@olympen.com; htrain4@gmail.com; Bob Wilbur; Maria Chamberlain; Jean Salls; Gwyn Staton; Dahl, Tim (BC); Suzy Palmer

Subject: RE: American Red Cross Guideline

I think it would be prudent to continue the "no diving rule" currently in effect at our pool. The lifeguards enforce the no diving rule very well. The pool deck is clearly marked "NO DIVING". The "deep end" where diving from the deck might be attempted ranges from 7 feet to 10 feet. The pool is not appropriate for diving in the lanes, except by trained, competitive swimmers. We cannot afford to allow diving. Fort Casey is a shallow pool and has had no serious diving injuries, because their lifeguards too are good at enforcing the no diving rule.

The current 10-foot depth in the old diving well is below sea level and everyone we hire needs to understand that limitation. It is not something that is readily apparent. They need to consider the engineering problems posed by tidal action before emptying the pool and time their work accordingly. Filling in the deep end would eliminate that concern. The depth of the deep end is no longer adequate for a diving board anyway. Lowering the depth would solve many problems encountered in maintaining the pool. It would not prevent diving by trained, competitive swimmers.

The American Red Cross is not the standard under Washington state law. We simply need to abide by RCW 70.90 and WAC 246-260. If a contractor or consultant doesn't know about it, they should not even be considered for the job.

RCW 70.90.160 Modification or construction of facility — Permit required — Submission of plans.

A permit is required for any modification to or construction of any recreational water contact facility after June 11, 1986, and for any other water recreation facility after July 26, 1987. Water recreation facilities existing on July 26, 1987, which do not comply with the design and construction requirements established by the state board of health under this chapter may continue to operate without modification to or replacement of the existing physical plant, provided the water quality, sanitation, and life saving equipment are in compliance with the requirements established under this chapter. However, if any modifications are made to the physical plant of an existing water recreation facility the modifications shall comply with the requirements established under this chapter. The plans and specifications for the modification or construction shall be submitted to the applicable local authority or the department as applicable, but a person shall not be required to submit plans at both the state and local levels or apply for both a state and local permit. The plans shall be reviewed and may be approved or rejected or modifications or conditions imposed consistent with this chapter as the public health or safety may require, and a permit shall be issued or denied within thirty days of submittal.

The Rules that were promulgated in accordance with the requirements of the Revised Code of Washington can be found in the Washington Administrative Code.

WAC 246-260-041

(5) **Specific design requirements for pools furnishing areas for diving.** Owners shall ensure areas designated for diving activities include a diving envelope meeting minimum requirements in:

(a) D-8.01, Table 1, APHA Public Pool Regulations, 1981, if the pool user would enter from the deck level twelve inches or less from water surface level.

(b) CNCA standard configuration in areas where user would enter from the deck level over twelve inches from water level, or has a platform or diving board provided at a height of less than one-half meter (twenty inches). This requirement is based on a standard described under CNCA publication *Swimming Pools: A Guide to Their Planning, Design, and Operation* 1987, Fourth Edition. Human Kinetics Publisher, Inc., Champaign, Illinois, Figure 8.1; or

(c) Dimensions for Diving Facilities, FINA facility rules, 2000-2001, if the pool user enters from the diving board or platform at a height of twenty inches (one-half meter) or greater from water surface level.

The books cited in the above code can be purchased online inexpensively. The rules apply not only to depth, but slope and other dimensions as well. I strongly recommend that we not try to make up our own standards or make changes that increase liability, cost, or that may endanger our pool patrons.

Per the Washington Administrative Code and the Revised Code of Washington, when it comes to any diving in our pool, the standards with which we must adhere are those of:

- The American Public Health Association (APHA),
- The Council for National Cooperation in Aquatics (CNCA), and
- The Federation Internationale de Natation (FINA)

The Federation Internationale de Natation, or FINA, is the international organization for competitive diving. FINA requires a minimum depth of 3.4 meters (prefer 3.5 meters) for a 1-meter high diving board, or about 11 feet 6 inches deep for a 3-foot high board, and at least 4.5 meters for a 10-meter high platform board.

The National Foundation for Spinal Health specifies a minimum 3 1/2 feet for any diving, 3 1/2-4 feet for dives from platforms of 18 inches above the water and 4+ feet for platforms up to

30 inches high, but these are not the standards for state law either. Statistical analyses show that the vast majority of accidents occur in water depths of about 3 ¼ feet or less. One study reports only 13% of accidents occurred in depths of 3 ¼ -9 feet. The "spinal wall" in our pool, the contour from the deep end diving well, is the real "danger" posed when we allow diving, not the depth itself.

Historically, more adults have signed in to use our pool than children, although the children who sign in tend to be in the water longer. The pool has always allotted certain time periods specifically limited to adult swimmers, but no such time periods where only children could swim. Fewer and fewer pools allow diving, and the use of diving boards in facilities that do have them is not significant.

Obviously, there are a number of "standards" and studies, but the only standards we must observe are those found in the RCW and WAC (or standards promoted by authorities and organizations those statutes and rules cite). Anything less would be unlawful. I vote on the side of lawful.

Thanks,
Dan!

To: whshed@live.com; dan_serv@hotmail.com; cedars@olypen.com; htrain4@gmail.com; bbwilbur@broadstripe.net; hermitanamarca@gmail.com; jean_salls2000@yahoo.com; gwynstator1@msn.com
 Subject: Re: American Red Cross Guideline
 From: cathianne@aol.com
 Date: Thu, 7 Feb 2013 12:52:31 -0500

Ed -

I thought he said in order to install a dual main drain(s) easily, it was be most practical to plumb and raise the level of the pool a few feet. He was explaining the different types of concrete, possible drilling problems, etc., and it sounded like he was thinking of a T-joint/pipe coming out of the main drain, splitting off into two drains, housed and covered up.

Will see what (and why) his recommendations are.
Cathie

-----Original Message-----

From: Ed Delahanty <whshed@live.com>

To: dan_serv <dan_serv@hotmail.com>; cedars <cedars@olypen.com>; htrain4 <htrain4@gmail.com>; bbwilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>; hermitanamarca <hermitanamarca@gmail.com>; jean_salls2000 <jean_salls2000@yahoo.com>; cathianne <cathianne@aol.com>; gwynstator1 <gwynstator1@msn.com>; tdahl <tdahl@shorelinefire.com>; suzypalmer1 <suzypalmer1@me.com>

Sent: Thu, Feb 7, 2013 9:42 am

Subject: American Red Cross Guideline

Hi All,

I was concerned that decreasing the depth of the deep end of the pool might create a situation that could potentially increase the risk of spinal cord injury in the pool. A little research turned up this recommendation from a New York State Department of Health web site.

Diving Safety Recommendations:

- The American Red Cross recommends a minimum of 9 feet of water depth for head first dives including dives from pool decks.
- Results for a comprehensive study of diving injuries are presented in "Diving Injuries: The Etiology of 486 Case Studies with Recommendations for Needed Action" edited by Dr. Alexander Gabrielsen, Ph.D., 1990, NOVA University Press.¹ A 13 member editorial panel of aquatic experts recommended:
 - Posting of appropriate warning signs which includes prohibition of diving in water depths less than 5 feet.
 - Proper supervision to control activities of swimmers/divers.
 - Public education in swimming and diving.
 - Improved regulations and standards for pool and beaches addressing design and operation issues.

I realize there could be a savings in operating costs if the pool deep end depth was reduced from it's current 10 feet by decreasing the required circulation capacity of the system and reduced sanitary chemical demand with the reduced volume of water.

But, since children and teens are the primary users of the pool and it's likely some of them will dive into the pool - even if it's prohibited - I'd like to suggest we keep the deep end depth at least within the American Red Cross guideline of 9 feet, so there is a designated area for safer diving - off the pool deck - to minimize as much as possible the risk of crippling spinal cord injuries in our pool.

Please consider this issue as options for pool refurbishment are evaluated.

Kind Regards,
Ed.