

# Environment Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No.:** HB-5230  
AN ACT CONCERNING SMOKE DETECTORS IN THE SOLID WASTE  
**Title:** STREAM.  
**Vote Date:** 3/20/2024  
**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute  
**PH Date:** 3/8/2024  
**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:**

Environment Committee  
Sen. Jan Hochadel, 13th Dist.

## **REASONS FOR BILL:**

Smoke detectors are an essential unit for every household, with the recommended lifetime before replacement being 10 years. Because the minimization of waste produced in the smoke detector usage, it is important that we encourage smart systems to reduce waste.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:**

The language adopted a 3-year phase in for the program, with the ban being shifted to one which only impacts the sale of any smoke detectors not conforming to the laid-out requirements of smoke detectors running on solely batteries which are not nonreplaceable, nonremovable, and capable of powering the unit for 10 years.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

None submitted.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

### **Erika Sheffer, Carrier Corporation**

As one of the work's largest manufacturers of fire safety products they support the bill with amendments. They suggest that the legislation be amended to restrict the sale of non-long-term, sealed, tamper-resistant battery powered smoke alarms, as it is their belief that they are a safer option and reduce product and packaging waste, as well as reducing the risk of human error when changing them out. About one quarter of the country has varying degrees

of requirements for long-term, sealed, tamper-resistant battery powered smoke alarms. They believe sealed long-term battery powered smoke alarms are the more cost-effective option.

**Judy Clark**

The testifier expressed support for the bill.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

**Walter Summers & Roger Nelson, Co-Legislative Representatives, Connecticut Fire Marshals Association**

The Fire Marshals believe the bill goes against all the work already accomplished, particularly having issue with section 1 (a) and (b). The Connecticut Fire Marshals do not support any elimination of smoke alarm choices for their residents until NFPA, or UL make a change in their requirements. They believe a more progressive start would be to require only sealed 10-year battery operated smoke alarms be sold in the state and transition away from 9-volt battery operated alarms; this has been adopted already in 15 states. If it is the intent to eliminate ionization smoke alarms, they believe it should be phased in over time.

**Jim Heckman, General Council, Connecticut Realtors**

The testifiers believe bill, as originally drafted, seeks to substantially change numerous issues related to detectors including the type, installation, and mandating change at the time of property transfers. During the 2023 legislative session CT Realtors worked closely with the Fire Marshal Association and the Connecticut Bar Association to pass Public Act 23-164 that saves lives by focusing on important disclosure issues related to the proper education and use of smoke detectors. They suggest that this bill as originally formed would not do so.

**Jim Perras, Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Connecticut**

HBRA agree with CT Realtors and the Fire Marshals that banning the use of certain smoke detectors should be left to DAS Codes and Standards Committee during the next code cycle.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

**Lindsay Seti, Advocacy Manager, Connecticut Conference of Municipalities**

CCM supports the provisions requiring new homes to install photoelectric-only type smoke detectors and older homes to upgrade their smoke detectors. CCM supports an extended responsibility program for smoke detectors similar to mattresses and paint. They believe this is an environmentally sound manner for the end-of-life stage of smoke detectors. They also suggest that a portion of the administrative fee collected to run the EPR program for smoke detectors could be distributed to municipalities to help off-set the handling of these products.

**Reported by: Pamela Bianca**

**Date: April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024**