

General Law Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5227 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING MOLD REMEDIATION.

Vote Date: 3/11/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 2/23/2026

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

General Law Committee per request of Rep. Winter, Rep. Zupkus, and Rep. Rutigliano

REASONS FOR BILL

The committee raised this bill because it was brought to several members' attention that unscrupulous individuals have been representing themselves as mold remediators despite having little to no training or qualifications to perform such work. The raised bill's provisions would require mold remediation professionals to register with the Department of Consumer Protection (DCP). In order to register with DCP, the individual would have to hold a mold remediation credential from one of several organizations named in the bill.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

The substitute language (LCO 3012) addresses DCP's concerns regarding cost by removing provisions about public education and removing certain reporting requirements. During the public hearing process, it was determined that it was best to limit the mold remediation registration to commercial mold remediation; that change is reflected in the substitute language.

During the committee process, the committee learned of a related issue regarding fire and catastrophic restoration businesses. It was reported that scammers had shown up on the scene of fires, floods, and other catastrophes to represent themselves as remediators. With the intent of protecting residents from these bad actors, the substitute language adds provisions regarding fire and catastrophic restoration licensing. Among other provisions, it requires businesses to register with DCP and issue credentials to their employees. It requires employees to wear ID badges and to wear the credential during certain emergencies.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY

[**Department of Consumer Protection \(DCP\)—Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner**](#) submitted written testimony expressing concern about language in Section 1 that contradicts the current definition of mold remediation as "home improvement." Commissioner Cafferelli requests that it remain a home improvement registration to protect access to the Home Improvement Guaranty Fund. With respect to Sections 5 through 7, he notes the Department does not have mold experts to launch a public awareness campaign, review new technologies, or prepare the required reports.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT

[**Miriam Lifshitz-Theroux, Deputy Mayor, Town of Rocky Hill**](#) testified in support of the bill, drawing upon recent experience regarding major water and mold damage in a prominent residential complex in her town. She states that when this damage occurs, families are vulnerable and need protection. Deputy Mayor Lifshitz-Theroux argues that the bill's provisions are straightforward and necessary. She states that the registration requirements are a basic way to prove professional competence, noting that when the water intrusion occurred in her town, it attracted both high-quality contractors and scammers, with residents struggling to guess the difference. Lifshitz-Theroux states that the bill's provisions ensure that remediation work is done properly so that consumers do not face added costs. Overall, she argues, "From the municipal perspective, this bill supports better outcomes with less public burden." She urges the committee to support the bill because it will ensure that families who are facing a housing crisis will interact with competent professionals.

[**Robbie Bradshaw, Director of Government Relations, Institute of Inspection Cleaning and Restoration Certification \(IICRC\)**](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill because it would establish reasonable and needed regulation of the mold remediation industry in CT. He characterizes requiring mold remediators to hold industry certifications as an important step toward consumer protection. To strengthen the bill, Mr. Bradshaw suggests clarifications as follows:

- Replace the term remediation specialist with remediator.
- Strike lines 28 through 32, as those provisions create ambiguity regarding who is subject to the certification and standard of care requirements.

[**David Silver, President, First Stop Environmental, Inc. and John Skelly, Owner, HNST Environmental**](#) both submitted testimony supporting this bill because as licensed and certified mold assessors in the State of New York, they have conducted numerous assessments in Connecticut. They testify that they have frequently encountered substandard contractor practices that leave homeowners, renters, and landlords vulnerable to excessive costs for poor work. They argue that the bill will provide a necessary regulatory foundation to establish and enforce clear guidelines, as well as provide accountability. Mr. Skelly suggests that the committee consider adding post-remediation inspection requirements to the legislation to further strengthen industry integrity and ensure that remediation efforts have been properly completed.

[Brandon Chappo, Director of Public Policy, Change the Air Foundation](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He testifies that the bill is a vital step toward addressing mold and water damage in homes and buildings by establishing a clear standard for mold remediation. Chappo states that the education provisions improve availability of resources and strengthen overall public awareness. He urges support of the bill because these measures will safeguard public health with stronger consumer protections.

[Maryann Cornelio](#) and **twenty-three other CT residents** submitted written testimony in support of this bill. All shared their story on how the absence of enforceable mold remediation standards caused harm to the health of family members. These residents commonly raised their concern that Connecticut's lack of standards forces homeowners into an unregulated system. They stress that the bill will establish clear, enforceable industry standards, create consistency, protect homeowners, and prevent families from facing repeated remediation failures and financial devastation.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION

[Jim Perras, CEO, Home Builders and Remodelers Association \(HBRA\) of Connecticut, Inc.](#) testified in opposition to the bill. Mr. Perras states that the bill as drafted imposes new certification, registration, education, and compliance mandates without sufficient evidence that existing regulatory frameworks are inadequate or that these new requirements are necessary to protect consumers. HBRA argues that the bill will likely increase mold remediation costs for homeowners, renters, builders and other property owners, as increased overhead for contractors will be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher remediation bills. Alternatively, Mr. Perras suggests conducting a comprehensive study of the issue and performing a thorough analysis of the costs and benefits of potential new requirements before any are implemented.

[Anonymous 27](#) opposes the bill.

GENERAL COMMENTS

[Anonymous 13](#) – filed their testimony as opposed to the bill, but in their submitted written testimony they state that they support it. This individual shared a personal story about the negative health impacts of mold poisoning on their daughter. They urge the committee to implement remediation protocols and training for residential landlords, schools, and state institutions.

Reported by: Jacqueline Olsen

Date: March 20, 2026