

State	Cost	Duration	Scope of Work	Funding Source	Lessons Learned
New Hampshire	\$	< 6 months	NH Building Code Official Survey, 2010 Survey Advance Letter, Code Officials Survey Results Presentation	ARRA	No site visits, field inspections or plan review. No third party. Compliance rate determined based off code officials' perceptions.
Utah	\$	< 6 months	Better understanding of level of compliance in residential construction. Report on sample set of residential construction to energy office. Field inspections, plan review, outreach to building officials.	ARRA Stimulus via DOE/PNNL	Building departments were generally supportive of energy code requirements and were making efforts to understand and comply with the code. Lack of time, money, and resources for local jurisdictions. resistance to compliance from home builders. Need for consistent education and support for code officials and home builders.
Maine	\$\$\$	< 6 months	Sample Design, Site Selection (~80 commercial sites), Recruiting, Site Visits, Data Cleaning and Entry, Code Compliance, Energy Use Intensity Comparison, Data Analysis, Report Writing	ARRA - SEP	In prep for site visits, when calling surveyors: Chains Most Difficult Schedule. For Site Surveys, time consuming digging for Plans & Specifications. Difficult Determining Insulation Levels, below grade and within wall cavities. Construction Practices Highly Variable (partly due to no statewide uniform code adoption)
Rhode Island	\$\$\$	6 – 8 months	COM: Code official survey/interviews and site visits. RES: Onsite checklists/surveys (PNNL), 40 site visits, mandatory inspector interviews (DOE survey).	Utility systems benefit charge, RGGI	<b>RES:</b> Getting sample of homes for on-sites. Info from Bldg depts isn't consistent, trying to track bldg groups that may keep databases etc. <b>COM:</b> Difficulty getting population data for recently constructed commercial buildings.
Massachusetts	\$\$\$\$	6 – 8 months	Evaluate residential "compliance" using different methodologies—PNNL checklist, HERS ratings. Overall Building UA, Annual Energy Cost approach. Apply methodologies to ENERGY STAR homes and non-ES homes: Compare results and Provide feedback regarding PNNL checklist from building code officials and builders.	DOE Pilot Awardee	Results vary based on methodology. Disconnect between "compliance" and "performance." ES homes "perform" and "comply" better than non-ES homes—HERS raters "make a difference." MA builders primarily building to performance or REScheck, not prescriptive compliance. Checklist requires multiple (3) visits by code official during construction – may not be feasible. 1 key code problem area: duct insulation.
New York	\$\$\$\$\$	~ 1 yr	Study covers new construction, renovations, and equipment replacements. A comprehensive, statewide assessment will determine Energy Code compliance in both commercial and residential construction, identify non-compliance areas, determine methods of verifying compliance on building plans and during construction, calculate the overall rate of compliance, and recommend improvements for compliance. A variety of surveys, interviews, site and field visits, data analysis and modeling, and other applicable assessment techniques used to obtain information and determine compliance.	NYSERDA	<b>Marilyn Kaplan, NYSERDA:</b> Dodge data/sample data generator was inadequate. Cooperation from code officials was difficult. Further complicated by the fact that they did not have direct access to data through Utilities. Homeowners also wary of being contacted/visited, despite incentive attempts with gift cards, baseball caps etc. Sample size (those that participated) = self-selecting (i.e. Only the "A students" raised their hands). <b>Overall:</b> not a lot of confidence in the compliance rates pilot study found (too high), in reality she would guess a more accurate compliance rate would be 20-30%.
Georgia	?	6 months	COMMERCIAL: Survey of all local jurisdictions using BECP's survey questions, the plan review, and on-site evaluations of 44 randomly chosen commercial buildings	DOE Pilot Awardee	*Contributing factors found to a reduced compliance rate were a lack of education and proper training. *Impediments to being able to verify compliance with the commercial energy code: 56% lack of education, 51% lack of time, 42% insufficient data provided on the plans, 40% lack of money, 23% lack of equipment, 8% lack of code books. *Many local jurisdictions in Georgia do not enforce the energy code and some do not even have code inspection programs. *Field inspections and plan review: 88% conduct commercial field inspections (1.29 hours average time per inspection), 74% conduct commercial plan reviews (1.23 hours average time per plan review) *The Department highly recommends using the BECP tools and materials.
Wisconsin	\$\$	8 months	44 commercial sites	DOE Pilot Awardee	Work done by Department of Commerce Staff - Staff that is typically responsible for plan review and inspections.
Iowa	\$\$	4 months	50 residential sites	DOE Pilot Awardee	Work done by a third party.
Illinois	\$\$	4 months	44 residential/10 commercial sites	ARRA code funds	Work done by third party; Darren Meyers led that effort. The use of a well known code official was instrumental in getting access in some cities.
					<b>Cost Key</b>
					\$ < \$50K
Washington	\$\$	9 months	2009 WA State Energy Code - RES	NEEA	\$\$ \$51 – 250K
Montana	\$\$	9 months	IECC 2009 - RES	NEEA & DOE	\$\$\$ \$251 – 500K
					\$\$\$\$ \$501 – 750K
Idaho	\$\$	9 months	IECC 2009 - RES	NEEA	\$\$\$\$\$ \$751K – 1M