

## **Quotes from Written Testimony on Building & Energy Codes (LD 43, April 11, 2011)**

“We feel very strongly that this universal code, which has been adopted by a clear majority of the nation, is very well-conceived, addresses a multitude of important building quality and energy conservation issues, and should be given the chance to work here in Maine.” – **John Morris, John Morris Architects, Camden**

“MUBEC is already in effect. Commitments have been made, money and effort have been spent. We are getting through the initial ‘growing pains’ and the process will get smoother as time goes on as builders, designers, homeowners and municipalities become more familiar with the codes.” –**Richard Tarr, Lapointe Lumber, Gardiner**

“MUBEC is not a regulatory hurdle, but rather a business friendly, pro-development approach that ensures consistency and uniformity statewide. To quote from the 2006 Brookings Institute Report Charting Maine’s Future, ‘Maine’s first strategy for promoting new investment...should be to streamline one can for all the state’s cluttered, confusing building-code regime’... MUBEC enjoys broad support from the construction industry because it reduces confusion and uncertainty about what is required from one municipality to another. It is a plus for development and ultimately reduces costs for contractors and development.” –**Jeffrey Ohler, Callahan Construction, Associated General Contractors of Maine**

“The bundle of adopted MUBEC codes includes the International Existing Building Code (IEBC). The IEBC is a powerful tool to encourage building rehabilitation and the restoration of historic buildings. It provides a choice of three methods of compliance to address the majority of code challenges face in rehabilitating existing buildings.” – **R. Michael Pullen, WBRC Architects Engineers, Bangor**

“As an educator, I’m charged with the task of laying the education foundation for high school students seeking to enter the profession. The State Department of Education expects that I use a nationally recognized curriculum as a standard for my program. How is it possible to reconcile that requirement if the State does not see fit to enforce those standards? To repeal this statute would encourage a second rate workforce and subpar housing in the State of Maine.” –**Wayne Hapgood, Building Trades Instructor, Biddeford Regional Center of Technology, Biddeford**

“The reasons for having energy codes are that residential buildings account for more than twenty per cent of energy consumption in the US. Having these policies and codes is part of our national security. Maine is one of the largest recipients of LIHEAP money as 85% of the homes built in the last twenty years qualify for energy upgrades as well as the previous existing stock, the easiest way to produce more energy is to conserve it.” –**Carl Chretien, Chretien Construction, Saco**

“Lack of consistent statewide building code will discourage business development. I admit that as a business owner I don’t like over regulation. I feel that many times it will stifle innovation, expansion and hiring practices. However most business like uncertainty and surprises even less. It is far easier to plan when you know what rules you will be following. A consistent statewide building code, although it can be construed as more government regulation, will enable business to make business decisions based on fact not guesses. A business that wants to invest in our state will be able to make that decision much easier if they are certain of the rules, and know they are consistent.” –**Richard Tarr, Lapointe Lumber, Gardiner**

“Many argue that a slow time in the construction industry is the wrong time to introduce the new code. In reality it is a better time to work out a smooth implementation...Repealing the code now is unfair to those that have invested the time and money to be trained in it.” –**Charlie Huntington, Maine Contractors & Builders Alliance, Camden**

“Maine is far behind on energy efficiency in new buildings; implementing the energy code passed in 2009 will save homeowners millions of dollars per year on energy costs. The uniform code levels the playing field for

developers and builders which will facilitate economic investments in Maine.” –**Barry Saxe, New Horizons, Freeport**

“Repeal of this code is no less dangerous than a bill that would repeal the State’s Electrical, Plumbing or Fire Protections Codes. We endorse the continuous evolution of MUBEC and working with all stakeholders to fine tune the regulations to truly suit the needs of all of the people of the State of Maine. It is our goal to provide highly trained municipal Code Professionals and Third Party Inspectors that will be a resource to the communities and the clients that we serve.” –**Michael Nugent, Certified Building Official, Maine Building Officials and Inspectors Association.**

“In 2008, MMA decided to support a reduction of local control for a state adopted building code because of the economic development benefits associated with it. The requirement of uniformity, it was thought, would remove some regulatory obstacles to development and make the development process somewhat easier and more predictable in the State... A better approach would be to identify the various concerns related to MUBEC and then revise the law as necessary to address those concerns. The municipal position is that the MUBEC law should be fixed-up rather than thrown out.” –**Greg Connors, Maine Municipal Association, Augusta**

“[MUBEC] also makes for more consistency in the bidding and construction of facilities by requiring all parties to provide certain minimum standards.” –**Jim Reny, Facility Director, Waterville Public Schools, Waterville**

“A single model building code for the United States results in less regulation, not more regulation, simpler regulation, not complex regulation, and savings for engineers, architects, and builders... Uniformity saves time and money for all of the participants in the building process.” –**Lyndon Keck, PDT Architects, Portland**

“This is a good code. Abolishing it, significantly changing it, or making adherence voluntary would be a significant step backwards and ensure that the \$100 million we are spending today for the mistakes of the past will continue into the future at significantly increased cost to the taxpayers in Maine.” –**Ashley Richards, Maine Association of Building Efficiency Professionals, Home Builders and Remodelers Association of Maine, Yarmouth**

“I have conducted nearly 80 energy audits over the last 4 years... what is surprising, however, is when I am asked to do energy audits for homes less than 2-3 years old... to repeal MUBEC will permit the construction standards to be what the builder feels they should be. This will result in expensive rework by homeowners costing homeowner hundreds of thousands of dollars.” –**Clough Toppan, Toppan Consulting Services, Vassalboro**

“We have been a consistent supporter of MUBEC because we support the concept of providing uniform statewide standards for development. The uniformity provided by MUBEC promotes predictability and consistency for development projects, so that developers are not subject to a patchwork quilt of building codes from one town to the next.” –**Brian Rayback, Maine Real Estate & Development Association, Portland**

“MUBEC provides the consistent regulatory environment businesses need. Reduce the cost of doing business in Maine by setting a single, consistent performance standard.” –**Nancy Smith, GrowSmart Maine, Portland**

“Our company routinely finds new homes with uninsulated foundation walls. Many times just this overlooked detail results in 100-300 gallons of heating oil wasted annually.” –**Richard Burbank, Evergreen Home Performance, Rockland**

“As a state, we have invested tens of thousands of dollars to develop the legislation, amendments, rulemaking, and training necessary to adopt the building code. It has involved thousands of hours of donated time by the Board and the business community and has included tens of millions of dollars of federal money given to the state to undertake energy projects based on the adoption of the energy provisions of the code. There will be challenges as we begin implementation, but to turn our backs on the code, and the progress we have made as a State, would be foolish and shortsighted.” –**Paul Becker, Becker Structural Engineers, Portland**