



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>BRAYDON PEMBERTON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-418-5085</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>ST LOUIS HOMEBUILDERS</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>205 E CAPITOL</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>KEVIN KLINKENBERG</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:		SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LYNNE M. SCHLOSSER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>913-461-8124</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>THE BUILDERS/AGC KANSAS CITY</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>1521 PEPPERWOOD DR.</b>			
CITY: <b>ST. LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63146</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>RACHEL STERN</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>716-225-9919</b>
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>CELLULOSE INSULATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b>
ADDRESS: <b>1930 18TH ST NW</b>		
CITY: <b>WASHINGTON</b>		STATE: <b>DC</b>
		ZIP: <b>20009</b>
EMAIL: <b>rachel@cellulose.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 7:56 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

On behalf of the Cellulose Insulation Manufacturers Association, we submit the following comments in support of Missouri HB 2384.

This bill establishes a reasonable and consistent ceiling on energy efficiency codes for residential, commercial, and industrial construction. We support this legislation because it reinforces the use of simple, well-understood model codes that provide clarity and predictability for builders, architects, building officials, and manufacturers. Furthermore, it will help ensure that construction standards remain accessible, enforceable, and cost-effective throughout the state.

By preventing escalation of code requirements beyond the IECC 2009, HB 2384 helps control construction costs while still maintaining a recognized national model code for energy efficiency. Simpler codes promote broader compliance, reduce administrative burden, and allow innovation to be driven by market demand rather than prescriptive mandates. While it might appear counter to the mission of an insulation trade association to support this bill, we ultimately believe in simpler, smarter codes that support sustainability and consumer protection. A streamlined approach to model codes best supports economic growth, housing affordability, and long-term investment across Missouri's residential, commercial, and industrial sectors.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>RICH AUBUCHON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-616-1845</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>HUNT MIDWEST</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>112 EAST HIGH STREET</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>SHAWN WOODS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>WILL RUDER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-517-3187</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF GREATER KANSAS CITY</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>600 E 103RD ST</b>			
CITY: <b>KANSAS CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64131</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>AMY SCHMIDT</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>989-513-2169</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>ENERGY EFFICIENT CODES COALITION</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>25 BRETT MANOR CT.</b>			
CITY: <b>HUNT VALLEY</b>		STATE: <b>MD</b>	ZIP: <b>21030</b>
EMAIL: <b>amy@energyefficientcodes.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 12:52 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Mr. Chairman and members of the Commerce Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this bill.

I serve as the Executive Director of the Energy Efficient Codes Coalition. My coalition supporters represent stakeholders that are responsible for the creation of thousands of building and construction jobs and millions of dollars in building and construction research and innovation. For the past 20 years the coalition has worked to help make homes and buildings more affordable for consumers.

I urge you NOT to vote for this bill. Why? This bill does NOT promote affordability. It stifles it.

Affordability includes the ability to pay monthly utility bills and the maintenance of the home. There is a high cost to cheap construction and the home or business owner always pay the price.

There are supporters of the bill who will try and scare you with inflated costs. But these numbers are not consistent with those that have been vetted by the Department of Energy using a methodology that has been publicly and thoroughly vetted as well as third-party analysis that found that the DOE numbers are repeatable and reliable.

The bill locks in the 2009 International Energy Code which is already 17 years old. There have been 5 updated versions published and determined to save more energy and to be cost effective.

Prohibiting jurisdictions from adopting any one of these newer versions is a disservice to Missouri constituents. It would harness the owners or renters of those homes or commercial buildings with higher utility costs.

The newer versions of the code also help make buildings more affordable by improving durability and by reducing moisture risks and other issues. Buildings that are more durable and healthy cut high maintenance costs and mitigate the unquantifiable high costs of health issues associated with moisture, mold and poor indoor air quality and other issues.

We support energy efficiency first. Including the efficient use of energy regardless of its source. We do not advocate for measures that promote electric equipment over gas equipment or that require renewable energy or electric vehicle charging or the like. We support code amendments to remove



non-efficiency measures from the energy code.

We also could support other versions of the energy code that do not include these beyond efficiency measures, but the 2009 International Energy Code is simply unsupportable. The 2009 IECC would create higher energy burdens for the entire state. Higher utility bills for all and stress on the energy grid leaving less available energy for manufacturing and technology center advancement.

I urge you to consider the 2012 or more recent version of the code for residential construction and the 2015 or more recent version of the code for commercial construction for the reasons I stated.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the Energy Efficiency Codes Coalition testimony.

Sincerely,

**Amy Schmidt**  
Executive Director



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>ANDREW BRACKBILL</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>202-591-2482</b>
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>XPSA</b>		TITLE: <b>POLICY DIRECTOR</b>
ADDRESS: <b>529 14TH STREET NW, SUITE 1280</b>		
CITY: <b>WASHINGTON</b>		STATE: <b>DC</b>
		ZIP: <b>20045</b>
EMAIL: <b>abrackbill@kellencompany.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 2:12 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

The Extruded Polystyrene Foam Association (XPSA) is the trade association representing manufacturers of extruded polystyrene (XPS) foam insulation products. XPSA members collectively manufacture more than 95 percent of all XPS destined for use in the North American market. XPSA promotes the safe use of XPS foam insulation in commercial and residential construction.

Restricting the local adoption of building energy codes and limiting energy efficiency standards to the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) will make Missouri homes and commercial buildings less comfortable and more expensive to heat and cool. Modern energy-efficiency codes are critical for reducing the long-term energy costs of heating and cooling buildings. The Department of Energy's own calculations indicate that, on average, 43% of a residential utility bill goes to pay for heating and cooling. Modern energy efficiency codes recognize the importance of continuous insulation applications, vapor barriers, and other product applications, which help building owners keep their energy costs in line. The cost savings provided by insulation is especially noteworthy over the long term, given the rising cost of energy. Comprehensive insulation installations also reduce the initial construction cost of homes and commercial buildings because they allow for the installation of more efficient low-profile heating and cooling systems, which the 2009 IECC codes do not account for.

For this reason XPSA is opposed to HB 2384 because we believe that it will harm Missouri citizens.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>ANDY PHELPS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>913-321-6444</b>
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>BARNES &amp; DODGE, INC.</b>		TITLE: <b>VICE PRESIDENT</b>
ADDRESS: <b>17135 W. 116TH STREET</b>		
CITY: <b>LENEXA</b>	STATE: <b>KS</b>	ZIP: <b>66227</b>
EMAIL: <b>aphelps@barnesanddodge.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 10:44 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I strongly oppose House Bill 2384. By prohibiting adoption of energy codes beyond the 2009 IECC, this bill locks Missouri into outdated standards and imposes significant costs on residents, builders, and designers.

The goal of the IECC is to conserve both energy and costs. Freezing codes at 2009 levels will raise energy costs. Less efficient buildings consume more energy, and as future energy prices rise, families and businesses will face higher utility bills and greater vulnerability to price shocks. This will create a double penalty for energy costs.

Most equipment manufacturers now design products to meet current and future energy codes. Restricting Missouri to 2009 standards creates a regressive mismatch between available equipment and code requirements. Standard HVAC equipment available with 2009 minimums is hardly available anymore.

From the designer's perspective, outdated codes make compliance harder. Reconciling modern best practices and client expectations with obsolete standards leads to rework, longer design times, and higher fees. Owners ultimately pay more for slower, less efficient projects.

This bill also undermines Missouri's competitiveness. Buyers and tenants increasingly demand efficient, resilient buildings. Restricting construction to 2009 standards reduces property value and market appeal.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose HB 2384.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ANNA CHOTT</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 10:22 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I hope you don't pass this bill, because it would result in energy bills increasing, and less efficiency in general. Additionally, the counties in Missouri should have the right to continue choosing the energy codes that are right for them. They shouldn't have the state take that away.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ARNIE C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVO</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 11:42 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>BRANDON WHITE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:55 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

Chair and Members of the Committee - Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in opposition to House Bill 2384. I respectfully urge you to reject this bill, as it undermines local control to hold high standards of construction for the members of their community, threatens progress towards combating scientifically proven climate change, and passes cost from developers and builders to residents in the form of increased utility costs. House Bill 2384 simply ignores common sense.

Please ask yourself: would you want automobile manufacturers to be held accountable only to the safety standards established 17 years ago, and no better? Probably not, even if it saved the manufacturers a small cost. This analogy sums up the proposed statutes within House Bill 2384. Building and energy codes establish minimum performance requirements, not exceptional or luxury standards. Freezing or limiting standards to outdated codes, such as those from 2009, is far too regressive to meet the needs of today's construction industry.

In addition, Missouri has no statewide building or energy code – local governments adopt codes that best serve their communities. HB 2384 would strip municipalities of their ability to enact standards they have deliberately chosen for the health, safety, and economic well-being of their residents.

Affordable housing is defined as housing where occupants pay no more than 30% of their gross income, including utilities. Currently, 29% of Missouri households are already cost-burdened. Under-insulated and inefficient buildings, paired with rising utility costs, place an unnecessary and avoidable financial strain on households—particularly those living in affordable housing. True affordability must include both housing costs and long-term utility expenses.

Missouri communities deserve the freedom to build safe, efficient, and resilient buildings that reduce long-term costs and improve quality of life – that is why I oppose House Bill 2384, and I urge you to reject it. Thank you.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>BRIAN PALLASCH</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>919-551-6206</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING ENCLOSURE CONSULTANTS</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT &amp; CEO</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>4334 FAYETTEVILLE STREET, SUITE 2400</b>			
CITY: <b>RALEIGH</b>		STATE: <b>NC</b>	ZIP: <b>27602</b>
EMAIL: <b>bpallasch@iibec.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:53 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Commerce Committee Members,

On behalf of the International Institute of Building Enclosure Consultants (IIBEC), an association of design professionals specializing in building enclosure projects, I respectfully submit our concerns regarding H.B. 2348, Applications for Property Developments.

We urge the committee to reconsider provisions that would roll back local authority to adopt modern energy codes, including those proposed in H.B. 2348.

IIBEC represents more than 3,900 members who design, investigate, and manage roofing, exterior wall, and waterproofing systems. Our members serve as trusted advocates for building owners, ensuring projects meet applicable standards, codes, warranties, and performance expectations.

Modern energy codes help building owners manage rising energy costs and support the state's electrical grid as demand grows. Compliance with the 2021 IECC (or ASHRAE 90.1-2019) reduces construction costs through efficient measures such as improved building envelopes. Across all building types in Missouri, the 2021 IECC provides \$3.50–\$4.00 per square foot in life cycle cost savings. Energy-efficient buildings are more comfortable, durable, and resistant to premature failure from air and moisture infiltration.

Over 42,000 Missourians are employed in the energy efficiency sector, from construction to the manufacturing of energy-saving technologies. Restricting local jurisdictions to the 2009 IECC would increase costs for businesses, decrease energy efficiency, and undermine Missouri's economic and sustainability goals.

We appreciate your commitment to public safety, fiscal responsibility, and improved building performance. Should you require additional technical information or industry expertise, IIBEC and its members are ready to serve as a resource throughout the rulemaking and implementation process.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and for your continued dedication to public safety and building performance.

Sincerely,

**Brian Pallasch, CAE**  
**Executive Vice President & CEO**





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>BRIAN VANNE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:22 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

The bill takes away the ability and rights of communities to self-determine appropriate policies, measures, codes, and other standards, of which I am against. It also causes a race to the bottom in regards to housing development by preventing communities from enacting codes and policies which in the end harms Missouri residents. Additionally, the elimination of these standards will allow predatory landowners and developers to both create sub-optimal housing which will pass costs onto the residents, which is especially problematic in a time where individual costs of those renting or leasing properties are already increasing.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>CAROLYN NISWONGER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>SIERRA CLUB-MO CHAPTER</b>		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: <b>MO</b>
EMAIL:		ZIP:
ATTENDANCE:		SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHARLENE HANSEN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:59 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**This legislation attacks home affordability and energy efficiency. Having energy-efficient homes supports our environment, supports families having to pay for energy, and moves Missouri in the right direction.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHARLES ANTHONY MCGRAIL</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:09 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**Chairman and Members of the Committee:**

I am a licensed architect practicing in the Kansas City metropolitan area and a resident of Lee's Summit. I have served on local code adoption committees and currently hold leadership responsibilities with AIA Kansas City. I write in opposition to HB 2384.

**Home Rule Is Constitutional Design, Not Administrative Convenience.**

Article VI, Section 19(a) of the Missouri Constitution provides that any city which adopts a charter for its own government "shall have all powers which the general assembly of the state of Missouri has authority to confer upon any city, provided such powers are consistent with the constitution of this state and are not limited or denied either by the charter so adopted or by statute."

This provision reflects a deliberate constitutional choice: Missouri's framers understood that land use decisions require local knowledge and local accountability. The 1971 amendment strengthening Section 19(a) was enacted precisely to ensure municipalities could address matters of local concern without requiring specific legislative authorization for each function.

HB 2384 inverts this constitutional structure. Rather than respecting the broad grant of home rule authority, it imposes uniform state mandates on development review processes—matters that are quintessentially local in character. The topography of Lee's Summit differs from Parkville. Stormwater management in my community reflects our particular watershed conditions. Infrastructure capacity—sewer, water, roads—varies block by block, not by legislative district.

When Jefferson City dictates uniform timelines or approval criteria for development applications, it substitutes speed for reality. A 60-day shot clock applied identically to a 200-unit multifamily project and a single-lot subdivision treats fundamentally different problems as equivalent. This is not efficiency; it is indifference to complexity.

This bill frames local review processes as bureaucratic delay. Having participated in code adoption, I can report what actually occurs: coordination between planning staff, public works, fire marshals, and utilities to identify conflicts before construction begins. The alternative—approvals granted by default when arbitrary deadlines expire—shifts costs downstream to builders who discover infrastructure constraints mid-project and to municipalities forced into expensive remediation.

The General Assembly retains authority under Section 19(a) to limit municipal powers by statute—but that authority should be exercised with restraint and substantial justification, not deployed to override local planning processes that function adequately. Missouri courts have repeatedly held that matters of purely local concern fall within the protected sphere of home rule authority. Development review procedures, tailored to local infrastructure and geographic conditions, exemplify such matters.

**Codifying an IECC Ceiling Freezes Standards in Statute and Undermines Market Function.**

HB 2384's provision establishing a maximum International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) year that municipalities may adopt reflects a misunderstanding of how codes function, why they evolve, and

who they actually serve.

The IECC is updated on a three-year cycle through a consensus-based process involving builders, manufacturers, utilities, code officials, and design professionals. Each cycle incorporates advances in building envelope performance, mechanical system efficiency, and cost-effective construction techniques. The process already balances efficiency gains against construction costs—provisions that cannot demonstrate cost-effectiveness over a reasonable payback period do not survive the consensus process.

When the General Assembly fixes an IECC ceiling in statute, it does not protect consumers from regulatory overreach. It prevents municipalities from adopting standards that reflect current material availability, current utility rates, and current construction practices. Consider the practical implications:

**Insulation and envelope requirements:** Material science advances. Spray foam formulations improve. Window glazing performance increases while costs decline. An IECC ceiling locks municipalities into thermal performance standards based on material costs and availability from years prior, regardless of market evolution.

**Mechanical system efficiency:** HVAC equipment efficiencies improve continuously as manufacturers respond to federal appliance standards and market demand. An IECC ceiling may require municipalities to permit installation of equipment that is less efficient than what contractors would install anyway, creating compliance theater rather than cost savings.

**Climate zone appropriateness:** The IECC is calibrated to climate zones. Kansas City sits in Zone 4A. The code provisions applicable here differ from those in St. Louis or Springfield. A statutory ceiling applied statewide ignores this calibration and substitutes legislative judgment for climate science.

**Utility coordination and rates:** Municipalities coordinate energy code adoption with local utility rebate programs, weatherization assistance, and infrastructure planning. A statutory ceiling disrupts this coordination by preventing alignment between code requirements and utility incentive structures.

When rate increases are already hitting residents, adding a statutory framework that makes buildings less efficient ends up as a double whammy to those paying on the downstream effects.

The sponsor's previous legislation (HB 939) argued that energy mandates price families out of homeownership. This framing deserves scrutiny. The IECC's cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that envelope and mechanical improvements produce utility savings that exceed incremental construction costs over the mortgage term. A home built to 2024 IECC standards costs less to occupy than a home built to 2018 standards—the construction cost delta is recovered through reduced utility bills, often within five to seven years or less.

More fundamentally: energy codes establish minimum performance thresholds. They do not prevent builders from constructing to lesser standards where market demand supports it—except that such construction would impose long-term operating costs on buyers who may not understand what they are purchasing. Energy codes function as consumer protection, ensuring that the least sophisticated buyers receive buildings that perform to contemporary standards rather than buildings optimized solely for first-cost minimization. They establish a floor instead of a ceiling.

If the General Assembly believes specific IECC provisions impose unreasonable costs to Missouri's market conditions, it should identify those provisions and subject them to public deliberation. A blanket ceiling on IECC adoption years substitutes legislative presumption for technical analysis and strips municipalities of authority to align local codes with local conditions, local utility structures, and current construction economics.

Having served on local code adoption committees, I can attest that municipalities do not adopt new energy codes reflexively or uniformly. Lee's Summit evaluates each code cycle, considers local amendments, engages the building community, and makes adoption decisions based on local capacity and conditions. This process works. It does not require a state-wide statutory ceiling to constrain it—particularly one that prevents adoption of standards the market may already exceed.

**The Affordable Housing Framing Does Not Survive Scrutiny.**

The sponsor's claim that regulatory streamlining produces affordability deserves examination rather than acceptance.

Housing costs in Missouri are driven primarily by construction input costs (materials, labor, land) and financing conditions. The National Association of Home Builders estimates regulatory costs at 24% of a new single-family home's final price—but the overwhelming majority of that figure reflects federal environmental requirements, state-mandated inspections, and structural/life-safety code compliance. Energy code provisions represent a small fraction of this total, and their costs are substantially offset by reduced operating expenses.

Local application review timelines represent a marginal fraction of development costs. A project delayed 30 days incurs carrying costs—but a project approved without adequate review and subsequently halted by utility conflicts, easement disputes, or stormwater failures incurs far greater

losses.

IECC ceilings do not predictably reduce housing costs. They prevent adoption of provisions that might increase envelope costs—but they equally prevent adoption of updated compliance pathways, improved equipment efficiency credits, and alternative methods that may reduce costs. The 2018 IECC is not inherently cheaper to build to than the 2024 IECC; the relationship between code year and construction cost is not linear, and market conditions evolve independently of code cycles.

If the General Assembly genuinely sought to address housing affordability, it would examine LIHTC allocation procedures, infrastructure financing mechanisms, land costs, or labor market constraints. Instead, this bill targets municipal planning authority and energy code adoption while leaving actual cost drivers untouched. The affordable housing framing is rhetorical cover for a deregulatory agenda that benefits a narrow constituency of volume builders at the expense of homebuyers who will pay higher utility bills for the duration of their ownership.

#### Professional Perspective

Architects coordinate with local planning departments daily. These interactions are not adversarial—they are collaborative problem-solving. When a planner identifies a setback conflict or a fire marshal questions egress distances, the result is a better project, not an obstructed one. Legislation that treats local review as an impediment to be circumvented misunderstands the development process. It also creates professional liability exposure: when approvals become automatic upon deadline expiration, who bears responsibility for unconsidered site conditions? When IECC ceilings prevent adoption of current standards, design professionals face the choice of designing to the statutory maximum (which may underperform relative to client expectations and contemporary practice) or specifying beyond code (which increases costs the sponsor claims to oppose). The bill creates confusion where current practice provides clarity.

#### Conclusion

HB 2384 would diminish the home rule authority that Missouri's Constitution deliberately grants to municipalities, freeze energy code adoption at an arbitrary point that may already lag market practice, and fail to produce the housing benefits its sponsor claims. Lee's Summit has demonstrated consistent ability to manage growth, approve development, adopt appropriate codes through deliberative local processes, and maintain community standards. The bill solves problems that do not exist in my community while creating risks that do.

I respectfully urge a "no" vote.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHARLES LUEBKE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:35 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**CURRENT CODES ARE A MINIMUM**

Building codes establish minimum performance, not exceptional performance. Setting a ceiling at 2009 is far too regressive to meet the current efficiency required in modern construction. Homes built to 2018 energy codes save approximately 30% in energy costs.

**Opposition:**

**1. ENERGY CODE CEILING**

This language is identical to 2025's HB 939 (Jones) in its perfected text form with Commercial and Industrial being impacted in additional to single-family construction and multi-family. This sets an Energy

Code ceiling at IECC 2009.

**2. SINGLE STAIR FOR MULTIFAMILY**

This language proposed multifamily construction may be served by a single egress stair if it is no more than six stories,

**3. PROVISIONS FOR APPROVALS ON PROPERTY DEVELOPMENTS**

This language is identical to 2025's HB 1264 (Casteel) proposing that applications for new construction (Residential, Commercial, and Industrial) which have not been reviewed within 30 calendar days be deemed approved.

**ENERGY AFFORDABILITY**

Missouri is ranked 9th most expensive energy costs in the United States.

Utility rates have increased 14% across the state of Missouri in the last year with the average cost of Energy bills in Missouri are \$118.55 for Electricity and \$108 for Natural Gas. (Forbes 7/26/2024). That's \$226.55 per month combined. Efficient home construction saves approx \$720 in annual energy savings.

This does not include the increases which will be coming as part of 2025's Senate Bill 4 which increases costs for residential energy rate payers.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN MISSOURI**

The definition of Affordable Housing is housing on which an occupant is paying no more than 30% of their gross income for housing costs, including utilities. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development).

29% of Missouri households are already cost-burdened. Underinsulating homes with energy costs increasing, creates an unnecessary burden on households.

**BUILDING CODES IN MISSOURI**

78% of the population of Missouri lives in an area that has an adopted code (Safer + Simpler Coalition) which would be impacted by this legislation.

**BAD BILL**

The language of this bill is vague with no definitions provided for terms used. The bill mentioned both IRC and IECC, leaving interpretation open for what can be deemed a “threat to affordability”, with the potential to affect protections to life safety, health, and welfare.

#### **CHANGES OVER TIME**

This bill does not provide any structure for a board/council/committee to oversee it or amend it over time.

#### **JOBS IN MISSOURI**

The construction workforce in the State of Missouri is 5.6% of the total private sector employment with more than 126,375 workers (Missouri Dept of Higher Education & Workforce Development, 2022). Energy code adoption and enforcement increases demand for skilled Clean Energy and Efficient Buildings Workforce. 70% of the 56, 500 Clean Energy Jobs in MO are in Energy Efficiency.

#### **LOCAL CONTROL**

Missouri is a Homerule state with no state-wide building or energy code. Local municipalities adopt their own codes for the good of their communities. HB 2384 would strip local municipalities of the codes that communities have chosen for themselves.

As a licensed architect in Missouri for over fifty years I must oppose this bill and urge you to do the same.

Charles M. Luebke Registered MO Architect -#3417





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHRISTOPHER MAHIN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 6:57 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I oppose this legislation and urge the Committee to consider the long-term costs it will impose on homeowners and residents. Weakening requirements for modern, energy-efficient materials and building codes may reduce upfront expenses, but it will increase utility bills, maintenance costs, and the overall cost of ownership over the life of a building.

With energy prices rising, halting improvements to building codes and efficiency standards is the wrong response. Buildings should be required to meet the highest standards to reduce energy consumption, ease pressure on our energy infrastructure, and protect occupants from escalating costs.

Please reject this legislation and maintain strong, modern building codes that safeguard affordability over the long term.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL SWAN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 10:37 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

My name is Christopher Swan. I am a Missouri architect, a member of AIA Missouri, and I live and practice in Springfield, Missouri, where I work for BRP Architects. I respectfully submit this written testimony in opposition to House Bill 2384.

HB 2384 would prohibit local governments from adopting building and energy standards beyond the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) for residential, commercial, and industrial construction. This would impose an outdated statewide energy code ceiling that fails to reflect modern construction practices and current economic conditions.

Building codes establish minimum standards, not exceptional performance. Capping energy codes at IECC 2009 prevents communities from adopting nationally recognized updates that improve building performance and reduce long-term operating costs. Homes built to more recent energy codes achieve approximately 30% energy savings, benefiting occupants for the life of the building.

Energy affordability is already a serious concern in Missouri. Utility rates have increased roughly 14% statewide in the past year, with average households paying more than \$225 per month for electricity and natural gas combined. Energy-efficient construction can save households approximately \$720 per year, savings that are increasingly important as additional rate increases are anticipated.

Affordable housing includes the cost of utilities, and 29% of Missouri households are already cost-burdened. Limiting energy efficiency while utility costs rise directly undermines housing affordability.

Missouri is a home-rule state, and approximately 78% of Missourians live in jurisdictions with adopted building codes that would be impacted by this bill. HB 2384 would strip local authority without providing a viable statewide alternative. The bill's vague language and lack of a process for oversight or future updates further increase the risk of unintended consequences affecting life safety, health, and welfare.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to oppose House Bill 2384 and preserve local authority to adopt current, consensus-based building and energy codes.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CURT RICH</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>202-257-4831</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>NORTH AMERICAN INSULATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION</b>		TITLE: <b>PRESIDENT AND CEO</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>3828 LEONARD'S COVE LANE, 3828 LEONARD'S COVE LANE</b>			
CITY: <b>TRAPPE</b>		STATE: <b>MD</b>	ZIP: <b>21673</b>
EMAIL: <b>crich@naima.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 5:48 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

The North American Insulation Manufacturers Association is the national trade association representing the fiberglass and mineral wool insulation industry. On behalf of our member companies, we oppose HB 2384.

Missouri and Kansas are a national hub for insulation manufacturing. CertainTeed and Owens Corning operate fiberglass insulation plants in the Kansas City area. Owens Corning also manufactures mineral wool insulation in Joplin. These facilities support jobs and produce building products that help families manage energy costs.

Insulation is unique among building materials because its sole purpose is to save energy. The better insulated a building is, the lower its heating and cooling bills. For that reason, NAIMA supports energy codes as the tool for setting cost-effective insulation levels. In practice, this means the modest upfront cost of insulation is quickly recovered through lower annual utility bills.

At the same time, NAIMA does not support energy codes that are not fuel-neutral, that mandate electrification, that set decarbonization targets, or that require rooftop solar, EV charging, or battery storage. We believe energy codes should be limited to cost-effective measures that make buildings more energy efficient — nothing more.

Missouri builders are appropriately concerned about construction costs. That concern is real. But it is also important to recognize that homes built to modern energy codes deliver lower lifetime utility bills to the families who buy them. Most homebuyers reasonably assume that a new home will be energy efficient.

HB 2384 would prohibit Missouri from adopting an energy code beyond the 2009 IECC. That would lock in higher heating and cooling costs for the life of new homes, with little to no meaningful upfront savings for the buyer.

By contrast, the 2012 IECC is about 20 percent more energy efficient than the 2009 code. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, building to the 2012 IECC in Missouri saves homeowners roughly \$8,000 in heating and cooling costs over 30 years. The payback period is less than five years, and the small increase in mortgage payments is typically offset by lower utility bills within the first year.

Requiring homes to meet the 2012 IECC simply ensures that reasonably efficient — “pretty good” — homes are built in Missouri. That is a balanced and practical policy outcome.

**In closing, NAIMA respectfully urges the Committee to modify the bill by setting the ceiling for energy code compliance at the 2012 IECC. This approach addresses builders' first-cost concerns while meeting the expectations of new homeowners and helping protect them from rising gas and electricity costs.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>DANA GRAY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 5:13 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

With steep energy cost increases across Missouri, we need to modernize our Energy Code, not roll it back.

Missouri's residential electricity costs increased 37% in 2025. See the linked article on energy cost increases across the US. Many face utility disconnections. Improved Energy Codes will help to reduce consumer's energy use and costs. Please oppose this bill.

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2025/11/24/power-shutoffs-surge-electricbills/?pwapi\\_token=eyJ0eXAiOiJKV1QiLCJhbGciOiJIUzI1NiJ9.eyJyZWZzb24iOiJnaWZ0liwibmJmljoxNzY0MDQ2ODAwLCJpc3MiOiJzdWJzY3JpcHRpb25zliwiZXhwIjoxNzY1NDI5MTk5LCJpYXQiOiJlMjY0MDQ2ODAwMDAsImp0aSI6IjRiZmRjZTM4LWFiZTEtNDIzYi04MjM5MjYyNDIhMWQ4YSIsInVybCI6Imh0dHBzOi8vd3d3Lndhc2hpbmd0b25wb3N0LmNvbS9idXNpbmVzcy8yMDI1LzExLzI0L3Bvd2VyLXNodXRvZmZzLXN1cmdlLWVsZWN0cmllLWJpbGxzLyJ9.FI5a0QmQUO\\_kUpE-sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2025/11/24/power-shutoffs-surge-electricbills/?pwapi_token=eyJ0eXAiOiJKV1QiLCJhbGciOiJIUzI1NiJ9.eyJyZWZzb24iOiJnaWZ0liwibmJmljoxNzY0MDQ2ODAwLCJpc3MiOiJzdWJzY3JpcHRpb25zliwiZXhwIjoxNzY1NDI5MTk5LCJpYXQiOiJlMjY0MDQ2ODAwMDAsImp0aSI6IjRiZmRjZTM4LWFiZTEtNDIzYi04MjM5MjYyNDIhMWQ4YSIsInVybCI6Imh0dHBzOi8vd3d3Lndhc2hpbmd0b25wb3N0LmNvbS9idXNpbmVzcy8yMDI1LzExLzI0L3Bvd2VyLXNodXRvZmZzLXN1cmdlLWVsZWN0cmllLWJpbGxzLyJ9.FI5a0QmQUO_kUpE-sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw)

Q2ODAwLCJpc3MiOiJzdWJzY3JpcHRpb25zliwiZXhwIjoxNzY1NDI5MTk5LCJpYXQiOiJlMjY0MDQ2ODAwMDAsImp0aSI6IjRiZmRjZTM4LWFiZTEtNDIzYi04MjM5MjYyNDIhMWQ4YSIsInVybCI6Imh0dHBzOi8vd3d3Lndhc2hpbmd0b25wb3N0LmNvbS9idXNpbmVzcy8yMDI1LzExLzI0L3Bvd2VyLXNodXRvZmZzLXN1cmdlLWVsZWN0cmllLWJpbGxzLyJ9.FI5a0QmQUO\_kUpE-sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw

MjM5MjYyNDIhMWQ4YSIsInVybCI6Imh0dHBzOi8vd3d3Lndhc2hpbmd0b25wb3N0LmNvbS9idXNpbmVzcy8yMDI1LzExLzI0L3Bvd2VyLXNodXRvZmZzLXN1cmdlLWVsZWN0cmllLWJpbGxzLyJ9.FI5a0QmQUO\_kUpE-sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw

L3Bvd2VyLXNodXRvZmZzLXN1cmdlLWVsZWN0cmllLWJpbGxzLyJ9.FI5a0QmQUO\_kUpE-sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw

sPtCqMnmgAzb7cP1gkt0Qay2Ifw



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>DANIEL C. WIND</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:30 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

This bill represents a reconfiguration of previously failed bills to restrict the use or implementation of current energy codes across the entire state of Missouri. I respectfully ask that this bill be opposed as it fails to adequately serve the citizens of Missouri in several critical ways. First, current building codes are suggestive of minimums, not maximums. Our buildings, therefore, meet the barest of requirements. By advancing outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, long-term energy costs would increase for residents, most acutely those that are low-income and those seeking to purchase their first home. Current energy codes are important because they impact insulation quality, air sealing, mechanical systems and indoor air quality, by reducing mold growth, moisture saturation and the accumulation of pollutants that contribute greatly to long term health issues such as asthma and other chronic respiratory issues. Better insulated buildings with higher quality air help reduce the energy costs of residents by \$40-\$50 per month, on average. Second, this bill denies local control of code adoption. The climate conditions vary throughout the state, as do infrastructural capacities/needs and local housing markets. Local responses, not over-arching state mandates, are required to best reflect these conditions. Third, homes and buildings constructed using outdated materials and methods consume more energy, thereby taxing our already stressed distribution system. With energy prices reaching new highs, responsible measures to help reduce energy use should be debated and enacted, and not the current effort to stymie energy efficiency and render state policies outdated and undesirable. Finally, this bill does nothing to advance Missouri's efforts to enhance transparency and maintain vital public input. A one-size fits all approach to energy usage, based on outdated codes ignores proven scientific advancements in materials technology, energy consumption and best practices, just to name a few. I implore you to vote no on HB2384. This is about protect local decision making and ensuring energy affordability for all residents in Missouri. Do not let Missouri get left behind as neighboring states continue to advance more robust and modern energy code compliance.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>DAVID BROWN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:09 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

This bill prohibits any county or municipality from enacting or maintaining any ordinance, regulation, or other policy that requires an owner, builder, or developer to implement green building design and construction practices for one- or two-family dwellings, condominiums, multiunit townhouses, multiunit apartment buildings, or commercial or industrial buildings, with the intent to improve sustainability, energy efficiency, high-performance energy standards, environmental responsiveness and other standards specified in the bill, that threatens the affordability of the construction, maintenance, repair or renovation.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>DAVID HERRON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>913-205-5649</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>AIA MISSOURI/AIA KANSAS CITY</b>		TITLE: <b>SECRETARY</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>1801 MCGEE ST STE 100</b>			
CITY: <b>KANSAS CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64008</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>DONALD WALLACE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:34 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Honorable Members of Missouri House Commerce Committee,

Proposed House Bill 2384 must be rejected. HB2384 purports to prohibit actions by local government entities that would require building design and construction practices that would mandate sustainable building standards or features, high-performance standards or features, energy efficiency standards or features, or environmentally responsive standards or features.

Specifically, local government entities would be prohibited from mandating requirements “exceeding standards or features defined in the 2009 International Residential Code (IRC).” Framed quite differently is the additional prohibition on local government entities mandating standards of the requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code. Here local government entities may not impose those standards “established in the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)” (curiously there is no prohibition on imposing standards that exceed the requirements of the 2009 IECC, as seen in the reference to the 2009 International Residential Code).

When many communities in Missouri have adopted more recent versions of the IECC than the 2009 iteration, it seems that this part of HB2384 is not needed. More likely, this proposed legislation is incomprehensible, both as to what is attempting to denote as well as to its rationale.

The goal of affordability is limited to the construction side and does not extend to the habitability side, i.e., for those families who will live in homes that are more costly to heat and cool and are less durable. The concerns for affordability in HB2384 are limited to saving construction costs. Yet, the incremental costs required by the latest energy efficiency standards of the IECC are relatively minor additional costs to that of a new home and there are no valid data that shows these costs are prohibitive. Completely ignored in HB2384 is the concern of affordability of the dwelling for the home-owner and especially for the renter. Affordability in terms of the increased costs of energy, of challenges from human health issues, and of construction durability must also be considered.

The callousness seen in HB2384 towards those who would dwell in multi-family housing is compounded by its willingness to risk lives in a six-story building to be “served by a single exit.” The preferential treatment for builders is magnified by its command to local governmental entities to act on a request for approval of a building permit within 30 calendar days or face a statutorily imposed automatic approval. No consideration is given to the complexity of the proposed project or the capacity of the political subdivision for the approval process.

**For any of these reasons please reject passage of HB2384.**

**Don Wallace  
Resident, Kansas City Missouri  
25th House District**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>EMILY ANDREWS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-577-0854</b>
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI GATEWAY GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b>
ADDRESS: <b>4651 SHAW AVENUE</b>		
CITY: <b>ST. LOUIS</b>	STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63110</b>
EMAIL: <b>emily@mogreenbuildings.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 12:08 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I'm writing to respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2384. This legislation would override local control and prohibit Missouri communities from adopting updated and modern energy codes — even when those updates are necessary to reflect local housing markets, climate conditions, and energy infrastructure.

Codes ensure that our buildings meet the bare minimum requirements. Energy codes play a vital role in helping homeowners and renters reduce their monthly utility bills. By restricting Missouri to outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, HB 2384 will not make housing more affordable. Instead, it would increase long-term energy costs for residents, especially first-time and low-income buyers.

Finally, Missouri's current system already ensures public input, transparency, and thoughtful local adoption of energy codes. HB 2384 would undermine that process and impose a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to account for the diverse needs of communities across our state.

Please vote no on HB 2384 to protect local decision-making, energy affordability, and smart growth in Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>EMILY PORCARI</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>301-910-2377</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>ASHRAE</b>		TITLE: <b>MANAGER, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>180 TECHNOLOGY PARKWAY NW</b>			
CITY: <b>PEACHTREE CORNERS</b>		STATE: <b>GA</b>	ZIP: <b>30092</b>
EMAIL: <b>EPorcari@ashrae.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:51 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

January 20, 2026

The Honorable Members of the House Commerce Committee  
 Missouri House of Representatives  
 201 W Capitol Ave  
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Re: House Bill 2384, "Applications for Property Developments"

Dear Chair Casteel, Ranking Member Butz, and Members of the House Commerce Committee:

I am writing on behalf of ASHRAE, the American Society of Heating Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers. ASHRAE, founded in 1894, is a global professional society of more than 54,000 members, including 860 in Missouri, that focuses on the engineering of building systems, indoor air quality, and resiliency. Through research, standards development, publishing, certification, and continuing education, ASHRAE shapes tomorrow's global built environment today.

I would like to express ASHRAE's opposition to HB 2384. This bill would significantly weaken energy codes in local jurisdictions that have adopted a more current version of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC). Specifically, it would prohibit any Missouri community from enacting an energy code at or beyond the 2009 IECC. These restrictions take away a community's local control and would put both commercial and residential energy codes nearly two decades out of date.

The proposed legislation also fails to recognize that some municipalities in Missouri have already adopted modern energy codes. By imposing blanket restrictions or rollbacks, this bill would create regulatory uncertainty, forcing communities that have invested in energy-efficient building practices to either abandon their progress or face compliance conflicts. A statewide limitation would undermine local decision-making, increase long-term energy costs for homeowners, and disrupt local economies that have adapted to modern building practices.

Ultimately, Missouri citizens face the biggest burden when outdated codes are used, creating inefficient buildings that cost far more to make them comfortable, even with added heating and air

**conditioning. In Missouri's case, a Department of Energy analysis shows that the cost of constructing a home in Missouri to the 2021 IECC would raise the annual mortgage payment of a homeowner by \$54. In return, the average new homeowner in Missouri can expect to save 26% with a home built to the latest version of the code, which would be an average reduction of \$677 annually on their utility bills.**

**In summary, ASHRAE respectfully opposes this legislation and requests the committee vote against advancing this bill to the House floor.**

**Thank you for your consideration of ASHRAE's comments.**

**Bill McQuade  
ASHRAE Society President, 2025-2026**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>EMILY WHITTY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 6:36 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to HB 2384. I respectfully urge the committee to vote against this bill.

HB 2384 would prohibit counties and municipalities from adopting or enforcing building and energy code provisions that promote sustainability, energy efficiency, and high-performance construction when those provisions are deemed to “threaten affordability.” While affordability is a critical concern, this bill ultimately undermines it by increasing long-term housing and utility costs, weakening life-safety standards, and stripping local communities of their authority to make decisions in the best interest of their residents.

**Building Codes Are a Minimum Standard, Not a Ceiling**

Building codes establish minimum performance requirements intended to protect life safety, health, and welfare. HB 2384 effectively imposes an energy code ceiling equivalent to the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)—a standard that is now more than 15 years outdated. This approach is regressive and fails to reflect modern construction practices or current energy realities.

Homes built to the 2018 IECC save approximately 30% in energy costs compared to older codes. Preventing communities from adopting updated codes locks residents into higher monthly utility bills for decades, directly contradicting the stated goal of affordability.

**Energy Costs and Housing Affordability**

Missouri currently ranks among the states with the highest energy costs, and utility rates increased approximately 14% statewide in the last year. The average Missouri household now pays more than \$226 per month for combined electricity and natural gas. Efficient home construction can save households approximately \$720 annually—savings that are especially critical for working families.

Affordable housing is defined as housing that costs no more than 30% of a household’s gross income, including utilities. Nearly 29% of Missouri households are already cost-burdened. By discouraging energy-efficient construction while energy costs continue to rise, HB 2384 would worsen housing insecurity rather than alleviate it.

**HB 2384 raises several additional concerns:**

**Single-stair provisions for multifamily buildings up to six stories introduce significant life-safety risks and remove proven fire and egress protections.**

**Automatic approval of development applications after 30 days undermines thorough review processes intended to ensure safety, quality, and compliance.**

**The bill's language is vague and undefined, leaving uncertainty around what constitutes a "threat to affordability" and opening the door to legal disputes and inconsistent enforcement.**

**The bill provides no mechanism for oversight or updates over time, despite the evolving nature of construction standards, technology, and safety research.**

#### **Economic and Workforce Impacts**

**Construction represents 5.6% of Missouri's private-sector employment, supporting more than 126,000 workers statewide. Energy code adoption and enforcement help drive demand for skilled labor, particularly in energy efficiency and clean energy sectors. Approximately 70% of Missouri's clean energy jobs are tied to energy efficiency. HB 2384 would slow this growth and reduce job opportunities across the state.**

#### **Preserving Local Control**

**Missouri is a home rule state with no statewide building or energy code. Local governments adopt codes that reflect the needs, priorities, and values of their communities. Approximately 78% of Missourians live in jurisdictions with adopted codes that would be directly impacted by this legislation. HB 2384 would override local decision-making and eliminate community-chosen protections without providing a viable alternative.**

#### **Conclusion**

**HB 2384 is a well-intentioned but fundamentally flawed proposal. It raises long-term housing costs, weakens safety standards, harms the construction workforce, and erodes local control—all while failing to deliver true affordability.**

**For these reasons, I respectfully urge the House Commerce Committee to oppose HB 2384 and vote no on this legislation.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Emily Whitty**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ERIK BIGGS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 12:47 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I submit this written testimony to express concerns regarding the impacts of HB 2384 on local governance, economic competitiveness, Missouri businesses, and the health and financial well-being of residents.

Missouri does not currently have a statewide building or energy code. Historically, the authority to adopt building and energy standards has been delegated to local jurisdictions, allowing communities to respond to their specific economic, environmental, and housing needs. More than 80 local jurisdictions throughout Missouri—including both large and small cities—have exercised this authority by adopting energy codes that exceed the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC). These communities include the City of St. Louis and St. Louis County.

This legislation would override those locally adopted standards and restrict future updates, effectively removing local decision-making authority in an area where municipalities have demonstrated leadership and accountability. Such preemption represents a significant and unnecessary expansion of state authority that disregards local expertise and investment already made by these communities.

Adopting or reverting to significantly outdated energy codes would place Missouri at a competitive disadvantage. The most recent edition of the International Energy Conservation Code was published in 2024 and is currently available for adoption. Multiple states comparable to Missouri—including Nebraska, Louisiana, and Texas—have adopted at least the 2015 IECC as a statewide baseline, while Illinois requires compliance with the 2021 IECC.

Maintaining codes that are more than a decade behind current standards limits Missouri’s ability to compete for economic development, talent recruitment, and modern construction investment. Businesses increasingly expect buildings to meet contemporary energy performance standards, and outdated codes signal a lack of commitment to modernization and long-term efficiency.

This legislation would have direct negative consequences for Missouri-based companies and their employees. Manufacturers and suppliers of high-quality construction materials—including high-performance windows, insulation, building enclosure systems, roofing products, and air-sealing technologies—would experience reduced demand for their products. Furthermore, local design and construction professionals—such as architects, engineers, energy consultants, and heating and cooling contractors—would face decreased opportunities for work related to high-performance and energy-efficient buildings. These are skilled, well-paying jobs that are rooted in local economies and cannot be outsourced. Suppressing demand for energy efficiency services harms Missouri’s workforce and undermines innovation in the building sector.



**Outdated energy codes also directly affect household expenses and public health. Modern energy codes, including the 2021 and 2024 IECC, improve insulation, air sealing, and mechanical system performance. These measures reduce energy consumption, resulting in average monthly utility savings of approximately \$40 to \$50 for homeowners. Over the life of a typical 30-year mortgage, this equates to roughly \$15,000 in savings per household—funds that remain in Missouri’s economy. Beyond financial savings, these same efficiency measures improve indoor air quality by reducing moisture intrusion, mold growth, and airborne pollutants. Improved indoor environments are associated with lower rates of asthma and respiratory illness, reducing health care costs and improving quality of life for Missouri residents.**

**In summary, this legislation undermines local control, places Missouri behind peer states, harms in-state businesses and workers, increases long-term energy costs, and negatively impacts public health. Local jurisdictions should retain the authority to adopt modern, cost-effective energy codes that reflect their communities’ needs and support long-term economic and public benefits. For these reasons, I respectfully urge this committee to oppose this bill or amend it to preserve local decision-making authority and allow Missouri to remain competitive, economically resilient, and responsive to the needs of its residents.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>FRANK S ZILM</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 6:58 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

Three reasons for opposition include home rule override, the impact on the affordability of new housing, and the inability to establish common regional codes. I plan to testify in person with details regarding each of these items.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>GABRIEL MUNNICH</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 7:56 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I am a Missouri-based architect working on residential housing projects. I am writing to express concern about legislation that limits local governments' ability to adopt energy-performance standards beyond the 2009 IECC.

Lower-performance construction may reduce initial cost, but it produces housing that degrades faster, requires more maintenance, and is more expensive to own over time. These costs are not borne by builders; they are borne by homeowners, renters, insurers, and ultimately municipalities.

When envelope performance is reduced, buildings experience greater temperature swings, air leakage, and moisture cycling. This increases the risk of condensation, mold growth, material degradation, and premature failure of framing, sheathing, and finishes. These issues directly affect occupant health and significantly shorten the service life of buildings.

From a housing-quality and long-term affordability standpoint, durability matters more than first cost. Preventing cities from adopting updated codes locks Missouri into a housing stock that is less resilient, less healthy, and more costly to maintain over its lifetime.

I respectfully urge the committee to reconsider legislation that restricts local energy codes, as lower performance standards undermine building quality and long-term housing value.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>GEOFF CROWLEY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:41 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

As a design professional, I want to ask the committee to please not pass this bill out of committee. This bill is not about improving the affordability of Housing for Missourians. This bill will clearly cost more money to Missourians and push more money out of state. SB4 was duly agreed and passed, and our utility rates are going up. Removing insulation from construction will just cost Missourians more to heat and cool their homes. The NHBA says that insulation is 1% of a home's value, while Countertops are 4.5%. So let's eliminate insulation and put in more granite. The average profit per unit has increased by 1.5% over a two-year period. This money is going straight into the home builder's pockets, not making the home more affordable, but making it more expensive to operate. These home builders are building massive developments with many spec homes, and buyers will have no way of knowing what their utility bills will cost until it is too late. Do not let this happen to us, Missourians. Use the home rule and let the LAH do their jobs. If they do not like the 2021 IECC, then ban that, but going back 16 years is an absurd request. Let the home builders deal with this locally in Kansas City, and do not make the rest of the state suffer.

A single stair for 5 stories is crazy. We are not building 1900 tenements in Missouri. Why is this even being considered? If a fire breaks out in that stairwell, who will step forward to take responsibility?

Missouri has one of the fastest average permit processes in the country. This portion has clearly been written by somebody who knows nothing about the process. To lump a shed in the backyard into a new KC football stadium-sized project for one-size-fits-all thinking is poor thinking. It is not possible for a plan reviewer to digest and coordinate a project over \$100,000,000.00 in thirty calendar days. One of the biggest issues in areas with longer timeframes is the shortage of people who want to work for the government and become plan reviewers. Work on encouraging people to join the profession rather than punishing the profession and our built environment.

This bill is poorly written (probably intentional) and should not be getting any consideration in Missouri. If you are for Missourians, you would stop this senseless bill in Committee. Taking money from Missourians to give more to developers while buying more energy from out of state. It is irrelevant that the chair is the sponsor. Even the chair shouldn't let this leave the committee.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>GEORGE PHELPS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>703-321-6813</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>KNAUF</b>		TITLE: <b>PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>ONE KNAUF DRIVE</b>			
CITY: <b>SHELBYVILLE</b>		STATE: <b>IN</b>	ZIP: <b>27520</b>
EMAIL: <b>george.phelps@knauf.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 9:43 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**OPPOSE Missouri Bill 2347 which will result in higher utility bills for home buyers and homeowners. Improved energy codes will help offset the demand for energy and help restrain increases in utility bills.**

**While Missouri produces some energy, it uses far more than it generates, relying heavily on imported coal and other fuels, and is looking at large capacity shortfalls projected by Midcontinent Independent System Operator MISO.**

**Key Indicators of a Deficit:**

- **MISO Capacity Auctions:** Recent auctions for the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) showed maximum prices in Missouri, signaling a need for more power generation capacity.
- **High Consumption:** Missouri uses eight times more energy than it produces and ranks high in per capita energy use, creating a large demand gap.
- **Aging Plants & Imports:** The state burns significant amounts of coal (mostly imported from Wyoming) but faces challenges with aging plants and limited local resources, driving the need for imports.
- **Future Projections:** The Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) projects a 4.7 gigawatt shortfall by 2028, highlighting future reliability risks.

**Context & Contributing Factors:**

- **Coal Plant Closures:** The planned shutdown of coal-fired plants is a major factor in the projected capacity shortfall.
- **Transmission Limitations:** Limited transmission capacity adds to the challenge of balancing supply and demand.
- **Growing Demand:** Increasing energy demands, including from new industrial users, strain the existing system.

**In Summary: While Missouri has energy resources like coal, wind, and ethanol, its consumption far outstrips local production, leading to a structural deficit that is expected to worsen without significant new generation, making the state vulnerable to supply issues and price volatility.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>GILLIAN GARLAND</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 9:25 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I'm writing to respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2384.

This legislation would override local control and prohibit Missouri communities from adopting updated and modern energy codes — even when those updates are necessary to reflect local housing markets, climate conditions, and energy infrastructure.

Codes ensure that our buildings meet bare minimum requirements. And new code versions come out every year. Energy codes play a vital role in helping homeowners and renters reduce their monthly utility bills. By restricting Missouri to outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, HB 2384 would increase long-term energy costs for residents, especially first-time and low-income buyers.

Additionally, the bill would lead to increased strain on Missouri's electrical grid. We are already experiencing unprecedented increases in energy bills. New homes built under outdated energy codes consume more energy, requiring future infrastructure upgrades that will continue to drive up rates for everyone — not just those in new construction.

Finally, Missouri's current system already ensures public input, transparency, and thoughtful local adoption of energy codes. HB 2384 would undermine that process and impose a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to account for the diverse needs of communities across our state.

Please vote no on HB 2384 to protect local decision-making, energy affordability, and smart growth in Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>GRANT STAHL</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>630-418-3751</b>
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>HUNTER PANELS, A DIVISION OF CARLISLE CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS</b>		TITLE: <b>NATIONAL SALES MANAGER</b>
ADDRESS: <b>101 ARMOR DR</b>		
CITY: <b>SIKESTON</b>	STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63801</b>
EMAIL: <b>grant.stahl@hpanels.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 8:45 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

- **Modern energy codes are an important policy tool that enables building owners to manage costs in an environment of rising energy and electricity prices. Reducing energy waste also helps states like Missouri to effectively manage the grid as demand surges with investments in domestic manufacturing and data centers.**
- **For commercial and industrial buildings, the latest energy codes offer immediate benefits. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, compliance with the 2021 IECC (or ASHRAE 90.1-2019) as compared to the 2009 IECC actually reduces the cost of construction due to efficiency measures such as better building envelopes that reduce the need for larger HVAC systems.**
- **On average for all building types in the State, the 2021 IECC generates life cycle cost savings ranging from \$3.50-4.00 per square foot. This is in addition to the lower first costs of construction when compared to the 2009 IECC.**
- **Energy codes also drive many non-energy benefits. Energy-efficient buildings are more comfortable to work and live in. Better building envelopes lower the risk for premature failure due to reduced air and moisture infiltration.**
- **Additionally, energy codes drive the energy efficient economy. In 2025, more than 42,000 workers in Missouri were employed in the energy efficiency sector, ranging from construction to the manufacture of products and technologies that reduce energy waste in buildings.**
- **HB 23484 places an unnecessary restriction on the authority of local jurisdictions to adopt modern energy codes. Any policy that limits adoption of energy codes for commercial and industrial buildings to the 2009 IECC is a bad policy for Missouri and will increase costs for Missouri businesses.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>HEATH PERKINS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:21 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I am speaking on behalf of myself. HB2384 goes against home rule for local jurisdictions, by forcing municipalities to adopt archaic building code standards. Why would anybody look at a building code that is five code cycles behind and call it satisfactory?

Lets dive into this proposal and show that even if you should adopt it you can't.

Line 25-26 "To implement green or otherwise excessive building design and construction practices"  
 This section would be read to not just regulate it to energy efficiency. Many people would say structural, electrical, plumbing and electrical issues that were added to the code after 2009 no longer apply as well.

Line 28-29: "condominiums, or multiunit townhouses, multiunit apartment buildings, or commercial or industrial buildings including, but not limited to"

This section is trying to apply this bill to IRC and IBC projects, which would be fine except for what occurs on line 34 and 35

"(e) Standards or features exceeding standards or features defined in the 2009 International Residential Code (IRC)"

By the wording of this section a municipality would no longer be able to adopt anything that exceeds the 2009 IRC. That means they wouldn't be able to adopt the IBC for commercial projects. So hospitals, apartment buildings, office buildings, etc. would either no longer be able to be built, because the IRC doesn't allow for them, or they could be built without any codes or oversight?

If everything above is just about trying to regulate energy conservation and not actual life safety issues, then please re-write them to be specific. Using the word "Excessive" and then defining it to mean anything exceeding the 2009 IRC is misleading and will be used to reduce life safety.

Now for section 5, starting at line 40. This proposal conflicts with the previous comments about how you can't be more restrictive than the 2009 IRC since it only applies to apartment buildings. This code proposal has been shot down multiple times around the country and by the International Code Council. In 2024 it was voted down by the committee 11 to 0. It just doesn't work. The 2027 IBC will have a single stair exit method that allows 4 stores with one stair, that has been through the full vetting process of building officials and fire code officials and has been deemed safe enough to amend the code for. The areas of the country that have adopted this code proposed in this bill have a fire department response time of less than 3 minutes. There is hardly any municipality in this state that would have that turn around time.

On December 29th an apartment fire in the 1700 block of Kansas Avenue in Kansas city Missouri 5 people had to be saved from the third story using portable ladders because the stair was not available



due to the fire burning into the stair. Those people would have died if this had been a 4 story building. The portable ladders that fire departments use are only good for 3 stories. Trying to use a portable ladder taller than that is not feasible. Trying to use a ladder truck to evacuate a building like this would have taken 15 to 20 minutes to set up just to get the ladder to one of the bedroom windows, and that is after then 7 to 12 minutes to get to the site.

Modification to 67.486 starting on line 1/60 page 3 of the proposed bill is trying to limit the review time for plans to 30 calendar days and if said review is not done in time it shall be deemed approved.

First in November 2025 there were only 17 working days, so in reality that is the most time a jurisdiction would have had to review a set of plans, that may have been for a 25 story building. That is a severe misjustice for the citizens of this state who would be occupying a building that may not be safe.

Second engineers are not infallible, if they were we wouldn't have had the Hyatt disaster, which is one of the worst engineering disasters in the world due to loss of life. That was caused by a lack of oversight on a change in construction design by the registered engineer.

Third insurance rates will greatly rise if you say sealed plans have to be approved without oversight. I also wanted to state that engineers are not actually taught the building code, mechanical engineers are not the mechanical code and so on and so forth. Engineers also don't typically know how wide stairs are supposed to be, rise and run on stairs, smoke detector placement in a house, egress windows size and so on and so forth.

There isn't any part of this bill that promotes the safety of the citizens of this great state. If you want to remove energy efficiency, then provide a proposal that does that. This bill is a bunch of smashed together pieces that when looked at in its entirety just says let us build what we want no matter how much it hurts the citizens.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JAMES E MEGERSON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>913-226-7077</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>DESIGN MECHANICAL</b>		TITLE: <b>VICE PRESIDENT</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>100 GREYSTONE AVE</b>			
CITY: <b>KANSAS CITY</b>		STATE: <b>KS</b>	ZIP: <b>66216</b>
EMAIL: <b>jmegerson@dmi-kc.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 11:38 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Members of the Missouri General Assembly,

I am writing to express my opposition to House Bill 2384 from the perspective of a practicing engineer and mechanical contractor working directly with Missouri’s building industry.

While I recognize and support the goal of improving housing affordability and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens, HB 2384 would, in practice, undermine building quality, safety, and long-term cost effectiveness by restricting reasonable local standards and accelerating approvals in ways that increase risk for owners, occupants, and contractors alike.

Local governments adopt building and performance standards for valid technical reasons—such as regional climate conditions, infrastructure limitations, fire safety, energy efficiency, and resilience. These standards are often developed with direct input from engineers, inspectors, and contractors who understand local conditions. HB 2384’s broad preemption of local authority would eliminate this flexibility and impose a one-size-fits-all framework that does not reflect real-world construction challenges across Missouri.

Of particular concern is the bill’s use of an undefined “affordability” threshold to invalidate local requirements. Without clear technical criteria, this language introduces regulatory uncertainty and increases the likelihood of disputes, delays, and inconsistent enforcement. As professionals who rely on predictable codes and standards, engineers and contractors need clarity—not ambiguity—when designing and installing building systems.

Additionally, the bill’s provision allowing automatic approval of permits if local authorities do not act within a short timeframe creates unnecessary risk. Thorough plan review is essential to ensure mechanical, plumbing, and life-safety systems are properly designed and code-compliant. Rushed or deemed approvals shift liability downstream to contractors and design professionals and increase the likelihood of costly errors, rework, or safety failures.

Most importantly, weakening performance and efficiency standards in the name of short-term affordability often results in **\*\*higher long-term costs\*\*** for building owners and occupants through increased energy use, maintenance, and premature system failures. Good engineering and thoughtful regulation are not obstacles to affordability—they are tools that protect it over the life of a building.

**For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2384 or significantly revise it to preserve local authority, maintain clear and enforceable standards, and ensure that public safety and long-term building performance are not sacrificed for speed or short-term cost considerations.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration of the technical and professional concerns raised by those of us who design, build, and maintain Missouri's buildings every day.**

**Respectfully,**

**James E Megerson, PE  
Vice President, Design Mechanical**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JAMES OWEN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>RENEW MISSOURI</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY: <b>COLUMBIA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65203</b>
EMAIL: <b>james@renewmo.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:38 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

To Chairman Casteel and Members of the Committee,  
 Renew Missouri, a 501(c)(3) organized to promote clean energy policy for all Missourians, wishes to express its concerns with House Bill 2384 in its current form. While the sponsor argues this is needed to make housing more affordable, Renew Missouri would argue that – by allowing houses to be built without energy efficiency in – mind this will cost homeowners in the long run.

Let’s be clear with the intention of this legislation. By wiping out a municipality’s abilities to set energy codes at standards they see fit, HB 2384 is a license to build inefficient dwellings that are drafty and unsafe. If affordable housing is the goal of this state, allowing legislation requiring residents to use more electricity over time is only going to add to the burden of the average household budget. While the Public Service Commission slashes utilities’ energy efficiency programs and the federal government guts assistance to low-income customers, relief is going to be hard to obtain. Research shows Missouri’s utility bills have gone up 100% since 1979 and because of last year’s Senate Bill 4 they will only go up from here. This legislation would only serve to make matters worse and housing less sustainable economically over time.

It should be noted the Missouri Legislature has declared energy efficiency to be “the public policy of the state” in other statutes, specifically Section 355.666 RSMo. That’s because energy efficiency not only leads to more manageable electric bills but also leads to healthier homes and less stress on the grid. As health care costs and energy demand rises, efficiency must remain at the forefront of any decision made by this body. HB 2384 is a step backwards from the policy already put into law.

As mentioned earlier, utility regulators have taken their knives to utility-proposed programs designed to reduce strain on our electricity grid and to save customers money on much-needed programs and appliances. Federal programs such as LIHEAP and Weatherization – with broad bi-partisan support – are being zeroed out. Ratepayers have limited options on controlling their utility bills in Missouri and need energy efficient homes in order to have some say in what their costs will be. While ratepayers are finding closed doors everywhere else, local governments are the only option we have to keep costs down.

With that, Renew Missouri urges you to vote against HB 2384 because its proposals are contrary to existing law and makes housing more unaffordable as time goes on. As utilities are allowed to raise rates higher and higher, this legislation deprives Missourians of basic relief from prohibitive costs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JAMES R TURNER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 9:52 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**I oppose HB 2384**

**Well-informed professionals established a model building code which sets cost-effective standards for building that would protect occupants from unnecessary excesses of fuel and electricity consumption during the entire life of the building. There is ample evidence that this does not excessively burden the financing of housing that is adequate for the comfort of residents. While proponents of this bill often claim green codes increase upfront costs, the reality is that lower utility bills month after month make homes more affordable over the life of the building, especially for low-income households who are hit hardest by high energy costs. (And in an era of tariffs, many incomes are lowering.)**

**Now that we see nationwide pressure to build data centers and artificial intelligence that greatly increase demand for electricity, it is more important than ever to take reasonable steps to avoid unnecessarily excessive utility bills. If legislators genuinely care for the economic well-being of Missourians, they should defeat HB 2384.**

**Local governments are close to the needs of their people and are best positioned to establish building codes, and state government should not pre-empt them.**

**Environmental sustainability and housing affordability are not opposites. Energy-efficient, well-designed housing is healthier, cheaper to operate, and better for Missouri's air and water. Blocking green building codes undermines both environmental responsibility and long-term affordability.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JASON HAINLINE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 5:46 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Missouri House Bill 2384 would prohibit local governments from adopting any building standards beyond those established in the 2009 International Residential Code and 2009 International Energy Conservation Code. This represents a catastrophic step backward for Missouri, locking our state into 16-year-old energy efficiency standards while our residents face rising utility costs and our communities grapple with the economic and environmental challenges of the 21st century. This legislation must be rejected.

**Outdated Standards Cost Missourians Money Every Month**

The 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) that HB 2384 mandates as Missouri's ceiling represents building science from an era before smartphones were ubiquitous. In the 16 years since, energy codes have evolved dramatically based on extensive research, field testing, and technological advancement. Buildings constructed to modern energy codes use 30-40% less energy than those built to 2009 standards.

For a typical Missouri homeowner, this translates to hundreds of dollars in unnecessary utility costs every year. Over a 30-year mortgage, a home built to outdated 2009 standards rather than current codes could cost a family \$15,000 to \$25,000 more in energy bills. By prohibiting communities from adopting modern efficiency standards, HB 2384 doesn't make housing more affordable—it makes it more expensive to live in.

Commercial buildings face even steeper penalties. Businesses operating in buildings constructed to 2009 standards pay significantly higher utility costs than competitors in states with modern codes. These higher operating costs make Missouri less competitive for business recruitment and expansion, directly harming our state's economic development efforts.

**The Myth of Construction Cost Savings**

Proponents of HB 2384 claim that prohibiting modern energy standards will reduce construction costs and improve housing affordability. This argument is fundamentally flawed for several reasons.

First, the incremental construction costs of meeting modern energy codes are relatively modest—typically 1-3% of total construction costs for residential buildings. These costs are quickly recovered through reduced utility bills, often within just a few years. Preventing communities from requiring these standards doesn't create long-term affordability; it creates long-term financial burden for residents.

Second, energy-efficient construction techniques have become increasingly cost-effective as the industry has adopted them. Many improvements that were considered expensive in 2009—such as improved insulation, high-efficiency HVAC systems, and better windows—are now standard practice with minimal cost premium. By freezing codes at 2009 levels, Missouri actually prevents the construction industry from capturing these efficiencies.

Third, modern energy codes reduce the size and cost of HVAC equipment needed to heat and cool buildings effectively. Better insulation and air sealing mean smaller, less expensive heating and cooling systems can maintain comfort, often offsetting the cost of efficiency improvements in the building envelope.

The real affordability crisis in housing stems from land costs, labor shortages, and financing—not from modern energy efficiency standards that save residents money from day one.

#### **Environmental and Climate Impacts**

Buildings account for approximately 40% of total energy consumption in the United States. Outdated building codes mean unnecessary energy waste, higher greenhouse gas emissions, and increased air pollution. While HB 2384 dismisses environmental concerns by characterizing sustainable building practices as "excessive," the reality is that building efficiency is one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce emissions while simultaneously saving money for building occupants.

Missouri is already experiencing the impacts of climate change: more frequent severe weather events, increased flooding, higher temperatures, and stressed agricultural systems. Modern building codes help mitigate these impacts by reducing energy demand and incorporating resilience features that protect buildings and occupants from extreme weather.

By prohibiting "environmentally responsive standards or features," HB 2384 prevents Missouri communities from addressing climate change at the local level, even when residents and local elected officials want to take action. This is both environmentally irresponsible and an affront to local democratic governance.

#### **Missouri's Competitive Disadvantage**

As other states continue updating their energy codes, HB 2384 would create a growing gap between Missouri's building standards and those of our competitors. This has serious economic consequences. Major employers increasingly prioritize sustainability in their real estate decisions. Companies with corporate sustainability goals may avoid locating facilities in Missouri if they cannot build to their preferred efficiency standards. Economic development officials across the state regularly hear from prospects about building performance and energy costs. HB 2384 would handicap these recruitment efforts.

The residential market is similarly affected. Homebuyers increasingly value energy efficiency, both for environmental reasons and for long-term cost savings. A prohibition on modern efficiency standards makes Missouri homes less attractive and potentially less valuable compared to homes in states with current codes. This could depress property values and make it harder for Missouri families to build wealth through homeownership.

Missouri's construction industry also suffers when the state falls behind national standards.

Contractors and builders who work regionally must understand and implement modern energy codes in other states but are prevented from applying that expertise in Missouri. This creates inefficiencies, limits professional development, and may make it harder to attract skilled construction workers to Missouri projects.

#### **Innovation Stifled, Progress Halted**

Building science continues to advance. New materials, construction techniques, and technologies emerge regularly that improve building performance while reducing costs. Modern energy codes provide a pathway for these innovations to be adopted responsibly and effectively.

By freezing standards at 2009 levels, HB 2384 removes any incentive for Missouri's construction industry to innovate or adopt new energy-saving technologies. Manufacturers of efficient building products may stop marketing in Missouri. Contractors lose opportunities to develop expertise in advanced building techniques. The entire state's construction sector becomes increasingly backward-looking and disconnected from national trends.

This stagnation extends beyond energy efficiency. Building codes are regularly updated to incorporate lessons learned from building failures, new understanding of structural performance, and improved fire safety measures. While HB 2384 specifically targets energy and sustainability standards, its freezing of codes at 2009 levels prevents communities from adopting any improvements in the International Residential Code developed over the past 16 years.

#### **Stripping Local Authority on Energy and Environment**

Perhaps most troubling is HB 2384's prohibition on local decision-making regarding energy efficiency and environmental standards. The bill explicitly prevents counties and municipalities from adopting:

Sustainable building standards or features

High-performance standards or features

Energy efficiency standards or features

Environmentally responsive standards or features

This represents an extraordinary state overreach into local governance. Communities across Missouri

have different priorities, resources, and circumstances. Some communities may prioritize energy efficiency to reduce utility costs for low-income residents. Others may focus on sustainability as an economic development tool or environmental stewardship. College towns, tourist destinations, and communities with strong environmental values may want to lead on climate action.

HB 2384 tells all these communities that their local priorities don't matter and that their elected officials cannot respond to constituent demands for action on energy costs or environmental protection. This is fundamentally undemocratic and contrary to Missouri's tradition of local control.

#### **Economic Impact: False Savings, Real Costs**

The economic analysis supporting HB 2384 appears to focus solely on upfront construction costs while ignoring the far larger long-term costs imposed on building occupants and the broader economy. Missouri residents will pay billions of dollars in excess utility costs over the coming decades if communities cannot adopt modern energy codes. These are dollars that could have been spent in the local economy, saved for retirement, or invested in education and other family priorities. Instead, they'll flow to utility companies to pay for unnecessary energy consumption.

Missouri businesses will face higher operating costs, making them less competitive. The state's economic development efforts will be hampered. Property values may suffer. And Missouri's construction industry will fall behind national standards, potentially losing workers and firms to states that embrace modern building practices.

The bill's supporters may point to short-term construction cost savings, but these pale in comparison to the long-term economic damage caused by energy waste, lost competitiveness, and reduced property values.

#### **Conclusion**

House Bill 2384's prohibition on modern energy efficiency and sustainability standards is economically destructive, environmentally irresponsible, and an affront to local democratic governance. By freezing Missouri's building codes at 2009 levels, this legislation condemns Missouri residents to decades of unnecessarily high utility bills, makes our state less competitive for economic development, and prevents communities from addressing climate change and environmental concerns according to local values and priorities.

The bill's premise—that modern energy efficiency standards are "excessive" and "threaten affordability"—is demonstrably false. Energy-efficient buildings save money, reduce environmental impact, and improve quality of life. The real threat to affordability comes from utility bills that are hundreds of dollars higher every year because buildings waste energy.

We urge the Missouri General Assembly to reject HB 2384 and instead work with local governments, the construction industry, and efficiency advocates to ensure that Missouri's building standards serve the long-term interests of Missouri residents and businesses. Our state should be moving forward on energy efficiency and sustainability, not backward to 2009.

The people of Missouri deserve buildings that are affordable to live and work in over the long term, not just cheap to construct. They deserve the right to shape their communities' energy and environmental future through their elected local officials. And they deserve a state government that doesn't lock them into 16-year-old standards while the rest of the nation moves forward.

House Bill 2384 fails on all counts and must be defeated!





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JENNIFER GUNBY</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>913-488-9094</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>U.S. GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, STATE &amp; LOCAL ADVOCACY</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>2101 L STREET NW</b>			
CITY: <b>WASHINGTON</b>		STATE: <b>DC</b>	ZIP: <b>20037</b>
EMAIL: <b>jgunby@usgbc.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 10:23 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**HB 2384 is a threat to the affordability of homes and businesses across Missouri and should not be supported by the House Commerce Committee.**

**Decisions about building codes and property owner rights are best made by local governments. Local jurisdictions are well positioned to respond to their communities' specific needs, including climate conditions, housing markets, and economic development goals. Rather than restricting local authority, the state should empower jurisdictions across Missouri to adopt the latest model codes more quickly by providing guidance on implementation and training on enforcement—both of which are critical to successful outcomes.**

**Allowing local governments to regularly update building codes is highly cost-effective. Modern codes deliver substantial long-term benefits, including lower utility bills, improved home comfort, better indoor air quality, and increased resilience to extreme weather. Studies consistently show strong returns on investment, with approximately \$11 saved for every \$1 spent.**

**If the state of Missouri chooses to intervene in the local code adoption process, it should do so by establishing a reasonable statewide floor—not a ceiling—such as requiring jurisdictions to adopt one of the two most recent national model codes. This approach would promote consistency while preserving local flexibility and protecting affordability for Missourians.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>JENNIFER REBECCA WHITTY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 7:46 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to HB 2384. I respectfully urge the committee to vote against this bill.

Why is Missouri insisting on these regressive changes? Just discuss these proposed changes with any architect and they will tell you...

"HB 2384 is a well-intentioned but fundamentally flawed proposal. It raises long-term housing costs, weakens safety standards, harms the construction workforce, and erodes local control—all while failing to deliver true affordability.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the House Commerce Committee to oppose HB 2384 and vote no on this legislation."

Thank you,  
Jenny Whitty  
Kansas City, MO



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JILL MAGRUDER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 8:19 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I'm writing to respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2384.

This legislation would override local control and prohibit Missouri communities from adopting updated and modern energy codes — even when those updates are necessary to reflect local housing markets, climate conditions, and energy infrastructure.

Codes ensure that our buildings meet bare minimum requirements. And new code versions come out every year. Energy codes play a vital role in helping homeowners and renters reduce their monthly utility bills. By restricting Missouri to outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, HB 2384 would increase long-term energy costs for residents, especially first-time and low-income buyers.

Additionally, the bill would lead to increased strain on Missouri's electrical grid. We are already experiencing unprecedented increases in energy bills. New homes built under outdated energy codes consume more energy, requiring future infrastructure upgrades that will continue to drive up rates for everyone — not just those in new construction.

Finally, Missouri's current system already ensures public input, transparency, and thoughtful local adoption of energy codes. HB 2384 would undermine that process and impose a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to account for the diverse needs of communities across our state.

Please vote no on HB 2384 to protect local decision-making, energy affordability, and smart growth in Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JOHN LOUIS COX</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 8:06 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I am a practicing architectural designer and I have seen firsthand how builders will cut corners at the cost of their future clients. The structure of this bill would impact the citizens of our state, producing housing that is less resilient to the constantly changing weather of Missouri, and a larger burden on our increasingly stressed energy grids. This bill lowers the bar only for home builders, who would happily build as cheaply as possible, and pass off the burden of a poorly built house to consumers. The citizens of Missouri deserve a higher standard of housing, and forcing the regions that have recognized that higher standard to ignore what is best for our citizens will have terrible ramifications on the housing stock within our state. If you support this bill you are standing with the worst of developers, rather than asking more of them, at the cost of every current and future resident of Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JOHN MADRAS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:38 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**This bill is not productive and**

**This bill trades short-term economic return for developers by shorting the future owners and residents of quality construction, risk reduction and long-term savings. It also removes local control from entities that foster building techniques that benefit their communities for many years to come. Even business-minded cities like Jefferson City where I build houses has adopted more efficient and worthwhile standards than the old 2009 version. Other cities have adopted more advanced versions. The standards are revised every three years and our local city uses a mix of the 2018 and 2012. Besides energy efficiency, the newer standards also protect against fire and other hazards, which also add cost and so may be voided by this bill. Some cities like Kirkwood, Columbia and Springfield are involved with local energy utilities, and their choices of building codes allow them to provide more comprehensive management of how city governments can serve their populations. Tying their hands with antiquated codes is costly and not productive for their people. From a personal perspective, had one of my houses met the current code, it would have saved me \$500 when I added solar panels. A small extra expense during construction can result in much larger saving later on. The houses I build exceed the energy efficiency standards of the codes presently required without significant additional cost, and the residents will benefit from lower energy bills for the next century. My house with solar panels will break even on the panel costs at 10 years and have essentially free electric for at least the following 15 years when their warranty runs out. Please let more people share opportunities like that. Thank you.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JOSE L REYNA</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>616-458-6733</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>ALLIANCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY DBA GREENHOME INSTITUTE</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>1451 LAKE DR SE, P.O. BOX 6484 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49516</b>			
CITY: <b>GRAND RAPIDS</b>		STATE: <b>MI</b>	ZIP: <b>49516</b>
EMAIL: <b>jose.reyna@greenhomeinstitute.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 12:08 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

On behalf of the Alliance for Environmental Sustainability DBA GreenHome Institute, I am submitting my opposition to the proposed inclusion of language that restricts the establishment of any regulations by local governments regarding green or sustainable construction practices.

The basic premises of the restriction is an infringement of the right for local governments and communities to establish and maintain their respective control. This prohibition is an overstep on the part of state government, if there is philosophy that local governments should maintain local control.

Secondly, the adoption of green or sustainable construction practices has demonstrated an increased level of health of the residents, an improvement and preservation of our natural environment, and a positive economic value. The suggestion that green or sustainable practices compromises affordability is a false narrative when the results evidence increased housing values and resale potential.

The Alliance for Environmental Sustainability adamantly opposes the proposed legislative change and encourages that the state adopt a standard of green and sustainable construction methods for all future construction for the preservation of health of building occupants, the preservation of the environment, and for increased economic benefit.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JOSHUA KLARICH</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-478-9298</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>SHEET METAL AIR CONDITIONING CONTRACTORS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION ST LOUIS</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>7078 BANCROFT AVE</b>			
CITY: <b>ST LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63109</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JUSTIN KOSCHER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>703-224-2289</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>POLYISOCYANURATE INSULATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION</b>		TITLE: <b>PRESIDENT</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>3101 WILSON BLVD.</b>			
CITY: <b>ARLINGTON</b>		STATE: <b>VA</b>	ZIP: <b>29466</b>
EMAIL: <b>jkoscher@pima.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/19/2026 10:57 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

The Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA) is opposed to HB 2384 and the proposed restriction on local adoption of building energy codes. Limiting the adoption of buildings standards to the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) for all building types would harm Missouri residents, businesses, and the State's ability to effectively manage growing energy demand and rising energy prices.

PIMA is opposed to HB 2384's proposed limitation on building energy codes for all building types in its entirety; however, the restriction is especially problematic for commercial and industrial buildings. According to a cost effectiveness analysis from the U.S. Department of Energy, building to the ASHRAE 90.1-2019 Standard (equivalent to 2021 IECC) reduces the first cost of construction for commercial and industrial buildings as compared to buildings built to the 2009 IECC. This result is achieved through better performing building envelope efficiency measures that allow for the installation of smaller, more efficient heating and cooling systems among other improvements.

Not only do modern building energy codes deliver immediate benefits to commercial and industrial building owners, but the energy efficiency improvements also deliver year-over-year savings on utility bills. According to the same cost effectiveness analysis, the ASHRAE 90.1-2019 Standard delivers life cycle cost savings over 30 years of \$3.50 to \$4.00 per square foot for commercial and industrial buildings.

Therefore, there is no affordability or constructability argument that justifies the proposed energy code restriction for commercial and industrial buildings. Moreover, in an environment of rising energy demand due to investments in domestic manufacturing and data center construction, building energy efficiency provides critical flexibility to grid operators and lowers the risk of power outages. Demand management also helps building owners insulate themselves against the financial impacts of rising energy and electricity costs.

Finally, the energy efficiency sector is important to Missouri's economy. According to the 2025 U.S. Energy and Employment Report, more than 42,000 Missourians were employed in the sector working jobs ranging from design to construction to the manufacture of energy saving products. These jobs include a polyisocyanurate insulation manufacturing plant in Sikeston, Missouri, operated by PIMA member Carlisle Construction Materials.



**For the reasons stated here, we encourage members of the House Commerce Committee to oppose HB 2384 and specifically request that commercial and industrial buildings be deleted from the legislation.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>KAREN UHLENHUTH</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 9:26 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I urge committee members to stop this bill, HB 2384, aimed once again at overturning the expressed wishes of Missouri citizens. The legislature has opted not to pass a building code, but now that communities across the state have taken the initiative to adopt tighter EE requirements, developers in the state have decided to campaign to undo them.

**Outrageous.**

In my hometown of Kansas City a group of citizens and organizations worked tirelessly a few years ago to persuade the city council to adopt more-stringent EE building standards that would reduce energy costs and carbon emissions. The city council voted yes, and it is estimated that new buildings in Kansas City are costing 8.7 percent less for utilities as a result.

I don't believe it is the role of the legislature to undo laws passed by local jurisdictions. If Missouri needs a building code, let's research the matter and solicit feedback from citizens and building experts across the state before making a decision.

This process, which I believe was devised of, by and for real estate developers, is a far cry from that.

Thank you. Karen Uhlenhuth



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>KATE STOCKTON</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 11:56 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I have reservations about the proposed HB2384 in regard to the inexact language around Building Code and Energy Code verbiage. Simply referring to a construction element as "green" or "sustainable" is rather loose. Would you consider any insulation a sustainable feature? How about any type of window? It is better to stick to an International Code Council adopted guideline -- for example the International Energy Conservation Code version 2009, 2012, 2015, 2018, 2021 or 2024 -- these cover most of the current municipalities in Missouri currently. Admittedly, the most recent versions of 2021 and 2024 are more stringent and I would advise any municipality to go through them with a fine tooth comb to exempt was is not reasonable for their community/this region. However, the main cost savings in energy conservation for residential did come to fruition with the IECC 2012 for residential housing (i.e., single family homes and multi-units less than 5 units). Five units or more is considered multifamily (i.e. apartments) and follows the commercial code -- similar to office buildings, hospitals, schools, etc. The requirements on multifamily unit/apartment buildings are far less stringent than say, a hospital, but due to the potential loss of life when people are living closer together in a dense environment requires slightly higher fire safety measures, etc.

On that note, I am pleased to see that the State of Missouri is discussing the single stair issue. I know historically this has been discussed in other states -- and historic units in New York City originally allowed this requirement. I would not feel comfortable with one stair for egress in a high-rise, but the verbiage limiting the height, number of units, etc. shows that this verbiage was very well thought out. I would request one tweak -- it says either interior or exterior stair. I have concerns about exterior stairs in multifamily buildings. You see the standard is to either build them of wood or steel risers/stringers with concrete treads. I have witnessed many of these exterior stairs when exposed to the Missouri elements (rain, freeze/thaw, etc.) rust out and treads dropping out of them. The same occurs with wood...sometimes multiple adjacent treads at a time. One of my college students just last week couldn't access his 2nd floor apartment because the treads fell out. He was forced to wait until maintenance could bring a ladder so that he could go home that day. Fortunately, this wasn't a fire emergency and he was only on the 2nd floor. Imagine if this was a grease fire (of which students have a habit of making) and this was a 4 story building. I would feel much better if the stairwell were interior -- the odds of them being able to escape is much higher. And if someone the single stair was ON FIRE, then a fire ladder could reach forty feet into the air to retrieve the occupants.

In summary, please consider changing the sustainable verbiage to specify which version of the IECC legislation is willing to compromise on. My suggestion would be no older than 2012 for residential and no older than 2018 for commercial. Also, please consider adjusting the verbiage on the single stair to only allow interior stairs.

**Thank you for your consideration. Your service is much appreciated and I truly appreciate your long hours and your fortitude when addressing these complex issues. I know in my heart that Missourians will find a way to make compromise -- assisting in more affordable housing and energy conservation alike.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LAURA HOLLOWAY</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-635-9134</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>MISSOURI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>1727 SOUTHRIDGE DR.</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65109</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LAURA MUELLER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 4:57 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

Dear Members of the Missouri General Assembly,

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to Missouri House Bill 2384.

While I appreciate the stated intent of addressing affordability, the bill’s use of broad language—particularly the phrase “construction practices which threaten affordability”—raises serious concerns.

Additionally, HB 2384 does not adequately account for the rapidly changing demands on Missouri’s infrastructure, particularly the significant increase in statewide energy consumption driven by the expansion of data centers and other energy-intensive development. These trends place growing strain on electrical grids and utilities, making energy efficiency, sustainable design, and green infrastructure more important than ever. Limiting or discouraging such practices under the guise of “affordability” may result in higher long-term costs for communities and residents.

Furthermore, HB 2384 appears to diminish the ability of municipalities to make informed decisions based on local conditions. Cities and counties are best positioned to understand the specific needs, constraints, and priorities of their own communities—whether related to housing stock, infrastructure capacity, climate considerations, or economic development goals. A one-size-fits-all approach at the state level risks overriding locally informed solutions that are responsive to community needs.

Affordability should be addressed through clear, data-driven policy that balances initial construction costs with durability, operational efficiency, and environmental responsibility.

The current language of HB 2384 risks prioritizing short-term cost reduction at the expense of long-term economic resilience and local autonomy .

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose House Bill 2384 in its current form and to support approaches that preserve local decision-making while thoughtfully addressing affordability statewide.

Sincerely,



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LAURA PASTINE</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-651-7749</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>AIA MISSOURI</b>		TITLE: <b>IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>415 E. 60TH STREET</b>			
CITY: <b>KANSAS CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64110</b>
EMAIL: <b>lpastine@treanor.design</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 2:47 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

HB 2384 proposes to establish an energy code cap across the state of Missouri at the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code, which is five full code cycles behind the current 2024 code. This is overly regressive and would allow new construction to be built to standards that do not reflect today's energy costs or household financial pressures.

Housing affordability is not limited to the initial cost of construction. True affordability is the ability for a household to sustain homeownership over time, including mortgage payments, utility bills, insurance, and ongoing maintenance. Homes constructed below modern energy code minimums impose permanently higher energy costs on occupants and often require expensive retrofits simply to reach baseline performance. This shifts long-term financial burden from builders to homeowners. It's imperative to balance the short-term cost concerns of builders with the long-term financial stability of residents. Allowing construction to fall back to 2009 standards places that burden almost entirely on homeowners, who will pay higher utility costs for the life of their home.

If this legislation is intended to respond to concerns regarding adoption of the 2021 IECC in Kansas City, a more reasonable approach would be to allow Home Rule adoption of the 2018 or 2024 codes, which provide more relaxed envelope performance than 2021. These more recent codes reflect current energy markets and technologies while still offering compliance pathways that balance construction cost with long-term operating affordability.

Freezing Missouri at 2009 permanently locks residents into outdated performance and higher lifetime energy costs. That is not an affordability strategy, it's a cost shift.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LOUISE WIENCKOWSKI</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:27 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I am in opposition to HB2384 as this bill undermines local governments' ability to update their building and energy efficiency codes in response to their community needs and preferences. Freezing energy codes to outdated iterations is stepping back to a time of ignorance about how to properly seal, insulate, heat and cool a house for optimum efficiency, comfort, safety, resilience and affordability. Homes that are built to the 2021 or 2024 International Energy Efficiency Codes use far less energy to heat and cool the building, saving homeowners and renters from excessively high utility bills. This benefit provides a safety net to low income buyers who often pay more of their income for utilities than middle class buyers.

Less energy waste reduces the strain on power companies and reduces the damaging fossil fuel emissions into the atmosphere. Our environment can benefit from cleaner air, addressing the issues of catastrophic weather events.

The State should not be dictating the building and energy codes for every municipality and county in Missouri. Local governments are structured as Democratic entities that serve their residents and are receptive to the needs and wants of those residents and citizens. The State is a collection of those entities and not in charge of local issues.

Several cities and counties in Missouri have adopted the 2018, 2021 and looking at the 2024 Codes in response to better technology, improved knowledge about energy efficiency and the recommendations of International experts in the industry. Missouri should be following those recommendations and not falling back into the Dark Ages of energy waste and cheap housing.





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MARCUS BRANSTAD</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>515-471-1960</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL</b>		TITLE: <b>SR DIRECTOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>500 E COURT AVE</b>			
CITY: <b>DES MOINES</b>		STATE: <b>IA</b>	ZIP: <b>50307</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MARIA COMERFORD</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 4:23 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Members of the Missouri General Assembly,

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to Missouri House Bill 2384. While I appreciate the stated intent of addressing affordability, the bill’s use of broad language—particularly the phrase “construction practices which threaten affordability”—raises serious concerns.

Additionally, HB 2384 does not adequately account for the rapidly changing demands on Missouri’s infrastructure, particularly the significant increase in statewide energy consumption driven by the expansion of data centers and other energy-intensive development. These trends place growing strain on electrical grids and utilities, making energy efficiency, sustainable design, and green infrastructure more important than ever. Limiting or discouraging such practices under the guise of “affordability” may result in higher long-term costs for communities and residents.

Furthermore, HB 2384 appears to diminish the ability of municipalities to make informed decisions based on local conditions. Cities and counties are best positioned to understand the specific needs, constraints, and priorities of their own communities—whether related to housing stock, infrastructure capacity, climate considerations, or economic development goals. A one-size-fits-all approach at the state level risks overriding locally informed solutions that are responsive to community needs. Affordability should be addressed through clear, data-driven policy that balances initial construction costs with durability, operational efficiency, and environmental responsibility.

The current language of HB 2384 risks prioritizing short-term cost reduction at the expense of long-term economic resilience and local autonomy.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose House Bill 2384 in its current form and to support approaches that preserve local decision-making while thoughtfully addressing affordability statewide.

Sincerely,



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MARY ANN LAZARUS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 1:38 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I'm an Architect based in St. Louis who has been in practice for over 40 years writing to respectfully urge you to oppose HB 2384.

This legislation would override local control and prohibit Missouri communities from adopting updated and modern energy codes — even when those updates are necessary to reflect local housing markets, climate conditions, and energy infrastructure. Given that the State of Missouri does not have a state wide building or energy code, this bill is an overreach by the state. Over 80 local jurisdictions have adopted energy codes that are beyond the 2009 code – this includes large and small cities all over the state.

Codes ensure that our buildings meet bare minimum requirements and protect the health, safety and welfare of occupants. And new code versions come out every year. Energy codes play a vital role in helping homeowners and renters and building owners reduce their monthly utility bills. By restricting Missouri to outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, HB 2384 would increase long-term energy costs for all, especially first-time and low-income buyers.

This bill leaves Missouri behind in attracting corporate, commercial and residential business. The most recent IECC set of codes was published in 2024 and is currently available for adoption. States including Nebraska, Louisiana, and Texas have adopted at least the 2015 IECC as a statewide standard. Illinois requires that builders comply with the 2021 IECC. We cannot compete with other states with codes that are over a decade behind the most current codes.

Additionally, the bill would lead to increased strain on Missouri's electrical grid. We are already experiencing unprecedented increases in energy bills. New homes built under outdated energy codes consume more energy, requiring future infrastructure upgrades that will continue to drive up rates for everyone — not just those in new construction.

Finally, Missouri's current system already ensures public input, transparency, and thoughtful local adoption of energy codes. HB 2384 would undermine that process and impose a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to account for the diverse needs of communities across our state.

Please vote no on HB 2384 to protect local decision-making, energy affordability, and smart growth in Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>MARY C PRIMM</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 7:36 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I've lived in 2 energy efficient homes. They may possibly cost a little more up front but in the long run, these kinds of home building techniques pay for themselves and then some. The state of Missouri is diverse. The housing needs in the Ozarks (where I have lived for the last 43 years) and e.g. St Louis (where I was born and raised and lived until 1983) are very different. Local government **MUST** be able to have the last word on the housing in their community where they understand the needs of the citizens. **Affordability is NOT a State-Wide One-Size-Fits-All situation.** I could say much more on this subject but let me end with this - green building codes reduce pollution and energy waste. Energy-efficient buildings use less electricity and gas, which lowers greenhouse gas emissions and reduces strain on Missouri's power grid. Please vote **AGAINST** HB 2384.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MEAGAN GERLEMANN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 7:39 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I write in strong opposition to HB 2384. Setting a ceiling at IECC 2009 is far too regressive to meet the current efficiency required in modern construction. Homes built to 2018 energy codes save approximately 30% in energy costs. The language of this bill is vague with no definitions provided for terms used. The bill mentioned both IRC and IECC, leaving interpretation open for what can be deemed a “threat to affordability”, with the potential to affect protections to life safety, health, and welfare. Missouri is a Homerule state with no state-wide building or energy code. Local municipalities adopt their own codes for the good of their communities. HB 2384 would strip local municipalities of the codes that communities have chosen for themselves. Please vote and speak against this bill to protect the health, safety, welfare, and affordability for Missourians.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>MELISSA VATTEROTT</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI COALITION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT</b>		TITLE: <b>POLICY DIRECTOR</b>
ADDRESS: <b>725 KINGSLAND AVE STE 100</b>		
CITY: <b>UNIVERSITY CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>
		ZIP: <b>63130</b>
EMAIL: <b>mvatterott@moenvironment.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 10:56 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**HB 2384 will damage Missourians' health, environment, and economy. Up to date building codes save money, energy, and ensure buildings are resilient during disasters. Safety is not a luxury. Please see further information in attached statement and thank you for voting "no" on this bill.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MICHAEL DREYER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:57 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I urge you to reject HB2384 (Jones), a bill that strips local governments of their ability to adopt forward-thinking building codes. By prohibiting cities and counties from exceeding the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)—a model code updated every three years by industry experts—this legislation undermines local control, jeopardizes public health, and ignores the urgent need to address rising energy costs and climate resilience.

Missouri’s municipalities have long had the authority to adopt building codes that reflect their communities’ needs. Over 100 cities and counties have chosen to exceed the IECC’s minimum standards to safeguard residents from skyrocketing utility bills, extreme weather, and unsafe housing. HB 2384 dismantles this local autonomy, prioritizing short-term developer profits over the long-term well-being of families. With utilities seeking rate hikes up to 41% in 2025, energy-efficient homes are not a luxury—they are a necessity. The U.S. Department of Energy confirms that modern energy codes save homeowners \$7,000 over a home’s lifecycle, paying for themselves in under four years. For the 1 in 3 U.S. households struggling to afford utilities, these savings are the difference between stability and crisis.

Beyond financial benefits, energy-efficient homes save lives. Tight building envelopes slow the spread of fires, efficient ventilation reduces allergens, and moisture control prevents toxic mold. These standards align with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes housing as a fundamental human right. HB 2384 would trap low-income families in substandard housing with higher utility bills and health risks, deepening inequality. Claims that the bill promotes “affordability” are misleading. Cities like St. Louis, Kansas City, and Columbia—which have adopted modern codes—have seen rising construction permits and stable housing markets, disproving the myth that energy standards stifle growth. Meanwhile, states with weak codes face higher homeowner costs, lost federal funding, and stalled job creation in the clean energy sector.

HB 2384 also ignores the climate crisis. Nationally, modern energy codes are projected to save \$138 billion by 2040 and reduce carbon emissions equivalent to 227 coal plants. In a state already grappling with extreme heat and flooding, blocking climate-resilient construction is reckless. This bill sacrifices our future for a false promise of affordability, leaving Missourians with homes that cost more to maintain, endanger their health, and fail to withstand disasters.

I implore you to stand with communities, not special interests. Reject HB 2384 and protect Missourians’ right to safe, sustainable, and affordable housing.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MORGAN HARPER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 6:28 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I am asking you to vote no on House Bill 2384. Please see the following points below:

1. HB2384 is dangerous because it will allow homes, multi-family housing, and other buildings to less efficient - costing owners, renters, and business owners hundreds to thousands of dollars each year, with the potential to worsens indoor air quality over time, causing major health issues.
2. HB2384 prevents communities from adopting ordinances, resolutions, regulations, codes, or policies. In Missouri, a Home Rule state, we value local autonomy, and HB2384 doesn't - Home Rule means cities are tasked with leading in developing policies that are right for them, while being spaces for innovation that help our state thrive. This bill does not align with the long-standing policy in Missouri and principles of good governance.
3. I oppose HB2384 as a Missourian/community leader/design professional who cares about the health, safety, and well-being of my family and community. I want to see better buildings across Missouri that save us all money while ensuring we stay healthy. Decisions we make now about new buildings will shape how they impact us for decades. We need to make sure buildings are built to last and ready to protect families living in them years from now.

If passed, HB2384 will block advanced codes which means that Missouri is blocking better building technologies. We cannot block the growth of an entire industry for the benefit of only a few, who will make more money in the short term. Better building standards help create safe buildings and durable systems that have longevity. Better standards are also help create job in our communities across the entire construction lifecycle, including planning & design, manufacturing, and on-site skilled labor. This bill is a step in the wrong direction. Please vote no.





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>PATRICK MICHAEL O'BRIEN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:27 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I'm writing to strongly urge you to oppose HB 2384.

This legislation would override local control and prohibit Missouri communities from adopting updated and modern energy codes — even when those updates are necessary to reflect local housing markets, climate conditions, and energy infrastructure.

Codes ensure that our buildings meet bare minimum requirements. And new code versions come out every year. Energy codes play a vital role in helping homeowners and renters reduce their monthly utility bills. By restricting Missouri to outdated standards that are nearly 20 years old, HB 2384 would increase long-term energy costs for residents, especially first-time and low-income buyers.

Additionally, the bill would lead to increased strain on Missouri's electrical grid. We are already experiencing unprecedented increases in energy bills. New homes built under outdated energy codes consume more energy, requiring future infrastructure upgrades that will continue to drive up rates for everyone — not just those in new construction.

Finally, Missouri's current system already ensures public input, transparency, and thoughtful local adoption of energy codes. HB 2384 would undermine that process and impose a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to account for the diverse needs of communities across our state.

Please vote no on HB 2384 to protect local decision-making, energy affordability, and smart growth in Missouri.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>PAUL RICHARD</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-348-0694</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>AUGUSTA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT</b>		TITLE: <b>FIRE MARSHAL</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>5551 S HWY 94</b>			
CITY: <b>AUGUSTA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63332</b>
EMAIL: <b>prichard@augustamofire.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 1:39 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**As a local code adoption authority and code official, I am in opposition to House Bill 2384. The bill essentially mandates the use of an obsolete code edition, promotes confusing language regarding the use of fire exit stairs in multi-story structures and places unreasonable restrictions and an unnecessary timeline on permit approvals at the local level.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>RYAN OSTERMAN</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>636-475-8793</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>DUPONT PERFORMANCE BUILDING SOLUTIONS</b>		TITLE: <b>SITE LEADER, RIVERSIDE PLANT (PEVELY, MISSOURI)</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>500 DOW INDUSTRIAL DR.</b>			
CITY: <b>PEVELY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63070</b>
EMAIL: <b>ryan.r.osterman@dupont.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 4:00 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**DuPont Performance Building Solutions**

Regarding HB 2384: Rollbacks of Local Building Energy Codes

Missouri House Committee Hearing: January 21, 2026

Dear Chairman Casteel and Members of the Committee:

DuPont Performance Building Solutions appreciates the opportunity to submit comments regarding proposed legislation that would restrict Missouri communities to outdated 2009 energy codes.

We are a major employer in the state through our Riverside Styrofoam™ XPS insulation manufacturing facility in Pevely, in which we employ 80 workers. Our XPS facility supplies builders across Missouri and North America with high performance insulation products that make buildings more energy efficient, resilient, and affordable to operate.

We respectfully oppose HB 2384 due to their impacts on affordability, grid stability, consumer protection, and Missouri manufacturing competitiveness.

1. Modern energy codes reduce monthly utility bills and improve long term housing affordability. Affordability is not determined by first cost alone; it is determined by the monthly bills that Missouri families must pay. Freezing Missouri communities at the 2009 IECC would lock families into decades of unnecessary energy waste.

Missouri families are already experiencing rising energy costs: recent reporting shows that Ameren Missouri implemented a rate increase beginning in June 2025, and statewide analyses project that Missouri households could face some of the steepest utility bill increases in the nation, with long term costs rising by hundreds of dollars annually. These increases create double digit upward pressure on monthly bills, making energy efficiency one of the most critical tools for protecting Missouri families from escalating utility costs.

2. Missouri’s rising electricity demand makes energy efficiency a critical grid stability tool. Missouri is experiencing growing demand from data centers, manufacturing expansion, and general

load growth. Studies show electricity rates are rising, and utilities have already filed for increases exceeding 10 percent.

Energy efficient buildings reduce peak electricity demand and help avoid expensive new generation and transmission infrastructure that is ultimately funded by ratepayers. Limiting communities to 2009 efficiency levels would worsen grid pressure at precisely the moment Missouri needs demand reduction tools the most.

3. Rolling back codes will disadvantage Missouri businesses, manufacturers, and workers. Missouri's building economy depends on locally manufactured, high performance materials, including insulation produced at DuPont's Pevely facility. Freezing Missouri at 2009 standards slows innovation and reduces demand for the very products Missouri manufacturers produce. Modern energy codes support: Missouri manufacturing jobs, Skilled construction and insulation trades, Demand for local materials, and Long term competitiveness in commercial and industrial development.

4. Local governments need the flexibility to adopt codes that reflect real world costs and community needs. Missouri does not have a statewide energy code. Municipalities adopt modern standards when they determine the benefits outweigh costs. HB 2384 would override these local decisions and lock Missouri communities into 15 year old requirements, irrespective of: Local financial analyses, Climate considerations, Economic development goals and Disaster resilience priorities.

5. A narrow amendment to address builder concerns is achievable, but full rollbacks are harmful. A tailored amendment can address specific issues without eliminating the core consumer protection benefits of modern energy codes. Broad rollbacks, however, would undermine long term affordability and competitiveness.

Missouri's rising utility costs further highlight why modern energy codes remain essential. Ameren Missouri's June 2025 rate increase, combined with statewide projections showing some of the largest expected household energy cost spikes in the nation, underscores that families are already facing substantial upward pressure on monthly bills. Freezing communities at 2009 energy standards would remove one of the most effective tools available to help Missourians manage those costs: strong, modern energy efficiency measures that reduce long term energy consumption and protect household budgets.

In conclusion, modern energy codes protect consumers, reduce energy costs, support grid reliability, and strengthen Missouri's building and manufacturing economy. Freezing the state at 2009 standards would shift long term energy burdens onto Missouri families, renters, businesses, and employers, including those rebuilding after disasters. In a state where there are frequent tornadoes, floods, and severe storms, modern codes also support safe and reliable rebuilding after.

For these reasons, DuPont respectfully urges the Committee not to advance legislation restricting local adoption of modern energy codes.

We appreciate your consideration and welcome the opportunity to discuss how Missouri can support affordability, resilience, and economic growth with balanced, up to date energy standards.

Sincerely,

Ryan Osterman  
Site Leader, Riverside Plant (Pevely, Missouri)  
Performance Building Solutions



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>SHANE S TURNER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:55 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I as a licensed builder here in the Kansas City have my company already conforming to the better current energy code ratings. I feel by doing so this not only holds trades accountable but us as a company as well. I also feel it provides a very good benefit to my clients by providing energy cost savings they can see.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>SHANNON COOPER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>660-890-1432</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>CITY OF KANSAS CITY</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>208 MADISON</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>SHAWN RANGLES</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>DAKE-WELLS ARCHITECTURE</b>		TITLE: <b>EDUCATION SPECIALIST</b>
ADDRESS:		
CITY: <b>SPRINGFIELD</b>	STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65804</b>
EMAIL: <b>srandles@dake-wells.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:07 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I have been on the client side and on the developer side of community tax funded projects, and I am in opposition of any form of government telling voters what they are limited to. If a community passes a tax to build XYZ, local control and small government means we can build a project to the highest specs we choose as long as we are meeting the minimum in local building codes. State and federal government should not be setting limits on building practices.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>SOPHI ALLEN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 2:35 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

As you consider House Bill 2384, I urge you to oppose this measure because its statewide “cap” on building code standards at the outdated 2009 IECC would have serious negative consequences for Missouri’s communities, economy, and the long-term financial well-being of families and businesses. Building codes are updated regularly by the International Code Council to reflect advances in energy efficiency, insulation, HVAC performance, lighting, and overall sustainability. Local governments across Missouri — from Kansas City to Springfield to St. Louis — have chosen newer versions of the IECC (2021, 2018, 2015, respectively) because these standards meaningfully reduce energy consumption and utility costs compared to the old 2009 code.

By freezing energy-related building requirements, HB 2384 would mandate that new residential, commercial, and industrial buildings be constructed to standards that are now more than 15 years out of date, precluding communities from adopting practices that lower long-term utility bills, improve occupant comfort, and enhance energy resilience. This rollback would likely lead to higher ongoing energy costs for homeowners and businesses because better insulation, tighter air sealing, efficient HVAC systems, and modern lighting technologies would no longer be required at the time of construction — forcing costly retrofits later, if they happen at all.

Energy efficiency improvements incorporated in newer codes have been shown to generate significant lifetime savings for occupants and reduce overall energy demand; for example, when using the standard U.S. DOE model home (2,400 sf) located in Springfield (the city in which I reside) and the currently used 2018 building code, federal analysis shows that even just the adoption of the 2018 IECC could save households hundreds of dollars annually on utility bills. Stripping local jurisdictions of the ability to require up-to-date codes undermines local control, hampers economic competitiveness, and locks Missouri into inefficiencies that neighboring states are moving beyond. For the sake of affordability, environmental stewardship, and stronger communities, we urge you to reject House Bill 2384 and leave code decisions in the hands of local governments that best understand their constituents’ needs.





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>STACEY L SMYLY</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-421-3360</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>SMACNA KANSAS CITY</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>720 OAK STREET</b>			
CITY: <b>KANSAS CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64106</b>
EMAIL: <b>stacey@smacnakc.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 11:18 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee,

My name is Stacey Smyly, I represent a majority of the HVAC / Sheet Metal Contractors in the Greater Kansas City Area as Executive Director of SMACNA Kansas City. My member contractors have worked for many years designing, installing, and servicing heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems in residential, commercial, and industrial buildings. We respectfully rise in opposition to the bill language that would prohibit counties and municipalities from adopting or maintaining building standards related to energy efficiency, high-performance construction, or environmentally responsive design. In an industry that works directly with building owners, developers, and homeowners, let us be clear: the efficiency measures targeted by this bill represent only a small fraction of total building costs, yet they deliver substantial and lasting financial benefits. In most projects, the incremental cost of installing modern, efficient HVAC systems or meeting updated energy standards is minimal compared to land acquisition, structural construction, finishes, and other core building expenses. These modest upfront investments are routinely recovered through reduced energy use and lower utility bills within a relatively short period of time.

Preventing local governments from adopting standards beyond the 2009 International Residential Code or the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code effectively locks our building stock into outdated technology. HVAC systems installed today are expected to operate for 15 to 30 years. Allowing lower efficiency systems may slightly reduce initial construction costs, but it guarantees decades of higher operating expenses for homeowners, renters, and businesses. This is not affordability—it is deferred cost shifting to occupants over the life of the building.

Energy efficiency standards are related to more efficient HVAC equipment. Manufacturers provide equipment that meet these national standards, they don't make both less efficient and then more efficient equipment as this would disrupt supply chain and internal production efficiencies. More efficient equipment will be all that is available, further reducing the reality of cost savings by enacting this bill.

Based on professional experience, higher-efficiency systems also reduce future maintenance and repair costs. Properly designed and efficient equipment runs more consistently, cycles less aggressively, and experiences less mechanical stress. This leads to fewer breakdowns, longer system life, and lower long-term service expenses. Rolling back efficiency requirements may increase short-term affordability on paper, but it increases real-world costs through more frequent repairs and earlier replacement.

Energy efficiency standards are also one of the most effective ways to reduce utility burden, particularly for low- and moderate-income households. Monthly energy bills are unavoidable expenses. Weakening standards ensures that occupants—often renters who have no control over equipment

selection—pay more every month for the life of the building. In contrast, reasonable efficiency requirements protect consumers by ensuring that new construction meets a baseline level of performance.

Finally, there is the issue of environmental and infrastructure impact. Efficient buildings reduce overall energy demand, easing strain on power generation and distribution systems while lowering emissions. These benefits are not abstract—they help stabilize utility costs, reduce the need for new infrastructure, and protect long-term community resilience.

As an HVAC contractor trade association, we support practical, achievable efficiency standards because we see their value every day in lower bills, better system performance, and satisfied building owners. Prohibiting local governments from adopting updated or higher-performing standards removes flexibility, stifles innovation, and ultimately increases long-term costs for the very people this bill claims to protect.

For these reasons, SMACNA Kansas City respectfully urges the committee to oppose this bill language.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>STEPHEN GARMAN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 7:06 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

H.B. 2384 is a commendable effort to reduce housing costs for Missouri taxpayers, but requires a different approach than simply imprisoning homeowners in unsafe, high-cost and low-value housing. Safe and energy-effective pathways exist through workforce investment and innovation.

The bill suggests that by lowering construction standards—specifically those related to energy efficiency and structural integrity—we can make homes more affordable. By permitting inefficient construction methods of 2009 and before, this bill guarantees that home energy costs are defenseless against rate hikes and broader climate fluctuations. For many Missouri families, these monthly utility spikes will quickly outweigh any savings gained during the initial purchase. Lowering building standards lead to “joys” such as premature wear on roofing, HVAC systems, and insulation. What is saved during the build will be paid back with financial and environmental interest through constant repairs and replacements.

A vote in favor of H.B. 2384 is, in effect, a vote for low-quality, pre-blighted properties. Standards exist not just for comfort, but for the longevity of our communities.

Homes built under reduced standards will depreciate faster than quality-built homes, robbing working-class Missourians of their primary vehicle for building wealth. Substandard housing is more susceptible to mold, drafts, and structural failures, leading to poor health outcomes and neighborhood decline.

Instead of regressing to quickly fix a housing crisis, Missouri will need to join the global community in the continual search for safer, more sustainable energy-efficient measures. The fact that solutions are not as affordable as builders want is an opportunity to invest further in the state’s technology and workforce development.

Missourians deserve housing that is both affordable to buy and affordable to live in. H.B. 2384 fails this test. By incentivizing the construction of inferior homes, we are setting the stage for mass regression and exodus. I urge you to reject this measure and instead seek housing solutions that prioritize durability, energy efficiency, and long-term value.

I strongly urge a "NO" vote on H.B. 2384.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>STEVE O'ROURKE</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-359-1825</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>ENERGUIDANCE</b>		TITLE: <b>PRESIDENT</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>1602 FONTANA DRIVE</b>			
CITY: <b>ST. LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63146</b>
EMAIL: <b>SORourke@EnerGuidance.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:47 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

This bill is a continued attempt to remove control from local authorities on building codes. The problem originated in Kansas City with the 2021 building code, which is admittedly challenging to adopt. Most AHJs are bypassing this code to go to 2024 as a much better option. The idea that we'd go backwards to 2009 is preposterous.

This bill is ill-conceived and poorly written, with vague terms and no regard for implications of its implementation. There are so many other factors that much more dramatically affect affordability, including material prices/inflation, land prices, interest rates, and simple supply and demand. factors.

The HBA is arguing that they want to build affordable homes for low income buyers. This is like trying to focus on building cars for low-income buyers, when they'll naturally gravitate to a used car rather than a new car.

We need to build new homes that have demonstrated efficiencies that will save the occupants money in the long term, and continue to increase the performance of our housing stock. The only practical time to create a high-efficiency building envelope is during construction; it's not something that the occupant can easily add later.

The HBA has refused to sit down and meet with the architects and energy professionals who can help them understand, embrace and sell energy efficiency. They are a powerful economic engine with a lot of influence in the business community, and need to be kept in check by the legislature.

Thank you for your consideration.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>TAMARA SZABO</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 2:45 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

The bill would have a seriously damaging effect on home energy efficiency and eliminate "home rule" for cities. The bill would lower building codes across Missouri, doing harm statewide. The 2018 and 2024 editions of the IECC Energy Code provide documented return on investments of less than ten years. The bill would vacate building inspection requirements for house-flippers, allowing poorly remodeled houses to be sold, buyer beware. With energy costs going up and expected to continue going up, we need energy efficient buildings. Thank you.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>TIMOTHY GREEN</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
REPRESENTING: <b>ST LOUIS ELECTRICAL CONNECTION IBEW/NECA</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>5735 ELIZABETH AVE</b>			
CITY: <b>ST LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63110</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>TIMOTHY SCHMITZ</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>630-774-9008</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL</b>		TITLE: <b>REGIONAL DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>528 REPUBLIC RD</b>			
CITY: <b>BATAVIA</b>		STATE: <b>IL</b>	ZIP: <b>60510</b>
EMAIL: <b>timothyschmitz1@gmail.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 1:20 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Chairman Casteel and Members of the House Commerce Committee,

I'm writing today to oppose HB 2384. For introduction purposes, the Code Council (ICC) is a member-focused non-profit association dedicated to building safety. The Code Council develops the model building codes, the I-Codes, used in the design, build and compliance process to construct safe, sustainable, affordable and resilient structures. The I-Codes, including the International Residential Code (IRC) and the International Building Code (IBC), are the most widely used and adopted set of building codes in the U.S. and around the world. Developed through a consensus-based process, the I-Codes are updated every three years and incorporate the latest technology while providing the safest, most resilient structures for our families and communities.

As introduced, HB 2384 sets to strictly limit local authority in adopting modern building codes. The language specifically prohibits locals from updating the International Residential Code (IRC) beyond the 2009 printed version. This restriction will impact not only the incorporation of updated safety guidelines in future editions but will also prevent the adoption of new technologies and cost-effective construction standards introduced after the 2009 IRC.

Technology evolves rapidly, making it impractical to keep communities tied to 2009 standards. Many code sections have seen improvements each cycle, including updates to safety standards—these enhancements would be blocked by this legislation. Since 2009, advances in life safety, lithium battery storage, electrical systems, and structural integrity address modern risks such as severe weather. The latest codes reflect current data to better protect Missouri residents.

In conclusion, ICC would like to state its strong opposition to limiting and in many cases, affecting building safety. The unintended consequences of passing this legislation will affect the residents of Missouri for many years to come.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>TIMOTHY SCHMITZ</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>630-774-9008</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL</b>		TITLE: <b>REGIONAL DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>528 REPUBLIC RD</b>			
CITY: <b>BATAVIA</b>		STATE: <b>IL</b>	ZIP: <b>60510</b>
EMAIL: <b>tschmitz@iccsafe.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 1:12 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Chairman Casteel and Members of the House Commerce Committee,

I'm writing today to oppose HB 2384. For introduction purposes, the Code Council (ICC) is a member-focused non-profit association dedicated to building safety. The Code Council develops the model building codes, the I-Codes, used in the design, build and compliance process to construct safe, sustainable, affordable and resilient structures. The I-Codes, including the International Residential Code (IRC) and the International Building Code (IBC), are the most widely used and adopted set of building codes in the U.S. and around the world. Developed through a consensus-based process, the I-Codes are updated every three years and incorporate the latest technology while providing the safest, most resilient structures for our families and communities.

As introduced, HB 2384 sets to strictly limit local authority in adopting modern building codes. The language specifically prohibits locals from updating the International Residential Code (IRC) beyond the 2009 printed version. This restriction will impact not only the incorporation of updated safety guidelines in future editions but will also prevent the adoption of new technologies and cost-effective construction standards introduced after the 2009 IRC.

Technology evolves rapidly, making it impractical to keep communities tied to 2009 standards. Many code sections have seen improvements each cycle, including updates to safety standards—these enhancements would be blocked by this legislation. Since 2009, advances in life safety, lithium battery storage, electrical systems, and structural integrity address modern risks such as severe weather. The latest codes reflect current data to better protect Missouri residents.

In conclusion, ICC would like to state its strong opposition to limiting and in some cases, reducing building safety. The unintended consequences of passing this legislation will affect the residents of Missouri for many years to come.





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>TYLER PECK</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/20/2026 3:21 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

The language in this bill needs to be revised per the American Institute of Architects recommendations.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>TYLER TRAVERS</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>RENEW MISSOURI</b>		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY: <b>COLUMBIA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>
		ZIP: <b>65203</b>
EMAIL: <b>tyler@renewmo.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 2:23 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>		
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>		
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>WILL MARRS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>417-848-8561</b>
REPRESENTING: <b>CITY OF SPRINGFIELD</b>		TITLE:
ADDRESS: <b>223 E CAPITOL AVE</b>		
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>
		ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL: <b>govservicesjcmo@gmail.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:12 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**This would be preempting local control, would be burdensome to the licensing process as well and difficult to implement under current law.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>WILLIAM FREDERICK DAVIES II</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 7:55 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Chair Casteel, Vice Chair Wilson, Ranking Member Kimble, and Members of the Commerce Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit this testimony.

My name is Billy Davies, and I am respectfully asking you to vote NO on House Bill 2384 as it will not resolve and only hinder home affordability and exacerbate housing and building costs for my neighbors and the state.

I am a resident of Kansas City, Missouri; I’ve been a tenant most of my adult life but bought my first house, an old house, with my wife in 2021, not long after we moved to the city in 2019. We are proud midwesterners, and part of what we loved so much and still do about our hometown is the care that the city takes in adopting policies to help Kansas Citians, and even Missourians across the region, breathe easier and have a better chance to thrive. This has included investing countless hours in analyzing new building codes that are informed by robust community engagement.

This bill, if it passes, will completely undermine my City’s, and towns across the state, from doing this good work, while harming the affordability and safety of our buildings for their occupants, that is you, me and our neighbors.

I don’t want to repeat the informed testimony of other witnesses and experts who have weighed in, but I did want to draw attention and concern to the bill language asserting a goal of outlawing any local policy that calls for “green” building practices. That word means a lot of things to different people, but it’s helpful to get clarity when we are talking about big and consequential pieces of draft legislation.

HB 2384 doesn’t define “green.” Nor does it elaborate much further other than to add a ban on “excessive” building practices, again without defining the term. The illustrative list only broadens the types of things banned under the bill (Sustainable Standards and Features; High Performance Standards; Energy Efficiency Features; or Environmentally Responsive Features). I’m pretty sure a “functional roof” could fall under all of these terms. Some clarity comes when the bill comes out and says that anything included in the “2009 International Energy Conservation Code,” (or presumably after), or “IECC.”

Since the bill mentions the “IECC,” and seems to label this as the most specific example of “green” things it seeks to outlaw, I think it’s worth checking out, or reminding ourselves for those who’re familiar, about the purpose and use of the this tool, and its author, the International Codes Council. All of this is publicly available.

**IECC - The IECC provides a framework for designing energy-efficient buildings by guiding construction decisions, ensuring compliance with local regulations and supporting upgrades in both new and existing structures. By following the IECC, stakeholders, including cities, developers, manufacturers, and building occupants, reduce energy costs and help future-proof buildings against evolving standards by promoting smart energy use. As the National Association of Homebuilders put it, this code is the most adopted energy code in the United States and is recognized as the national model energy code for residential buildings.**

**ICC - The International Code Council is the leading global source of model codes and standards and for establishing a baseline for building safety to support building developers, product manufacturers, and most importantly, building occupants and their communities. The International Code Council's codes, standards, and solutions are used to ensure a safe, affordable, and durable built environment for communities and buildings worldwide. This body is the trusted source for model codes, namely by building leaders like the National Association of Homebuilders.**

**If this is what we mean by “green,” then it seems to be something worth keeping, and especially it seems when it comes to creating a better built environment for Missourians.**

**Hearing from other witnesses, this is all the more true and shows why House Bill 2384 is bad for Missouri. The IECC, like other tools developed by the International Codes Council, is important and beneficial for homebuyers, renters, and businesses occupying buildings as residential and commercial buildings account for well over a third 37% of the nation's total energy consumption. It's even more so in many cities, including my home of Kansas City, where buildings account for well over half of the region's energy consumption. KC is working hard to address this, as it has been for years as it has adopted new iterations of the IECC, including 2012, 2015, 2021, and soon probably 2024.**

**Implementing these standards is one of the best ways cities and counties can lower costs for Missourians. And our local building officials are in the best position to consider, adopt, and implement standards that work for their community.**

**I want to thank you again for your time, and I welcome any questions you may have.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2384</b>		DATE: <b>1/21/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Commerce</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ZOYA EHSAN</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>317-616-8572</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MIDWEST ENERGY EFFICIENCY ALLIANCE</b>		TITLE: <b>BUILDING CODES AND POLICY ASSOCIATE</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>20 N WACKER DR., STE 1301</b>			
CITY: <b>CHICAGO</b>		STATE: <b>IL</b>	ZIP: <b>60608</b>
EMAIL: <b>zehsan@mwalliance.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>1/21/2026 8:57 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Dear Representative Jones,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide information on the impact of limiting building energy efficiency requirements in Missouri jurisdictions. The Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) is a member-based, non-profit organization promoting energy efficiency to optimize energy generation, reduce consumption, create jobs and decrease carbon emissions in all Midwest communities. We have worked in Missouri and other states to provide technical assistance and education on energy-efficient building policies since 2009.

Limiting the adoption of new energy codes and/or prohibiting jurisdictions from requiring energy efficiency measures more recent than the 2009 International Residential Code or International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) would decrease affordability for homeowners and occupants, diminish health and safety in new Missouri buildings, and harm the construction workforce. Energy codes, just like other types of construction codes (e.g., fire, electrical, mechanical), ensure health and safety by providing better indoor air quality and more reliable, resilient homes and buildings in times of emergency or extreme weather events. Energy codes protect consumers by guaranteeing minimum standard safeguards that most homebuyers do not know to ask about (e.g., insulation behind walls). Additionally, energy codes make homes and buildings more affordable to inhabit and become more cost-effective with each new version. By placing limits on jurisdictions, the Missouri construction workforce would also take a step back and revert to out-of-date building practices.

**1. Building energy efficiency is a public health and safety matter.**

The State of Missouri has a responsibility to protect the health and safety of its citizens. This includes adopting and enforcing energy codes, which are critical to ensuring that buildings operate as intended. They integrate electrical, heating, cooling, ventilation and building envelope components to provide a safe, healthy and comfortable place to live.<sup>1</sup> Insulation and ventilation are crucial to keeping out pollutants and ensuring proper ventilation, and only energy codes contain provisions that dictate the proper balance between these components. Accordingly, homeowners in energy efficient homes report fewer hospital visits for respiratory issues.<sup>2</sup>

Another way energy codes protect health and safety is through moisture management. When moisture infiltrates a building, it can lead to rotting construction materials and harmful mold growth. A well-

sealed building envelope and proper insulation, as required with strong energy codes, help keep the cold outside air from the warm interior, reducing both condensation and ice damming.<sup>3</sup> Removing building energy efficiency standards will undoubtedly have negative health effects on Missouri residents.

Energy codes also enhance peoples' safety. Energy-efficient buildings put less demand on the electrical grid, making it more reliable for longer periods of time. This means residents can shelter in place longer and more comfortably during emergencies (e.g., tornadoes, heat waves) and power outages. Overall, energy-efficient construction techniques and products protect homes in extreme weather events, especially when utility services are disrupted.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, energy codes protect homebuyers' health and safety by prescribing minimum standard safeguards that most people do not think about. For example, when people go to buy a home, they do not typically ask the real estate agent about the age or condition of the electrical wiring (and the real estate agent typically won't know the answer) – they simply trust that it was assembled up to code and that it passed all relevant inspections. The same goes for insulation and other energy efficiency standards. Most potential homebuyers do not consider qualities like how well a home is sealed to keep out air pollutants and moisture or how long a home will stay livable during power outages. It is up to the energy code to guarantee these safeguards and the health and safety of the occupants.

## **2. Energy efficiency protects consumers and makes homes more affordable to live in.**

Occupants of energy-efficient homes are 32% less likely to default on mortgages<sup>5</sup> and are cheaper to maintain, making them more affordable to homebuyers. In August 2022, it was discovered that at least 20 million U.S. homes had fallen behind on their utility bill payments.<sup>6</sup> Since before Covid-19, the amount owed to utility companies has doubled for approximately one out of every six homes nationwide.<sup>7</sup> Electricity inflation rose by 15.2% in July 2022 compared to the same period the previous year.<sup>8</sup> In August 2022, natural gas was trading at around \$9.35 per Metric Million British Thermal Unit (MMBtu), more than twice the cost it was the year before.<sup>9</sup> All these happenings ultimately force homeowners and occupants to make tough decisions, between paying the rent or mortgage, affording groceries, or paying their utility bills.

Energy codes help ensure that a home is properly and sufficiently insulated, reducing the need for occupants to make these tradeoffs. Home insulation provides resistance to heat flow and thereby lowers heating and cooling costs.<sup>10</sup> The heat that is lost during the colder months must be replaced by heating systems, and the heat gained during the warmer months must be removed by cooling systems. However, when a home is properly and sufficiently insulated, the overall heat flow is decreased – heating and cooling systems do not need to run as much, and homeowners and occupants do not need to pay as much. Due to the annual costs of energy, the amount of money people save from energy efficiency accumulates year after year for the life of the home.

Moreover, building energy codes become more efficient and cost-effective with each new version that is developed. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is required by law to issue a determination as to whether the latest version of the IECC will improve energy efficiency compared to the previous edition of the corresponding standard or code. For example, DOE found that the 2024 IECC improved efficiency by 7.8% and energy cost savings by 6.6% over the 2021 IECC. ?

If homes are not built to updated standards, homebuyers will actually end up spending more. As described above, most buyers simply trust that a home has been built to code and properly inspected. Once already built, they do not independently verify that insulation is sufficient for health and safety or would result in low-cost utility bills. If there are no improved code standards in place, homebuyers will need to pay additional costs to ensure that homes are livable. These costs have the potential to add up very quickly.

## **3. Local governments are in the best position to know the wants and needs of their communities.**

Missouri law is written providing for no mandatory statewide energy code, thus, local jurisdictions are meant and expected to adopt the building energy standards they (and their residents) want. At least 14 counties and 87 cities in Missouri currently have standards in place that go beyond the regulations of the 2009 IECC.<sup>11</sup> Notable examples include Kansas City, Springfield and St. Louis.

Kansas City - As referenced above, Kansas City adopted the full, unamended 2021 IECC in 2022, the

strongest energy code in the state. In doing so, it has provided occupants with significant savings on their utility bills for years to come. According to a determination by DOE, updating to the unamended 2021 IECC would result in a national average of 9.4% energy savings and 8.7% energy cost savings compared to the 2018 IECC.<sup>12</sup> Of course, those savings will be even higher if updating from an even older code. The adoption of the 2021 IECC also helps Kansas City meet its goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2040.<sup>13</sup> A recent attempt to roll back the standards in Kansas City determined that the new energy code was not negatively impacting permits and that increased costs of the 2021 IECC were exaggerated.

Springfield - Springfield also updated its building energy standards in 2022 to the 2018 IECC. Compared to the 2006 IECC (Springfield's previous energy code), per the home specifications outlined by the Springfield Building Department,<sup>14</sup> this will reduce homeowners' energy use by an average of 9% per year, saving them \$142 annually on their energy bills.<sup>15</sup> Even when factoring in potential increased construction costs associated with a code update, this proves to be cost-effective. A homeowner with a 30-year mortgage (which includes incremental construction costs) may use the monthly energy cost savings to pay for a portion of the total incremental costs and realize a positive cash flow<sup>16</sup> after 17 months.<sup>17</sup> The energy savings and cost-effectiveness of the 2018 IECC are even more favorable for larger homes with more volume. For instance, when using the standard DOE model home (2,400 sf) located in Springfield, a homeowner would reduce their energy use by 20%, save an average of \$408 on their energy bills and see a positive cash flow in around six months.

City of St. Louis – In 2018, St. Louis adopted the 2018 IECC. Due to this update, new homebuyers in St. Louis are expected to reduce their annual energy use by 27% and energy costs by approximately \$580 annually.<sup>18</sup> When factoring in potential increased construction costs associated with a code update, this update proves to be cost-effective. A homeowner with a 30-year mortgage will realize a positive cash flow after eleven months, and a life-cycle cost savings of over \$7,700.<sup>19</sup>

Additionally, the clean energy sector currently supports more than 14,400 jobs in the St. Louis metro area, which is more than one third of all clean energy jobs in the state. Of those jobs, 83% are in the energy efficiency sector, and the vast majority are interdependent with the building industry, whether it be HVAC, insulation, or lighting.<sup>20</sup> These are good jobs in a vital, growing sector of St. Louis' economy. In fact, the clean energy sector grew at a rate of 5.3% from 2015 to 2016 in Missouri – over three times faster than all other sectors in the state.<sup>21</sup>

Prohibiting jurisdictions from adopting new building energy standards and enforcing currently adopted standards that go beyond the 2009 IECC effectively rolls back energy codes in several Missouri jurisdictions. These municipalities have set advanced goals for themselves to achieve better and cleaner buildings, and they have committed to achieving those goals by adopting stronger building energy standards. They have done all this work in order to make Missouri a better place to live and work, to make Missouri attractive for businesses and funding, and to make Missouri a leader in energy conservation and innovation. To effectively “roll back” the results of this hard work would be to wash away years of dedication, energy and cost savings, and all-around progress.

#### 4. The cost memorandum being used to support such code changes is inaccurate..

The ~\$31,000 increased costs cited in the referenced memorandum (memo) are taken out of context and are not accurate, as they only represent the costs associated with the prescriptive path of the 2021 IECC. The other two compliance path options included in the 2021 IECC have been shown to be less expensive to implement and are generally supported by the industry for their flexibility. For example, air sealing and tightening of the building envelope has the highest impact on increasing energy efficiency and is also the least expensive improvement to make. A builder could choose to build a tighter building envelope (e.g., 2 ACH(50) instead of 3 ACH(225023)) and then trade off that efficiency so that continuous insulation in the walls and R60 in the roof would not be required. Choosing another path also means that double frame walls (as represented in the cost calculations) would not be necessary; double frame walls are not a requirement of any energy code.

Moreover, MEEA calculated the cost attributed to continuous wall insulation using Means Construction Cost Data and arrived at a number about three times less than that proposed in the memorandum (i.e., \$6,958 as compared to \$18,137).



**The “Additional Energy Package” that is cited to cost around \$3,000 is also unnecessary if a builder puts all the ducts in conditioned space, which is a common building practice in many Midwestern homes (and is better for air quality in general).**

**If you have any questions about these comments, noted reports and references or general impact and analysis of building energy codes, please contact Zoya Ehsan at [zehsan@mwalliance.org](mailto:zehsan@mwalliance.org).**

**Thank you for your consideration.**