



**HOME BUILDERS & REMODELERS ASSOCIATION
OF CONNECTICUT, INC.**

3 Regency Drive, Suite 204, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Tel: 860-216-5858 Fax: 860-206-8954 Web: www.hbact.org

*Your Home
Is Our
Business*

March 1, 2016

To: Senator Timothy D. Larson, Co-Chairman
Representative Stephen D. Dargan, Co-Chairman
Members of the Public Safety & Security Committee

From: Bill Ethier, CAE, Chief Executive Officer

Re: **Opposition to HB 5278, AAC Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems
in Residential Buildings Designed to be Occupied by Two Families
Opposition to SB 238, AAC Adoption of Municipal Ordinances
Regarding Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems in New Residential
Buildings**

The HBRA of Connecticut is a professional trade association with about eight hundred (800) member firms statewide employing tens of thousands of CT's citizens. Our members, all small businesses, are residential and commercial builders, land developers, remodelers, general contractors, subcontractors, suppliers and those businesses and professionals that provide services to our diverse industry and to consumers. We build between 70% to 80% of all new homes and apartments in the state each year and engage in countless home remodeling projects.

The HBRA of CT strongly opposes both HB 5278, mandating the installation of fire sprinklers in all new 2-family homes, and SB 238, allowing municipalities to adopt by ordinance a mandatory sprinkler requirement in all new 1&2 family homes. We greatly respect and honor the service that fire fighters provide to protect our communities. Also, all home builders would be happy to install a fire sprinkler system in a new home if requested to do so by their customer. **However, our opposition to these fire sprinkler mandates is about logic, reason and common sense. These mandates would be ineffective at reducing fire deaths, and would be an extremely expensive and unwise policy.** To outline the many arguments surrounding this seemingly perennial issue (i.e., the 7th time the sprinkler mandate has been before you over 12 plus years), I offer the following:

- One page summary of our arguments in opposition to a sprinkler mandate;
- Four page point/counterpoint that examines the proponent's arguments in favor of a mandate and our responses to each one; and
- Two-page article that examines the motivations of the three stakeholder groups (i.e., the fire community, sprinkler manufacturers and installers, and home builders and realtors), as well as the proper role you as legislators must play in setting policy.

Please examine the attached before making a decision on these issues. We hope and urge that you will not move either of these bills forward. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this legislation.

**Vision: "Building CT's Economy, Communities and Better Lives One Home at a Time"
Mission: "Using Effective Advocacy and New Knowledge to Solve Our Member's Problems."**

Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Connecticut, Inc.

PLEASE OPPOSE HB 5278 Mandating Fire Sprinklers in 2-Family New Homes and SB 238, a Local Option for Mandating Sprinklers

- **Sprinklers in NEW 1&2 Family Homes Will Not Save Lives** because most residential fires (88 – 90%) **and almost all fire deaths and serious injuries occur in homes that are 30 or more years old**. NFPA’s own data shows for every 1,000 home fires you have a 99.62% survival rate if you have working smoke detectors and you have a 99.82% survival rate with both smoke detectors and sprinklers. Smoke detectors, costing \$500-\$600 per home, gets you to almost 100%. Does an additional \$15,000 to \$20,000+ for sprinklers justify the incremental 0.2% increase, but still shy of 100%? The CT Fire Chiefs Assoc. states only that with fire sprinklers, “the fire death rate per 1,000 ...fires was lower by 82%.” Their math is both wrong and hides the true tiny incremental increase in life safety for an enormous cost.
- **Installing sprinklers in new 1&2 family homes addresses the wrong homes. Homes built to older codes are far more dangerous. New homes are simply built better than they used to be**, incorporating better fire stopping materials, better electrical systems and installations, better egress (i.e., ways to get out of a home), and the hard wiring (with battery backup) of smoke detectors. **And, light frame (i.e., truss) construction – blamed by sprinkler proponents for safety issues – is not new**; it’s been used in home construction for over 50 years.
- **The cost for individual new home buyers would be \$10,000 for a very small home to \$20,000 and up for a typical new 1 or 2 family home**. They cost \$6.00/sq ft or more (real quotes today). A Sprinkler mandate will make unaffordable a growing trend to build 2 family units, such as in-law and accessory apartments. If renters want sprinkler protection they can rent any number of the growing multi-family apartments that are being built across the state.
- **Fire sprinklers are a choice home buyers should make for themselves**. All home builders would be happy to install a fire sprinkler system in a new home if requested to do so by their customer – and all home builders must by law inform every buyer about fire sprinklers. But, almost ALL home buyers DO NOT WANT sprinklers; they’re viewed as a liability.
- **Fire deaths in homes have been decreasing nationally and recent data shows one death for every 92,000 homes in CT**. Therefore, we will have to put sprinklers in 92,000 new homes, a societal cost of far over \$1 billion, to protect, on average, that one life. This assumes sprinklers work 100% of the time (**they don’t**) and that home owners perform necessary annual maintenance (**they won’t**), and ignores the fact that **almost all deadly fires occur in homes built before 1985**.
- **Adding costs to new homes keeps potential buyers in older homes, potentially increasing their risk of fire-related injuries or death**. Nationally, every \$1,000 in increased price for a home knocks 217,000 buyers out of that market. Some portion of those buyers will, therefore, be forced to stay put in older homes or choose a less expensive, perhaps older, existing home versus a new home. **Since the vast majority of fire-related deaths occur in older homes, requiring sprinklers in newly constructed homes – even just 2-family homes, could actually increase a person’s risk of injury and death from a home fire by keeping them in an older home**.
- **SB 238’s local option mandate would destroy 45 years of having a statewide mandatory building code** – one of the few regulatory benefits available in CT to the building and design industry. **We urge you to NOT allow this mandate even by local option**.
- **Before requiring sprinklers at \$15,000 to \$20,000 or more for new 1&2 family homes, ask why you have not installed them yourself – it does not cost that much more to put them into an existing home to protect your own family**.

Mandatory Installation of Fire Sprinklers in All New One & Two Family Homes: Facts and Truths

Proponents of mandatory fire sprinklers in all new 1 & 2 family homes – or even just 2-family homes - make a number of factual assertions. Learn the truth and what’s behind the facts.

See also, <http://www.hbact.org/FireSprinklers>

Factual Assertion	Truth
Fire sprinklers in new homes will save lives.	<p>In CT, “almost” all fire deaths in homes occur in older homes, homes built prior to 1985. Why? That’s the year hard wired smoke detectors, with battery backup, were required in all new home construction in CT. For new homes, we say “almost” because we leave open the possibility there may be a fire death in a new home the records have not yet revealed, but nobody has put that evidence forward. We examined, when we had the resources to do so, all CT fire deaths in homes that occurred over 11 years. Every fire death occurred in a home that was built well prior to 1985, many of them in much older homes. So, if nobody has died in a home fire in a home built since 1985, how can fire sprinklers in new homes save more lives? In new construction, smoke detectors and other fire safety requirements, save lives. Fire sprinklers could save some lives if installed in all older homes (see next line).</p>
Fire sprinklers save twice as many lives when installed in a home with working smoke detectors versus a home with just working smoke detectors. Or, as stated by CT Fire Chiefs Association, “the fire death rate per 1,000 reported home structure fires was lower by 82%” in homes with sprinklers. (2015 testimony on HB 6777)	<p>This grossly misstates what an NFPA study actually shows. NFPA data shows your survival rate in a home fire increases from 99.62% (without sprinklers) to 99.82% (with sprinklers) - assuming in both cases you have working smoke detectors. NFPA looked at the <u>avg. fire death rate per 1,000 reported home fires</u>, and compared (A) homes with hardwired smoke detectors <u>but no</u> fire sprinklers, and (B) homes with battery or hardwired smoke detector <u>and</u> installed sprinklers. The rate of fire deaths per 1,000 reported fires for (A) is 3.8 deaths out of 1,000 home fires (or a 99.62% survival rate), and for (B) is 1.8 fire deaths (or a 99.82% survival rate). In terms of lives saved, it’s 996.2 per 1,000 fires without sprinklers versus 998.2 per 1,000 fires with added sprinklers. Yet, that incremental increase in lives saved will cost society \$1 billion + per life (see next line). And, even with fire sprinklers, there will still be 1.8 deaths per 1,000 fires. The data (NFPA’s own data) overwhelmingly shows it is smoke detectors that save lives.</p> <p>It also overwhelmingly demonstrates the law of diminishing returns. It’s like saying you can be struck by lightning 1,000 times and with a special suit (aka home smoke detectors that cost \$500 - \$600) you’ll survive 996.2 times. But if you buy a super special suit (aka sprinklers, costing an add’t’l \$15,000, \$20,000 or more) you’ll survive 998.2 times.</p>
Sprinklers are a reasonable and cost effective way to save lives.	<p>There are just over 1.4 million housing units in CT, and just under 73% are 1&2 family homes. Fire data from the US Fire Administration shows 23 fire fatalities in CT in “residential settings” in 2014. 12 were in multifamily structures, 11 in 1&2 family homes, and <u>where age could be determined all of the homes were built in 1960 or earlier.</u> That’s one fire death per 92,000 homes. At “only” \$11,000 cost of sprinklers per home (<u>a very low avg.</u>) that’s over \$1 billion to, statistically, save the next life. Real sprinkler quotes from installers have come in at \$6+ / sq. ft. or \$15,000 to over \$20,000 per home.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">There is nothing reasonable or cost effective to these numbers.</p>

<p>The cost of sprinklers is equivalent to granite countertops, or wall to wall carpeting, or the cost “to put a front door on their home.”</p>	<p>Proponents obviously do not know the cost of granite countertops, flooring or doors, all of which are far less than sprinklers. But, more to the point, are proponents suggesting consumers should trade off granite countertops, wall to wall carpets or front doors so they can afford sprinklers? Legislators should offer that trade off to new home constituents in their districts and see what they say. Ask your constituents what they would have paid to have sprinklers in their new homes and see what they say - See next line.</p>										
<p>If consumers were only educated to the benefits of sprinklers they would pay for them.</p>	<p>Maybe, but unlikely. But even if true this calls for an education campaign, not a construction mandate. An extensive survey of home buyers regarding sprinklers was done in Indiana and showed the following results: When asked, “if fire sprinkler systems were offered as an option for your new home, what is the most you would be willing to pay for it?” For a typical 3 bedroom home:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Choose not to have fire sprinklers regardless of cost: 49%</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$3,000 to \$4,000:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$5,000 to \$6,000:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$7,000 to \$8,999:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$9,000 to \$10,999:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$11,000 to \$13,000:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1%</td> </tr> </table> <p>At the real costs of \$15,000, \$20,000 and up, it’s the very rare home buyer who wants sprinklers installed in their home.</p>	\$3,000 to \$4,000:	31%	\$5,000 to \$6,000:	9%	\$7,000 to \$8,999:	2%	\$9,000 to \$10,999:	1%	\$11,000 to \$13,000:	1%
\$3,000 to \$4,000:	31%										
\$5,000 to \$6,000:	9%										
\$7,000 to \$8,999:	2%										
\$9,000 to \$10,999:	1%										
\$11,000 to \$13,000:	1%										
<p>“40, 29, 8 and 5 are the only stats you need to know.” This cites a UL “study” that shows that older legacy homes will collapse in a fire in 40 minutes and flashover in 29 minutes, while modern homes collapse in 8 minutes and flashover in 5 minutes, based on test burns of homes with three different configurations. This is blamed on both allegedly “new” lighter frame (i.e., truss) construction and modern synthetic furnishings that are in newer homes. Light frame construction is also blamed on threats to fire fighters.</p>	<p>The “new” light frame construction argument is just wrong and the UL study has been discredited. Collapse of a structure is determined most by how fire impacts the structural elements of home construction and especially when the fire starts in a building cavity where it could be in contact with lightweight building materials. Yet, lighter frame truss construction has been used in home construction since the 1950s. It’s not new at all even though firefighters cannot seem to learn this. See here from the pen of a fire battalion chief who is also a building contractor. Firefighters themselves are finally only recently beginning to question tactics when fighting fires with known truss construction. And, HB 5348 (2015) would establish a truss notification system to protect firefighters, which the HBRA would likely support. About 60% of new home construction today uses truss construction while 40% uses traditional framing. According to NIST, “the number of collapse fatalities on an annual basis has declined since 1979.” Finally, according to NFPA, only 3.1% of fires reported originated within concealed structural locations, causing 2.8% of civilian fatalities – the reason being due to enforcement of code requirements for properly installed fireblocking.</p> <p>Flashover is determined most by contents in a home, not construction. The UL study assumed new homes are filled with all new, more flammable synthetic furnishings, while older homes are furnished with more flame resistant older furnishings. Yet, when people move from an older home to a new home, most take their existing furnishings with them. It also presumes owners of older homes don’t buy new furnishings. Both assumptions have no basis in reality. Perhaps the solution is to require better fire retardants in new furnishings, over which builders have no control.</p>										

<p>Sprinklers cost only \$2/sq ft.</p>	<p>This number comes directly out of the 1996 fire sprinkler legislative task force report. That’s 20 years old. Has labor increased since then? Have material costs increased since then? Real quotes received from sprinkler installers today have are in the \$6/sq.ft range. And, the NFPA 13D standard, which all home sprinkler installations must meet, requires you to sprinkle basements, so a 2,000 sq. ft. home will require an additional 1,000 sq ft., a 3,500 sq ft homes could require 5,300 sq ft to be sprinklered.</p>
<p>Cost of sprinklers is only \$6,000 to \$7,000</p>	<p>Again, this also comes out of the 1996 legislative report. It’s very old data and very old costs. At \$6/sq.ft., a new 2,000 sq.ft. home today would cost \$18,000; a 3,500 sq.ft. home would cost \$21,000 – NOTE the math – it’s because under the code sprinklers must also be installed in basements, so what is called a 2,000 sq. ft home requires about 3,000 sq.ft of sprinklered space. One fire fighter at the 2015 public hearing on HB 6777, who stated he felt it necessary to sprinkle his new home to protect his family responded to the cost question by saying it cost him \$12,000 - \$14,000. We can show you real quotes sprinkler installers provide to builders.</p>
<p>The CT Residential Fire Sprinkler Research Working Group has been cited as a broad based group with all stakeholders that should be taken as the authority on this issue. Proponents have offered to send it to the Public Safety Committee.</p>	<p>We, too, cited to this report in the HBRA’s 2015 testimony. We hope you look at it and look first to the last page listing the working group members. Created as a “compromise” by the state Codes & Standards Committee when it rejected the sprinkler mandate, this group, totally dominated by sprinkler proponents, was 34 members and the HBRA had one (1) rep on the group. In fairness, we hope you also look at the dissenting comment memo the HBRA rep filed with then DPS (now DAS). The working group nonetheless, even as one-sided as it was, pointed out a number of problematic hurdles to implementing a sprinkler mandate, all of which remain to this day. All posted at: http://www.hbact.org/FireSprinklers</p>
<p>“All model safety codes now require the use of home fire sprinklers in new 1&2 family homes.”</p>	<p>In reality, the only <u>two</u> model codes for homes do require sprinklers. But, the nation’s model codes are far from perfect and are subject to special interest lobbying pressures as much as legislatures. What’s not said about the two model codes (i.e., all of them) is one such code for new construction is written by the NFPA itself and is not used in virtually any jurisdiction for 1&2 family homes. The other code is the IRC (International Residential Code), used in most states, that’s produced by the International Code Council (ICC). Also what’s not said is how the ICC code hearing that led to the sprinkler mandate adoption was rigged by sprinkler manufacturers, who even paid for voting fire officials to attend the hearing. All documented here: http://www.hbact.org/FireSprinklers#Sprinkler Mandate Rigged. Also what’s not said is, as of Jan 2013, forty (40) states have removed this mandate when adopting the IRC “model” code; some have passed legislation prohibiting the sprinkler mandate in new homes. And, some states are even moving away from the ICC codes because of the irregular voting procedures that led to this mandate’s adoption. Model codes necessarily require state review and because they’re not perfect, these “models” are substantially amended on a number of provisions.</p>

<p>Consumer costs are offset by reduced homeowner's insurance.</p>	<p>Not true. Real quotes from real insurance brokers, including a Hartford area firm that does extensive work with new homes, quotes the cost savings at \$18/yr. What's not said is the annual or quarterly (we're not sure which; both were stated at the 2015 public hearing) maintenance costs for the sprinkler system. Sprinkler installers testified that they perform this service and it should be similar to one's annual maintenance service on a furnace, about \$200 - \$300 per year, far exceeding any annual insurance savings. Also what is not said are the occasional malfunctions of sprinkler systems that cause water damage when there's no fire that has occurred. See, for example, the Wallingford Library sprinkler malfunction.</p>
<p>Sprinklers add value to a home's resale.</p>	<p>Not true. This obviously does not come from anyone who sells homes. Sprinklers are not desired by buyers – see the survey results above. Just because something costs a certain amount does not mean it automatically gets added to market value. That's the reality of how real estate markets work, indeed how any free market works for any product. Sprinklers are, in fact, a marketing liability. Real estate brokers also report that some buyers disable sprinklers by shutting off the water valve to the system. Rightly or wrongly, they don't want to risk potential water damage and a buyer's belief is very determinative of market value.</p>
<p>"Let's face facts. Smoke detectors don't work. People and children sleep right through them."</p>	<p>Again, the NFPA own data shows survival rates in homes with fires is 99.62% when hard wired smoke detectors are available. That's 996.2 out of 1,000 home fires there is no death. It does rise from 99.62% to 99.82% when sprinklers and smoke detectors are both available. Also, we have found no evidence of a home fire death in CT in a home built since 1985, when hard wired smoke detectors were first required in new home construction in CT. Fire deaths occur in older homes (homes built prior to 1985), not new homes, and most likely when smoke detectors are not present or working.</p>
<p>The latest argument made by proponents of a sprinkler mandate professes their concern for the potential liability of Codes & Standards Committee members if they do not adopt the mandate.</p>	<p>Obviously not an argument made by an attorney, although made directly to Codes and Standards late in 2015 by the sprinkler coalition in attempt to pressure them to not exempt the mandate from the 2012 IRC. This argument has no basis in law. See the HBRA's response, also provided to Codes and Standards. As our statement concludes, for all of the logical and legal reasons noted, CSC members would not be liable for exercising their governmental discretion to not adopt the ICC's sprinkler mandate for the state.</p>

Fire Sprinklers in New Homes & the Cost of Public Safety: the Significance of Perspective

by Bill Ethier, CEO, HBRA of CT (February 23, 2015)

The public hearing on HB 6777 (2015), Requiring Fire Sprinkler Installation in All New One and Two Family Homes, presented a compelling study in what motivates humans to influence legislators. A lot of misinformation was put before the committee by sprinkler proponents that the HBRA addresses elsewhere (see HBRA's Facts and Truth statement). This article is an examination of human nature.

It appeared to this observer that it was too easy for some people to tell some other guy, who happens to be buying a new home, that he has to spend \$10,000 or more to protect himself and his family from a potential fire, rather than allow him to make that choice for himself. I mean, it's easy isn't it because we're talking about saving lives, right? Well, not really, but that's a factual issue I'll get into later.

More significantly, the same reasoning that leads to the decision to tell a new home buyer it's important to pay up to protect the home buyer's family **demands** that it must be exponentially more important for sprinkler proponents, including any legislators who would do so, to rise up and protect their own families. Is this not logical? Don't all of us value the lives of our own loved ones more than some stranger's?

And, it can be done, you know. You can put fire sprinklers into an existing home for not that much more than it costs in new construction. You can run the plastic piping through the joist chases in ceilings. You can install a backflow preventer on your water system if you're on city water, or I'm sure you can find the space in your basement to install a \$1,500 250-gallon water tank and pump system if you're on well water. The sprinkler heads and annual maintenance fees will cost the same in new or existing homes. The only extra cost will be a little more labor to work around and through closed-in walls and ceilings, some repair to the walls and ceilings post sprinkler installation, some wall board compound and a new coat or two of paint. A good contractor can make it all look as good as new. Isn't that minor extra cost to protect your own families worth it?

So, it seems if you are so willing to tell someone else, a stranger, they must purchase this protection, I am compelled to presume you've come to the same decision about the safety of you and yours. If not, if you're willing to make that decision for someone else, but not for yourself, with all due respect, there's a tinge of paternalistic arrogance that overlays that approach to public safety. Rules for others good; but not for yourself, or put another way, "Do as I say, not as I do."

Putting paternalistic tendencies aside, the individual and societal cost of mandating fire sprinklers in all new homes is where the study in human nature really comes in. Admittedly, how one views the cost of sprinkler systems really depends on the perspective of the various advocates who surround this issue.

To home builders, the cost of sprinklers is highly significant but not necessarily because of the direct cost to the builder's bottom line on an individual home. If "the market allows," builders simply add the installation into the construction schedule and add a charge to the total cost to their buyers. Builders don't lose anything, and don't gain much either by installing sprinklers for a client homebuyer. The real question for builders, as well as Realtors – the reason we both testified in opposition to the mandate – is, will "the market allow" these costs to be absorbed. Undeniable economics dictates that increased cost for a product lowers demand. Higher cost housing means more people are removed from the marketplace of potential purchasers. On top of this economic fact, most buyers not only do not perceive sprinklers as a benefit but rather see them as a liability. Buyers do not want them. Adverse market realities, what builders deal with every day, is the real significance of a sprinkler mandate on new homes. Despite all the regulatory burdens

in CT that continue to face the home building industry to get a shovel into the ground, all the tax and fee impositions in CT that exact pounds of flesh from a home builder's business, and the industry's ongoing housing finance issues, the biggest complaint I have heard from builders over our continuing eight year Great Housing Recession is, "we don't have enough buyers in CT." Higher costs, from this sprinkler mandate or from other reasons, will depress demand even lower. That not only hurts the building industry in CT further but also our entire economy that is so dependent on a growing, healthy housing market.

To the union sprinkler pipefitters, the nonunion merit-shop sprinkler installers, and the sprinkler manufacturers – all of whom testified in support of the new mandate – the costs of sprinklers is also highly significant. Why? Because that cost is all going to flow to them as revenue. Like so many issues that filter through the halls of the state capitol, motivations for or against a new law can often be determined by the wisdom of "follow the money." When they profess sprinklers are worth the price to save your family, understand the sprinkler industry stands to make billions nationwide and hundreds of millions in CT with a mandate to install them in all new homes.

To the fire service, the fire fighters and fire marshals – who testified in support of the new mandate – the cost of sprinklers is insignificant. Why? Because they are all about public safety. They are 100% all in on public safety. And, frankly, that's a good thing. I am actually comforted by that. All of us, the entire public, want our first responders to think like that. We need them to think like that. It takes a special individual who is willing to think like that. So everyone should – as I do – have great respect and admiration for the fire service for what they do, to risk their own life if need be, to protect us. Their service deserves and demands our honor for them as well as our understanding of their position to support a sprinkler mandate.

To legislators, while you, too, should honor the fire service as I know you all do, you do not have the luxury of thinking like them or any other advocate for that matter. You are policy makers, law makers. You must wear a different hat to fulfill your responsibility to the whole public. Your role demands of you, before making a decision, to weigh the pros and cons, to conduct a cost benefit analysis, to bring the facts to the table and reflect various opinions off of the facts. You are, of course, all entitled to your own opinions, but nobody is entitled to their own facts. Arguing over facts is, frankly, silly if not stupid.

So, for the costs on an individual, before demanding someone pay \$10,000, \$15,000 or more to protect themselves, please reflect on your own decision to protect your own. For the costs on society of a sprinkler mandate, understand the fact that there's one residential fire death for approximately every 92,000 homes. There are over 1.4 million homes and apartments in CT. And, nobody knows which of those homes will have a deadly fire, although the facts overwhelmingly say it will be in a home that was built in the early 1980s or older, often much older. So, society will have to sprinkle at least 92,000 homes before, statistically, one life is saved. Do the math ... please. **It's an astronomical societal cost to save a life.** While the 1996 legislative task force on fire sprinklers determined the cost at \$403,000,000 to save a life, because fire deaths in homes have been decreasing and the per sq ft cost has increased since 1996, the societal cost now of a sprinkler mandate is approaching one billion dollars. Do the math. It's irrefutable. **As a public policy matter, legislatures and regulators do not regulate anything else, no safety hazard, no toxic chemical, no life-threatening condition, nothing, that remotely comes close to this societal cost to save a life.**

Human nature, such as it is, often vaporizes common sense and logic. On this issue, the costs are crushingly too great for society if that's allowed to happen. Sprinklers in new homes will not save the lives proponents claim. Nobody is dying in new homes from fires. The sprinkler industry won't acknowledge the facts because they're blinded by the prospect of wealth. The fire service can't see the facts because they're blinded by their passion for public safety. Facts, logic and common sense dictate strong opposition to mandating fire sprinklers in 1 or even 2 family homes, or as a local option.