



## From the Editor

*Another great article from The Rooms Chronicle®, the #1 journal for hotel rooms management! \*\*\*Important notice: This article may not be reproduced without permission of the publisher or the author.\*\*\* College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Niagara University, P.O. Box 2036, Niagara University, NY 14109-2036. Phone: 866-Read TRC. E-mail: editor@roomschronicle.com*

*Notice: The ideas, opinions, recommendations, and interpretations presented herein are those of the author(s). The College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Niagara University/The Rooms Chronicle® assume no responsibility for the validity of claims in items reported.*

The first couple of months of 2012 have not been without suspense for the Lodging Industry. The ongoing saga of the revised Americans with Disabilities Act continues to affect hotels, especially with regards to the lift and accessibility requirements for pools, AH&LA continued to petition Congress and the Department of Justice (DOJ) first for clarification on and then for a delay to implementing the pool lift requirement. Literally at the 12<sup>th</sup> hour on the day all hotels were required to comply with the new mandates, the DOJ granted a 60 day extension for compliance and comment.



Hotel operators certainly understand the importance of attempting to accommodate guests with disabilities onto their properties. No one wants to exclude any individuals because of a disability that poses challenges to everyday living. But at what point and expense must every business accommodate every disability?

Given that pool lifts are not exactly inexpensive to procure and can pose an attractive nuisance hazard for young children, I have no doubts that we will see fewer and fewer swimming pools, spas, steam rooms and saunas being installed in newly developed hotels and resorts. While larger properties may be able to assume this capital expense, expect that smaller limited-service and select-service hotels will “opt out” from building these recreational features in order to avoid not just the procurement and maintenance expense, but the possibility of more comprehensive ADA requirements pertaining to such amenities in the future.

I am not sure if the DOJ fully considered this possible negative outcome before mandating such accommodation. Certainly something to ponder.

William D. Frye, Ph.D., CHE  
Executive Editor