

Public Safety and Security Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5401 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROCEDURE FOR ADOPTING, REVISING AND AMENDING THE STATE BUILDING CODE AND REQUIRING RELATED

Title: TRAINING.

Vote Date: 3/17/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/5/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Public Safety and Security Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill was raised in order to make revisions to preexisting statute regarding the State Building Code. This provision would require the State Building Inspector to work with the Codes and Standards Committee, pending the approval of the Commissioner of Administrative Services, to adopt a new State Building Code in Connecticut in order to better align the state with the most recent and nationally recognized standards. This bill would also revise the state building code to adopt a new 6-year (or once per two full model code) cycle in place of the existing 3-year cycle. The bill also aims to establish a one-year implementation period for training and code enforcement education, ensuring the most up to date and safe practices are learned in Connecticut.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

[Connecticut Administrative Services](#), expressed concern about switching to a 6-year cycle saying that waiting this long could hurt progress made in safety and energy efficiency. They state that the bill only addresses the Building Code; they express that it is closely related to the Fire Safety and Fire Prevention Codes, and that all three need to be updated together to avoid conflict. They say that the state needs to fully understand the impacts on training, enforcement, and local rescue before committing to a 6-year cycle plan.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Connecticut Business & Industry Association \(CBIA\)](#), they say that it establishes a more predictable framework for the adoption of the State Building Code. They believe this bill is important as the

housing shortage drives up costs for employers and residents. They urge the committee to further support the bill.

[Frank C. DeFelice](#) urges the committee to support the bill. He says that this would help minimize the increases of housing, without compromising safety.

The following submitted identical testimony, showing their support for the bill. They say the bill provides “much-needed stability” by establishing a six- year adoption cycle; it limits off-cycle amendments. They highlight that the bill will provide more predictability for businesses and provisions for health and safety protection.

[Anthony DeRosa, Contractor](#)

[Jeniffer DeVivo, Broker & COO, Calcagni Real Estate,](#)

[Bob Wiedenmann, Sunwood Development Corp](#)

[Douglas Porter, Woodstock Building Associates,LLC](#)

[Marc Michaud, Managing Partner,Michaud Development Group](#)

[Bepin Mgushi,Fixiup Building & Remodeling](#)

[National Association of Home Builders,](#) writes in support of the bill, they cite work done in other states in relation to pausing future building code updates, reconsidering residential code updates, and altering the process of code adoption cycles to longer than three years. They welcome the opportunity for further discussion and look forward to supporting HBRA of CT in their efforts to help the General Assembly.

[Joel Grossman,Realtor,](#) writes in support of the bill saying that it helps to eliminate unpredictable code changes which cause increased construction and slow housing production.

[Alan Hanbury, President, House of Hanbury Builders, Inc.,](#) notes that currently there are unpredictable code changes creating significant cost pressures and other issues. He says this bill provides stability by establishing a six-year adoption cycle.

[Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Connecticut \(HBRA of CT\),](#) share their strong support for the bill. They say a six-year adoption cycle allows for more predictability, which can help to limit the current housing shortage and allows for cost awareness in the adoption process. They highlight that this legislation does not weaken safety protections, but rather allows for action to take place for genuine safety and meet federal requirements.

[Eric Santini, Owner, Santini Homes,](#) expresses his support of the bill. He says currently the State Building Code makes it difficult for builders and developers due to the frequent changes. He says that by adopting this 6 year plan it will mitigate the uncertainties for builders and developers. He says this bill is a crucial step in addressing the affordability crisis by providing more certainty.

[Gregory Ugalde, President & CLO, T&M Building Co.Inc.,](#) shares his support for the bill. He says that the current unpredictable building code changes, increases the cost and delays housing projects. He highlights that this bill will create more stable processes with a six-year plan, limit off-cycling changes, and add a one year implementation period. He states that this will support housing developments and maintain safety standards.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[Kathryn Braun,](#) is in opposition of the bill, saying that it would unreasonably block government agencies from updating their building codes. She says that this will leave residents at a higher risk,

prevent municipalities from enforcing rules, and contradict progress of building regulations. She urges the committee to vote down the bill.

[Kirk Carr](#), opposes saying that the main provision of the bill prevents municipalities from enforcing building regulations and is stricter than the State Building Code. They say that this bill poses a danger to residents in communities with inadequate fire suppression infrastructures.

[Paul Costello](#), is in opposition saying that taking six years to adopt an updated State Building Code would have significant setbacks for Connecticut. He shares his concerns related to the National Electrical Code(NEC), saying that under the proposed timeline, Connecticut could fall behind in NEC cycles. He warns this will leave Connecticut in a 2023 NEC while the rest of the country has moved to the 2032 NEC cycles.

[Robert Mannarino, President, Mannarino Builders Inc.](#) He warns the committee that each time another code or regulation is added, he says it is another layer that causes Connecticut to get further from affordable housing.

[Connecticut Building Officials Association](#), does not support the bill as written. They understand the intent of the proposal, but as drafted they say it is not workable. They highlight that it does not address the adoption cycle for fire prevention or fire code safety code. They also are concerned over the new State Building Code not being in effect until October of 2032. They are happy to collaborate further with the committee.

[International Code Council\(ICC\)](#) opposes the bill as drafted. They say that ICC currently models building codes every three years in order to keep pace with technological advancements and improvements in building science. They note research that shows that up-to-date codes provide strong financial benefits and do not significantly increase housing prices.

[Mike Ose](#), says that not adhering to the latest edition of codes can lead to serious shortfalls and causes for preventable injuries to occur. He states that if fire marshalls and building officials are not trained on the updates, then they will not know the rules that need to be enforced. He advises the committee to stick to a 3 year cycle to keep up requirements for the overall safety of citizens.

[Western Connecticut Council of Government \(WestCOG\)](#), provides comments in opposition of the bill. They say the bill freezes innovation, which includes cost-reduction and voluntary code pathways. They state that the bill will lead to regulatory lag, by limiting code revisions to no more than six-years. They say this will cause a lag at least one national cycle behind other safety standards. They also share that the bill increases constraining municipal floodplains and resilience authority, as well as, having long-term insurance and affordability impacts. They raise further safety concerns surrounding the wording of "imminent threat".

[American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers \(ASHRAE\)](#), expresses opposition to the bill, saying it prohibits the State Building Code to be revised more frequently than 6 years. They highlight that by not having any code updates for the next 6 years it will limit Connecticut residents. They say residents will miss out on the most updated cost effective and energy efficient practices.

[Air-Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Institute \(AHRI\)](#), they recommend that the Committee remain on a three-year cycle code to maintain consistency with model codes. They give examples of emerging code developments that have the potential to reduce construction costs. They say the three-year cycle is important to incorporate the latest safety and technology advancements.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

[Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments \(RiverCOG\)](#), writes with questions surrounding the bill. Sharing their concern for the freezing of the State Building Code for up to six years, they feel it may delay adoption of new and important construction techniques that can make housing more affordable.

Reported by: Emma Rybacki, Clerk
Megan Oros, Assist. Clerk

Date: 3/27/26