U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM



North Dakota Energy and Cost Savings for New Single- and Multifamily Homes:

2009 and 2012 IECC as Compared to the 2006 IECC

Building Energy Codes



Figure 1. North Dakota Climate Zones

North Dakota Energy and Cost Savings for New Single– and Multifamily Homes: **2009** and **2012 IECC** as Compared to the **2006 IECC**

The 2009 and 2012 International Energy Conservation Codes (IECC) yield positive benefits for North Dakota homeowners.

Moving to either the 2009 or 2012 IECC from the 2006 IECC is cost-effective over a 30-year life cycle. On average, North Dakota homeowners will save $2,353 over 30 years under the 2009 IECC, with savings still higher at $8,719 under the 2012 IECC.

After accounting for up-front costs and additional costs financed in the mortgage, homeowners should see net positive cash flows (i.e., cumulative savings exceeding cumulative cash outlays) in 1 year for the 2009 and 1 year with the 2012 IECC. Average annual energy savings are $149 for the 2009 IECC and $560 for the 2012 IECC.

Highlights

Cost-effectiveness against a 2006 IECC baseline:

- Life-cycle cost savings, averaged across climate zones and building types, are $2,353 for the 2009 IECC and $8,719 for the 2012 IECC
- Simple payback periods are 4.1 years for the 2009 and 4.6 years for the 2012 IECC

Consumer savings compared to a 2006 IECC baseline:

- Households save an average of $149 per year in energy costs with the 2009 IECC
- Household savings rise significantly to an average of $560 per year with the 2012 IECC
- Net annual consumer savings, including energy savings, mortgage cost increases, and other associated costs in the first year of ownership, average $112 for the 2009 IECC and $405 for the 2012 IECC
- Energy costs, on average, are 9.6% lower for the 2009 IECC and 36.2% lower for the 2012 IECC

Cost-Effectiveness

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) evaluates the energy codes based on three measures of cost-effectiveness:

- **Life-Cycle Cost**: Full accounting over a 30-year period of the cost savings, considering energy savings, the initial investment financed through increased mortgage costs, tax impacts, and residual values of energy efficiency measures
- **Cash Flow**: Net annual cost outlay (i.e., difference between annual energy cost savings and increased annual costs for mortgage payments, etc.)
- **Simple Payback**: Number of years required for energy cost savings to exceed the incremental first costs of a new code

Life-cycle cost is the primary measure by which DOE assesses the cost-effectiveness of the IECC. These savings assume that initial costs are mortgaged, that homeowners take advantage of the mortgage interest deductions, and that long-lived efficiency measures retain a residual value after the 30-year analysis period. As shown in Table 1, life-cycle cost savings averaged across climate zones are $2,353 for the 2009 IECC and $8,719 for the 2012 IECC.

Table 1. Average Life-Cycle Cost Savings from Compliance with 2009 and 2012 IECC, Relative to the 2006 IECC

	Life-Cycle Cost Savings ($)	Net Positive Cash Flow (Years)	Simple Payback (Years)
2009 IECC	$2,353	1	4.1
2012 IECC	$8,719	1	4.6

Consumer Savings

Annual consumer cash flows impact the affordability of energy-efficient homes. Based on this analysis, North Dakota homeowners, on average, should see annual energy cost savings of $149 per year and achieve a net cumulative savings that accounts for an increased down payment in addition to energy costs, mortgage costs, and tax-related costs and benefits in 1 year when comparing the 2009 IECC to the 2006 IECC. When moving to the 2012 IECC from the 2006 IECC, the average annual savings increase substantially to $560 per year, and it is again only 1 year before cumulative savings exceed cumulative costs. Table 2 summarizes these results.

Table 2. Impacts to Consumers' Cash Flow from Compliance with 2009 and 2012 IECC Compared to the 2006 IECC

	Consumers' Cash Flow (Average)	2009 IECC	2012 IECC
A	Down payment and other up-front costs	$65	$278
B	Annual energy savings (year one)	$149	$560
C	Annual mortgage increase	$35	$151
D	Net annual cost of mortgage interest deductions, mortgage insurance, and property taxes (year one)	$2	$4
E = [B-(C+D)]	Net annual cash flow savings (year one)	$112	$405
F = [A/E]	Years to positive savings, including up-front cost impacts	1	1

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) provides estimates of energy and cost savings from code adoption:

- **National**: Energy cost savings (only)
- **Climate Zone**: Energy cost savings, life-cycle cost savings, and consumer cash flows
- **State**: Energy cost savings, life-cycle cost savings, consumer cash flows, and simple paybacks

For more information on how these estimates were developed, visit the DOE Building Energy Codes website: **www.energycodes.gov/development/residential**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM

EERE Information Center
1-877-EERE-INFO (1-877-337-3463)
www.eere.energy.gov/informationcenter

September 2012 PNNL-21782

Building Energy Codes
For information on Building Energy Codes, visit **www.energycodes.gov**

Technical Appendix A

Methodology

An overview of the methodology used to calculate these impacts is provided below. Further information as to how these estimates were developed is available at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Building Energy Codes website.[1]

Cost-Effectiveness

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) calculated three cost-effectiveness metrics in comparing the 2009 and 2012 International Energy Conservation Codes (IECC) to the 2006 IECC. These are:

- Life-Cycle Cost (LCC): Full accounting over a 30-year period of the cost savings, considering energy savings, the initial investment financed through increased mortgage costs, tax impacts, and residual values of energy efficiency measures
- Cash Flow: Net annual cost outlay (i.e., difference between annual energy cost savings and increased annual costs for mortgage payments, etc.)
- Simple Payback: Number of years required for energy cost savings to exceed the incremental first costs of a new code

LCC is a robust cost-benefit metric that sums the costs and benefits of a code change over a specified time period. LCC is a well-known approach to assessing cost-effectiveness. DOE uses LCC for determining the cost-effectiveness of code change proposals, and for the code as a whole, because it is the most straightforward approach to achieving the desired balance of short- and long-term perspectives.

The financial and economic parameters used for these calculations are as follows:

- New home mortgage parameters:
  - 5.0% mortgage interest rate (fixed rate)
  - Loan fees equal to 0.7% of the mortgage amount
  - 30-year loan term
  - 10% down payment
- Other rates and economic parameters:
  - 5% nominal discount rate (equal to mortgage rate)
  - 1.6% inflation rate
  - 25% marginal federal income tax and 2.82% state income tax
  - 0.9% property tax
  - Insulation has 60-year life with linear depreciation resulting in a 50% residual value at the end of the 30-year period
  - Windows, duct sealing, and envelope sealing have a 30-year life and hence no residual value at the end of the analysis period
  - Light bulbs have a 6-year life and are replaced four times during the 30-year analysis period

[1] www.energycodes.gov/development/residential

Energy and Economic Analysis

This analysis determined the energy savings and economic impacts of the 2009 and 2012 IECC compared to the 2006 IECC. Energy usage was modeled using DOE's EnergyPlus™ software for two building types:

1. Single-Family: A two-story home with a 30-ft by 40-ft rectangular shape, 2,400 ft^2 of floor area excluding the basement, and windows that cover 15% of the wall area, equally distributed on all sides of the house
2. Multifamily: A three-story building with 18 units (6 units per floor), each unit having conditioned floor area of 1,200 ft^2 and window area equal to approximately 10% of the conditioned floor area, equally distributed on all sides of the building

Each of these building types, single-family and apartment/condo in a multifamily building, have four unique foundation types:

1. Slab on grade
2. Heated basement
3. Unheated basement
4. Crawlspace

Each building type also has four unique heating system types:

1. Natural gas
2. Heat pump
3. Electric resistance
4. Oil

This results in 32 unique scenarios (2 × 4 × 4) for each of the two climate zones.

PNNL incorporated the prescriptive requirements of the 2006, 2009, and 2012 IECC when modeling the impacts of changes to the code. Whenever possible, PNNL uses DOE's EnergyPlus model software to simulate changes to code requirements. However, in some cases, alternative methods are employed to estimate the effects of a given change. As an example, in order to give full consideration of the impacts of the 2012 IECC requirement for insulating hot water pipes (or shortening the pipe lengths), a separate estimate was developed for hot water pipe insulation requirements in the 2012 IECC, which results in a 10% savings in water heating energy use (Klein 2012).

Energy and economic impacts were determined separately for each unique scenario, including the single-family and multifamily buildings, the four unique foundation types, and the four unique heating system types. However, the cost-effectiveness results are reported as a single average for each climate zone and as an overall state average. To determine this average, first the results were combined across foundation types and heating system types for single-family and multifamily prototypes as shown in Table A.1 and Table A.2 (single-family and multifamily have the same shares for foundation types). For example, the primary heating system type in new residential units in North Dakota is a natural gas furnace. Therefore, the combined average energy usage calculations were proportionally weighted to account for the predominance of natural gas heating. Then single-family and multifamily results were combined for each climate zone in the state and the climate zone results were combined to determine a state average weighted by housing starts from 2010 U.S. Census data as shown in Table A.3.

Table A.1. Heating Equipment Shares

Heating System	Percent Share	
	Single-Family	Multifamily
Natural gas	56.7	68.0
Heat pump	39.6	24.8
Electric resistance	3.4	4.3
Oil	0.2	3.0

Table A.2. Foundation Type Shares

Foundation Type	Slab on Grade	Heated Basement	Unheated Basement	Crawlspace
Percent share	22.1	46.9	15.5	15.5

Table A.3. Construction by Building Type and Climate Zone

Climate Zone	Housing Starts	
	Single-Family	Multifamily
6	789	191
7	1,295	1,037

Differences Between the 2006 IECC, the 2009 IECC, and the 2012 IECC

North Dakota has no mandatory statewide energy efficiency code. There is no detailed data on current construction techniques related to energy efficiency in new North Dakota residences. However, there is likely to be a spectrum in the levels of energy efficiency. Some new housing may be built to levels equal to or even better than the 2006 IECC (for example, homes certified to meet ENERGY STAR); others may fall well short of the IECC. For this study, we assumed that the baseline home will be built to exactly the 2006 IECC requirements. This isolates the impacts of key improvements in the 2009 and 2012 IECC.

All versions of the IECC have requirements that apply uniformly to all climate zones, and other requirements that vary by climate zone. Highlights of the mandatory requirements across all buildings include:

- Building envelope must be caulked and sealed. The 2012 IECC adds a requirement that the building must be tested and a level of leakage that is no more than a maximum limit must be achieved.
- Ducts and air handlers must be sealed. Testing against specified maximum leakage rates is required in the 2009 and 2012 IECC if any ducts pass outside the conditioned space (e.g., in attics, unheated basements). The 2012 IECC leakage requirements are more energy efficient.
- Supply and return ducts in attics, and all ducts in crawlspaces, unheated basements, garages, or otherwise outside the building envelope must be insulated.
- For the 2009 and 2012 IECC, a minimum percentage of the lighting bulbs or fixtures in the dwelling must be high-efficacy lighting.
- A certificate listing insulation levels and other energy efficiency measures must be posted on or near the electric service panel.

A comparison of significant IECC requirements that do not vary by climate zone is contained in Table A.4. Of these, the most significant changes in the 2009 and 2012 IECC compared to the 2006 IECC are the requirements for pressure testing of the building envelope and ducts/air handlers, and for insulating service hot water pipes (2012 IECC only). The requirement for high-efficacy lamps, while significant, is somewhat abated by a superseding federal regulation banning the manufacture or import of less efficient lamps at common watt levels that takes effect in 2012 to 2014.

Table A.4. Comparison of Major Requirements That Do Not Vary by Climate Zone

Requirement	2006 IECC	2009 IECC	2012 IECC
Building envelope sealing	Caulked and sealed, verified by visual inspection	Caulked and sealed, verified by visual inspection against a more detailed checklist	Caulked and sealed, verified by visual inspection and a pressure test against a leakage requirement
Ducts and air handlers	Sealed, verified by visual inspection	Sealed, verified by visual inspection, and pressure tested, or all ducts must be inside building envelope	Sealed, verified by visual inspection, and pressure tested against a leakage requirement, or all ducts must be inside building envelope
Supply ducts in attics	R-8	R-8	R-8
Return ducts in attics and all ducts in crawlspaces, unheated basements, garages, or otherwise outside the building envelope	R-8	R-6	R-6
Insulation on hot water pipes for service water heating systems	None	None	R-3 except where pipe run length is below a diameter-dependent threshold
Insulation on hot water pipes for hydronic (boiler) space heating systems	R-3	R-3	R-3
High-efficacy lamps (percent of lighting in the home)	None	50% of lamps	75% of lamps or 75% of fixtures
Certificate of insulation levels and other energy efficiency measures	Yes	Yes	Yes

Requirements such as insulation levels and fenestration (window, door, and skylight) U-factors can vary by the eight zones in the United States. Table A.5 shows these requirements. North Dakota has two climate zones (Climate Zones 6 and 7) as defined in the IECC.

Table A.5. Comparison of Major Requirements That Vary by Climate Zone

Climate Zone	IECC	Components											
		Ceiling (R-value)	Skylight (U-factor)	Fenestration (windows and doors)		Wood Frame Wall (R-value)	Mass Wall* (R-value)	Floor (R-value)	Basement Wall** (R-value)	Tested Max Air Leakage Rate (air changes per hour)	Slab*** (R-value and depth)	Crawl Space** (R-value)
				U-factor	SHGC							
1	2006	30	0.75	NR	0.4	13	3/4	13	NR	NR	NR	NR
	2009				0.3					NR		
	2012				0.25					5		
2	2006	30	0.75	0.75	0.4	13	4/6	13	NR	NR	NR	NR
	2009	30	0.75	0.65	0.3					NR		
	2012	38	0.65	0.4	0.25					5		
3	2006	30	0.65	0.65	0.4	13	5/8	19	0	NR	NR	5/13
	2009	30	0.65	0.5	0.3	13	5/8		5/13****	NR		
	2012	38	0.55	0.35	0.25	20	8/13		5/13****	3		
4	2006	38	0.6	0.4	NR	13	5/13	19	10/13	NR	10, 2 ft	10/13
	2009	38	0.6	0.35		13	5/10		10/13	NR		10/13
	2012	49	0.55	0.35	0.4	20	8/13		10/13	3		10/13
5	2006	38	0.6	0.35	NR	19	13/19	30	10/13	NR	10, 2 ft	10/13
	2009	38	0.6	0.35		20	13/17		10/13	NR		10/13
	2012	49	0.55	0.32		20	15/19		15/19	3		15/19
6	2006	49	0.6	0.35	NR	19	10/13	30	10/13	NR	10, 4 ft	10/13
	2009		0.6	0.35		20	15/19		15/19	NR		10/13
	2012		0.55	0.32		20+5	15/19		15/19	3		15/19
7 and 8	2006	49	0.6	0.35	NR	21	19/21	30	10/13	NR	10, 4 ft	10/13
	2009		0.6	0.35		21		38	15/19	NR		10/13
	2012		0.55	0.32		20+5		38	15/19	3		15/19

* The second number applies when more than half the insulation is on the interior side of the high mass material in the wall.

** The first number is for continuous insulation (e.g., a board or blanket directly on the foundation wall) and the second number is for cavity insulation (i.e., if there is a furred-out wall built against the foundation wall). Only one of these two has to be met.

*** The first number is R-value. The second value refers to the vertical depth of the insulation around the perimeter.

**** Basement wall insulation is not required in the warm-humid region of Zone 3 in the southeastern United States.

NR = not required

SHGC = solar heat gain coefficient

While exemptions or allowances in the code are not included in this analysis, the code does allow for some of these depending on the compliance path. Examples include the following:

- One door and 15 ft^2 of window area are exempt
- Skylight U-factors are allowed to be higher than window U-factors
- Five hundred square feet or 20% of ceiling area of a cathedral ceiling, whichever is less, is allowed to have R-30 insulation in climate zones where more than R-30 is required for other ceilings

Incremental First Costs

Table A.6 shows the costs of implementing the prescriptive measures of the new codes. Costs are provided for both the reference home and apartment/condo, and for the cost of moving from the 2006 to the 2009 IECC, as well as from the 2006 IECC to the 2012 IECC. The costs derive from estimates assembled by Faithful + Gould (2012) and a number of other sources.[2] The original cost data were based on a national average. The costs are adjusted downwards by 11.2% (multiplied by 0.888) to reflect local construction costs based on location factors provided by Faithful + Gould (2011).

Table A.6. Total Construction Cost Increase for the 2009 and 2012 IECC Compared to the 2006 IECC

	2,400 ft^2 House			1,200 ft^2 Apartment/Condo		
	Unheated Basement or Crawlspace	Heated Basement	Slab on Grade	Unheated Basement or Crawlspace	Heated Basement	Slab on Grade
2009 IECC						
Zone 6	$834	$1,060	$834	$428	$461	$428
Zone 7	$722	$693	$466	$381	$329	$296
2012 IECC						
Zone 6	$3,318	$3,544	$3,318	$1,571	$1,604	$1,571
Zone 7	$3,206	$3,176	$2,950	$1,524	$1,471	$1,439

Results

Life-Cycle Cost

Table A.7 shows the LCC savings (discounted present value) of the new codes over the 30-year analysis period. These savings assume that initial costs are mortgaged, that homeowners take advantage of the mortgage interest tax deductions, and that efficiency measures retain a residual value at the end of the 30 years. As shown in Table A.7, LCC savings, averaged across climate zones, are $2,353 for the 2009 IECC and $8,719 for the 2012 IECC.

[2] The Faithful +Gould cost data and other cost data for energy efficiency measures are available on the "BC3" website at http://bc3.pnnl.gov/.

Table A.7. Life-Cycle Cost Savings Compared to the 2006 IECC

	Zone 6	Zone 7	State Average
2009 IECC	$2,545	$2,283	$2,353
2012 IECC	$9,518	$8,416	$8,719

Cash Flow

Because most houses are financed, consumers will be very interested in the financial impacts of buying a home that complies with the 2009 or 2012 IECC requirements compared to the 2006 IECC. Mortgages spread the payment for the cost of a house over a long period of time (the simple payback fails to account for the impacts of mortgages). In this analysis, a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage was assumed. It was also assumed that homebuyers will deduct the interest portion of the payments from their income taxes.

Table A.8 and Table A.9 show the impacts to consumers' cash flow resulting from the improvements in the 2009 and 2012 IECC, respectively. Up-front costs include the down payment and loan fees. The annual values shown in the table are for the first year.

The savings from income tax deductions for the mortgage interest will slowly decrease over time while energy savings are expected to increase over time because of escalating energy prices. These tables also include increases in annual property taxes because of the higher assessed house values. The net annual cash flow includes energy costs, mortgage payments, mortgage tax deductions, and property taxes but not the up-front costs. The time to positive cash flow includes all costs and benefits, including the down payment and other up-front costs.

As shown in Table A.8, on average, there is a net positive cash flow to the consumer of $112 per year beginning in year one for the 2009 IECC. Positive cumulative savings, including payment of up-front costs, are achieved in 1 year. The positive cash flow is more significant with the 2012 IECC. Here state average net annual cash flow savings are $405, with only 1 year to positive cumulative savings after covering up-front costs (see Table A.9).

Table A.8. Impacts to Consumers' Cash Flow from Compliance with 2009 IECC Compared to the 2006 IECC

	Cost/Benefit	Zone 6	Zone 7	State Average
A	Down payment and other up-front costs	$90	$55	$65
B	Annual energy savings (year one)	$169	$141	$149
C	Annual mortgage increase	$49	$30	$35
D	Net annual cost of mortgage interest deductions, mortgage insurance, and property taxes (year one)	$2	$1	$2
E = [B-(C+D)]	Net annual cash flow savings (year one)	$118	$110	$112
F = [A/E]	Years to positive savings, including up-front cost impacts	1	1	1

Table A.9. Impacts to Consumers' Cash Flow from Compliance with 2012 IECC Compared to the 2006 IECC

	Cost/Benefit	Zone 6	Zone 7	State Average
A	Down payment and other up-front costs	$328	$257	$278
B	Annual energy savings (year one)	$620	$535	$560
C	Annual mortgage increase	$178	$139	$151
D	Net annual cost of mortgage interest deductions, mortgage insurance, and property taxes (year one)	$4	$3	$4
E = [B-(C+D)]	Net annual cash flow savings (year one)	$438	$393	$405
F = [A/E]	Years to positive savings, including up-front cost impacts	1	1	1

Simple Payback

Table A.10 shows the simple payback period, which consists of the construction cost increase divided by first-year energy cost savings. This calculation yields the number of years required for the energy cost savings to pay back the initial investment. Simple payback does not consider financing of the initial costs through a mortgage or favored tax treatment of mortgages.

As Table A.10 shows, the simple payback period from moving to the 2009 IECC from the 2006 IECC averages 4.1 years across climate zones. The simple payback for the 2012 IECC is slightly longer, averaging 4.6 years.

Table A.10. Simple Payback Period, Relative to the 2006 IECC (Years)

Code	Zone 6	Zone 7	State Average
2009 IECC	5	3.6	4.1
2012 IECC	4.9	4.5	4.6

Energy Cost Savings

All fuel prices were obtained from the DOE Energy Information Administration and are recent residential prices specific to North Dakota (DOE 2012a, 2012b, 2012c). For this analysis, natural gas fuel prices were set to $0.685/therm. Electricity prices were set to $0.073/kWh for space heating and $0.094/kWh for air conditioning. Oil prices were set to $23.7/MBtu. Energy prices are assumed to escalate at the rates published in DOE's *Annual Energy Outlook* (DOE 2012d).

Table A.11 shows the estimated annual energy costs, including heating, cooling, water heating, and lighting per home that result from meeting the requirements in the 2006, 2009, and 2012 IECC. Table A.12 shows the total energy cost savings as both a net dollar savings and as a percentage of the total energy use.[3] Results are averaged across home type (single- and multifamily), foundation type, and heating system types.

[3] The percent savings is the annual energy cost savings for heating, cooling, water heating, and lighting divided by the total baseline annual energy cost for heating, cooling, water heating, and lighting.

Table A.11. Annual Energy Costs for Different Versions of IECC

	2006 IECC					2009 IECC					2012 IECC				
	Heating	Cooling	Water Heating	Lighting	Total	Heating	Cooling	Water Heating	Lighting	Total	Heating	Cooling	Water Heating	Lighting	Total
Zone 6	$1,147	$153	$245	$148	$1,693	$1,010	$146	$245	$123	$1,524	$608	$140	$221	$104	$1,073
Zone 7	$1,016	$119	$228	$120	$1,483	$899	$115	$228	$100	$1,342	$546	$112	$205	$85	$948
State Average	$1,055	$129	$233	$128	$1,545	$932	$124	$233	$107	$1,396	$564	$120	$210	$91	$985

As can be seen from Table A.12, energy cost savings per year for the 2009 IECC compared to the 2006 IECC range from $141 in Zone 7 to $169 in Zone 6. Annual energy cost savings rise significantly with the 2012 IECC, ranging from $535 per year for Zone 7, up to $620 per year in Zone 6. On a percentage basis, energy cost savings average 9.6% with the 2009 IECC and 36.2% with the 2012 IECC.

Table A.12. Total Energy Cost Savings Compared to the 2006 IECC

	2009 IECC		2012 IECC	
	Savings ($/yr)	Percent Savings	Savings ($/yr)	Percent Savings
Zone 6	$169	10	$620	36.6
Zone 7	$141	9.5	$535	36.1
State Average	$149	9.6	$560	36.2

References

Faithful + Gould. 2012. *Residential Energy Efficiency Measures – Prototype Estimate and Cost Data*. Portland, Oregon. http://bc3.pnnl.gov/wiki/index.php/Downloads

Faithful + Gould. 2011. *Residential Energy Efficiency Measures – Locations Factors*. Portland, Oregon. http://bc3.pnnl.gov/wiki/index.php/Downloads

Klein, G. 2012. *Cost Estimation for Materials and Installation of Hot Water Piping Insulation*. Affiliated International Management, LLC, Newport Beach, California.

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012a. *Electric Power Monthly*. DOE/EIA-0226. Washington, D.C. http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/epm/table5_6_a.html

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012b. *Natural Gas Monthly*. DOE/EIA-0130. Washington, D.C. http://www.eia.gov/oil_gas/natural_gas/data_publications/natural_gas_monthly/ngm.html

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012c. *Petroleum Marketing Monthly*. DOE/EIA-0380. Washington, D.C. http://www.eia.gov/petroleum/marketing/monthly/

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012d. *Annual Energy Outlook*. DOE/EIA-0383. Washington, D.C.