

Urban Heat Island Amplification Estimates on Global Warming Using an Albedo Model

Alec Feinberg, Ph.D., DfRSoft Research

DfRSoft@gmail.com

Vixra: 2003.0088, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32758.14402

Key Words: Urban Heat Islands, Albedo modeling, UHI amplification effects, global warming causes and amplification effects, cool roofs

Abstract

In this paper we provide nominal and worst case estimates of global warming due to UHI effect (including urban areas) using a Weighted Amplification Albedo Solar Urbanization (WAASU) Model. This is done with the aid of related studies on UHI footprint surface coverage yielding effective amplification factors. Using this method, we find conservatively between 4.8% and 20% of global warming may be due to the UHI effect (with urban areas). We also provide more aggressive estimates. Results provides insight into the UHI area effects from a new perspective and illustrates that one needs to take into account effective amplification factors when assessing UHI's to include their footprint on a global scale. Lastly, such effects likely show a more persuasive argument for the need of world-wide UHI albedo goals.

1. Introduction

It is concerning that there are so few UHI publications recently on their possible influences to global warming. Part of the motivation for this paper is to illustrate the continual need for more up-to-date related studies including UHI amplification effects (that include their urban areas) as will be discussed in this paper. The subject of UHI effect having significant contributions to global warming is very important and should remain so. The topic has a controversial history. One such paper was from McKittrick and Michaels, in 2007, who found that the net warming bias at the global level may explain as much as half the observed land-based warming. This study was criticized (Schmidt 2009) and defended for a period of about 10 years by McKittrick (see McKittrick Website). Other authors have also found significance (Feddema et al. 2005, Ren et al. 2007, Stone 2009, Yang et al. 2011, and Haung et al. 2015). These studies used land-based temperature station data to make assessments. Although the studies have all found global warming UHI significance with different assessments, they have yet to influence the IPCC enough to necessitate albedo goals in their many reports and meetings like the CO₂ effort. This is important because, we feel it really is the IPCC's responsibility to inform the global community of such needs in the form of goals. Although they have provided reports on UHIs including health related issues, the response to their reports does not appear to be effective on the global scale compared with the on-going CO₂ effort. Surely promoting UHI albedo goals would make a large impact.

The contention that UHI effects are basically only of local significance is most likely related to urban area estimates. For example, IPCC (Satterthwaite et. al. 2014) AR5 report references Schneider et al. 2009 study that resulted in urban coverage of 0.148% of the Earth (Table 1). This seemingly small area tends to dismiss the contention that UHI effect can play a large scale role in global warming. Furthermore, estimates of how much of land has been urbanized vary widely in the literature and this is in part due to the definition of what is urban and the datasets used. Despite the growing importance of urban land in regional to global scale environmental studies, it remains extremely difficult to map urban areas at coarse scales due to the mix of land cover types in urban environments, the small area of urban land relative to the total land surface area, and the significant differences in how different groups and disciplines define the term 'urban'.

Furthermore, global warming UHI amplification effects are not quantified to a large degree related to area estimates. Because of this, the average solar heating area itself has not been quantified as part of such area estimates on land size effect and typically unrelated to important building solar heating areas.

Table 1 Summarizing Literature Urbanization Area Estimates

Percent of Land	Percent of Earth	References
2.7	0.783	GRUMP 2005, From NASA Satellite Light study based on 2004 data supplemented with census data
1%	0.29	NASA 2000 Satellite data, Galka 2016
0.5	0.148	(Schneider et al. 2009) based on 2000-2001 data from Satterthwaite IPCC 2014 reference
0.5%	0.145	(Zhou 2015) based on a 2000 data set [60]

53 Surface area land approximations vary widely and most are obtained with satellite measurements sometimes
54 supplemented in some way with census data. Table 1 captures some papers that are of interest.

55
56 One key paper listed in the table that we study here is due to Schneider et al. (2009) since it is cited by the AR5
57 2014 IPCC report (Satterthwaite et al. 2014). In Schneider paper, the larger area found in the GRUMP 2005 study in
58 Table 1 is criticized. These area estimates are important in our paper as we are using a *Weighted Amplification*
59 *Albedo Solar Urbanization (WAASU) Model*. Amplification factors that we will use are related to such urban
60 coverage. Therefore, we decided to use both the Schneider et al. and GRUMP studies as the nominal and worst cases
61 urbanization area estimates respectively. Furthermore they were both done using data set from around 2000 which is
62 a convenient time to extrapolate down to 1950 and up to 2019 (see Sec. 3).

63
64 In our study, where we introduce the WAASU model, we will see that it has some advantages over the ground-based
65 temperature studies like McKittricks and Michaels. The model is non probabilistic, in line with the way typical
66 energy budgets are calculated, it uses only two key parameters (urban coverage, and average albedo). Because it is
67 simplistic, it has transparency compared with the complex land-based studies.

68 69 2. UHI Amplification Effects

70
71 The table below lists the global warming causes and amplification effects. In this section we will summarize only
72 the UHI amplification effects listed in the table since the root causes and the main global warming amplification
73 effects are fairly well known.

74
75 **Table 2** Global Warming Cause and Effects

Global Warming Causes →	Population → Expanding Urban Heat Islands (UHI), Roads & Increases in Greenhouse gas
Global Warming Amplification Effects →	Increase in Specific Humidity, Decrease in Relative Humidity, Decrease in land albedo due to cities & roads, Decrease in water type areas from loss of albedo (reflectivity) due to Ice and snow melting
Urban Heat Island Amplification Effects →	UHI solar heating area (building areas), UHI building heat capacities, humidity effects and hydro-hotspots, reduced wind cooling, solar canyons

76
77 The UHI amplification effects that we consider to dominate listed in the Table are as follows:

- 78
79 • ***The humidity amplification effect:*** This has been observed. For example, Zhao et al. (2014) noted that UHI
80 temperature increases in daytime ΔT by 3.0°C in humid climates but decreasing ΔT by 1.5°C in dry
81 climates. They noted that such relationships imply that UHIs will exacerbate heat wave stress on human
82 health in wet UHI climates. One explanation for this is how heat dissipates through convection which is
83 more difficult in humid climates. Another explanation is that warmer air holds more water vapor. This can
84 increase local specific humidity so that there could be local greenhouse effects.
- 85
86 • ***The heat capacity and solar heating area amplification effect:*** This contributes to the day-night UHI
87 cycle. Here in most cities, it is observed that daytime atmospheric temperatures are actually cooler
88 compared to night. For example, in a study by Basara et al. (2008) in Oklahoma city UHI it was found that
89 at just 9-m height, the UHI was consistently 0.5–1.75°C greater in the urban core than the surrounding rural
90 locations at night. Further, in general UHI impact was strongest during the overnight hours and weakest
91 during the day. This inversion effect can be the results of massive UHI buildings acting like heat sinks with
92 large solar area and heat capacities, absorb radiation via convection in the day, and actually reducing the
93 UHI effect, but at night, buildings cools down, giving off their stored heat that increases local temperatures
94 to the surrounding atmosphere. This effect increases with city growth as buildings have gotten substantially
95 taller (Barr 2019) since 1950.
- 96
97 • ***The Hydro-hotspot amplification effect:*** This effect is not well addressed. Here atmospheric moisture
98 source is a complex issue due to Hydro HotSpots (HHS). Hydro hotspots occur when buildings are hot due
99 to sun exposure. Then during precipitation periods, the hot highly evaporation surfaces increase localized
100 water vapor in the air via the effect that warm air holds more moisture. This increase in local greenhouse
101 gas, could blanket city heat and increase infrared radiation during these periods. This, as discussed above,
102 is another possible UHI humidity amplification.
- 103
104 • ***Reduced Wind Cooling and Solar Canyons:*** In UHIs reduced wind is a known effect due to building wind
105 friction. As well, tall buildings create solar canyons and trap sunlight reducing the average albedo although

106 some benefits occurs from shading. In general both have the effect of amplifying the temperature profile of
 107 UHIs.
 108

109 **2.1 Urbanization Surface Area Amplification Factors**

111 We see from the previous section that estimating climate change impact just based on the UHI and Urban area
 112 coverage as in Table 1, cannot take into account solar heating building sidewall areas, massive heat capacities, the
 113 humidity effects, wind reduction and the solar canyon effect which amplify UHI effects beyond its own climate area.
 114 In order to estimate the UHI amplification effects, it is logical to look at UHI footprint studies. Zhang et al. (2004)
 115 found the ecological footprint of urban land cover extends beyond the perimeter of urban areas, and the footprint of
 116 urban climates on vegetation phenology they found was 2.4 times the size of the actual urban land cover. In a more
 117 recent study by Zhou et al. (2015), they looked at day-night cycles using temperature difference measurements. In
 118 this study they found UHI effect decayed exponentially toward rural areas for majority of the 32 Chinese cities.
 119 Their study was very thorough and extended over the period from 2003 to 2012. They describe China as an ideal
 120 area to study since it has experienced the rapidest urbanization in the world in the decade they evaluated. They
 121 found that the “footprint” of UHI effect, including urban areas, was 2.3 and 3.9 times of urban size for the day and
 122 night, respectively. These factors are summarized in the table below. Our study uses the average day-night
 123 amplification footprint coverage factor of 3.1 as a conservative value in our WAASU model.

124 In this study we consider these as urban area coverage amplification factors. That is, because buildings have a larger
 125 solar area, greater than its ground area, one can think of this as essentially making up for the building surface sides
 126 by increasing the ground “footprint” surface urban coverage area by a factor of 3.1. As buildings do increase the
 127 solar heating area of the Earth, this is a reasonable way to account for the UHI effect through the footprint
 128 amplification. This is the “footprint” concept. Essentially the UHI climate coverage has an average area 3.1 times
 129 larger than its own which is how the parameter is treated in the WAASU model. This also increases the solar surface
 130 area of the Earth that is accounted for in our model through renormalization discussed in Section 4 and Appendix B.

131 **Table 3** Urban Climate Amplification Factors

Urban Climate Amplification	Footprint Amplification Factor	Day-Night Average Factor
Area Coverage Amplification	2.3-3.9	3.1 Conservative
Spherical Area Coverage	4.6-7.8	6.2 Aggressive

132
 133 Although the 3.1 amplification factor may seem high, it is likely conservative. For example, two effects that would
 134 be hard to quantify are loss of wetlands and rainwater management due to urbanization. Here we note,

- 135 • Changes to the wetland area show a negative correlation with temperature (i.e. wetland decrease, increase
 136 in temperature), and a positive correlation with precipitation (i.e. wetland decrease, precipitation
 137 decrease).” Cao et. al. (2011) Hirshi et al. (2011)
- 138 • Impermeable surface creates annual evapotranspiration unknown amplification issues with natural cooling
- 139 • As well many coastal cities like Sydney, dump (132 billion gallons, Cormack 2015) frequently elevating
 140 temperatures from storm water runoff from hot buildings and streets into rivers, lakes and the sea raising
 141 local and costal temperatures in the vicinity also extending the footprint.

142
 143 These effects in some areas may be responsible for added draught, deforestation due to urbanization and draught
 144 related fires. We note that such amplification effects are hard to quantify.

145
 146 Furthermore the 3.1 factor from the Zhou et al. (2015) study does not provide for altitude atmospheric dissipative
 147 effects that also may contribute to global warming. We might envision altitude area effects as part of a spherical area
 148 footprint about the UHI and its coverage. In this way, we might aggressively extend this with a half sphere over the
 149 UHI with urban coverage in order to include some vertical radiation effects for global extent. UHI have been
 150 modeled with exponential decay as described (Zhou et al.), this can more easily be approximated by a half sphere
 151 roll off to simplify for an aggressive case. A half sphere model may be more appropriate as well. The area of a half
 152 sphere would then add another factor of 2 $\{(4\pi r^2/2)/\pi r^2\}$. Therefore, this extrapolated amplification footprint factor
 153 ranges of 4.6-7.8 for the day-night cycle respectively yielding an average of 6.2 shown in the table.

154 **3.0 Area Extrapolated Rates to 1950 and 2019**

155 In order to apply the area amplification factors, we first need to project the Schneider and GRUMP area estimates
 156 down to 1950 and up to 2019. Both use datasets from around 2000 so this is a convenient somewhat middle time
 157

158 frame. Here we decided to use the world population growth rate (World bank 2018) which varies by year as shown
 159 in Appendix A in Figure A1. We used the average growth rate per ½ decade for iterative projections (that averaged
 160 between 1.3% and 1.6% per year).

161
 162 To justify this we see that Figure A2a illustrates that building material aggregates (USGS 1900-2006) used to build
 163 cities and roads correlates well to population growth (US Population Growth 1900-2006).

164
 165 It is also interesting to note that building materials for cities and roads also correlates well to global warming trends
 166 (NASA 1900-2006) shown in Figure A2b.

167
 168 Column 2 in Table 4 show the projections with the actual year (~2000) data point tabulated value also listed in the
 169 table (also see Table 1). Since 1950 is taken as the reference year, we did not use any amplification factor for this
 170 period. Next we assumed the amplification factor of 3.1 (conservative) and 6.2 (aggressive) applied to the percent of
 171 the Earth values (see Table 1) shown in the Schneider and GRUMP studies. Therefore, under these assumptions, the
 172 urban effective amplification coverage used in the WAASU model is shown in Column 4.

173
 174

Table 4 Values used to estimate the Solar Surface area in cities

Year	Urban coverage Percent of Earth	Urban Coverage Amplification Factor Effect	Effective Amplification Coverage Area Effect
IPCC Schneider Study			
1950	0.059*	1	0.059%**
2000-2001	0.0051x29%=0.148		
2019	0.188*	3.1 footprint***	0.583%
2019	0.188*	6.2 half-sphere****	1.166%
Worst Case GRUMP Study			
1950	0.316%	1	0.316%**
2000	0.027x29%=0.783%		
2019	0.952%*	3.1 footprint***	2.95%
2019	0.952%*	6.2 half-sphere****	5.9%

175 *Growth rate of cities using world population yearly growth rate in Fig A1, study,**amplification factors
 176 not used, considered reference year,*** conservative, ****aggressive amplification.

177

178 4. Weighted Amplification Albedo Solar Urbanization (WAASU) Model Overview 1950 & 2019

179

180 The WAASU model is very straightforward; it is based on a global weighted albedo model. The weighted Earth
 181 constituents are

$$182 \quad EWA = \sum_i \{ \% Earth Area_i \times Surface Item Albedo_i \} \quad (1)$$

183 Here EWA is the Earth's Weighted Albedo value. The model allows us to hold all values from 1950 to 2019
 184 constant except for the urban coverage value. The effect of cloud coverage is also weighted and is averaged in with
 185 Equation 1 as

186

$$187 \quad Global Weighted Albedo = Average\{(Clouds Albedo) \times \% Coverage\} + (Earth Weighted Albedo) \quad (2)$$

188

189 The components of the model are flexible and only need to have reasonableness in known values and maintain
 190 relative consistency from 1950 to 2019 as they are held fixed. The important values are the variables of interest,
 191 urban coverage. In this way the WAASU model has been adjusted to the most commonly used global albedo 1950
 192 value of 30.03% shown in Table 5a. Then in 2019, using the extrapolated area coverage (see Sec.3.0) the area is
 193 amplified, the resulting model change to the global albedo is found as 29.98% for the Schneider nominal case
 194 (shown in Table 5b) and for the GRUMP worst case the albedo was similarly obtained as 29.82% for the
 195 conservative amplification factor. Other examples provided in Appendix B.

196

197 Although factors are held constant, since urban coverage increases in 2019, this increases the surface area of the
 198 Earth which realistically does occur with city growth of tall buildings having large solar heating areas as accounted

199 for by the amplification in the model. This new area, however small, requires some renormalization in the model of
 200 the Earth components in the WAASU model (see Appendix B). Renormalization then may introduce some slight
 201 error in the model. However, the model is sensitive to urban coverage changes but works well with renormalization.
 202 In Section 4.1, global warming estimates show proportionality to urban coverage demonstrating model consistency.
 203
 204

Table 5a: Albedo=0.3003, 1950

Table 5b : Albedo=0.2998, 2019

Surface	Enter	Enter	Weighted Albedo in % Results	Surface	Enter	Enter	Weighted Albedo in % Results
	% of Earth Area	Albedo (0-1)			% of Earth Area	Albedo (0-1)	
Water	71			Water	70.623		
Sea Ice	15	0.66	9.90	Sea Ice	14.92	0.66	9.85
Open Ocean	56	0.06	3.36	Open Ocean	55.703	0.06	3.34
Land	29.009			Land	29.3787		
Roads (0.04)	0.05	0.04	0.00	Roads (0.04)	0.0497	0.04	0.00
Urban Cov (0.12)	0.059	0.12	0.01	Urban Cov (0.12)	0.583	0.12	0.07
Forest (0.17)	3.5	0.17	0.60	Forest (0.17)	3.481	0.17	0.59
Forest (Snow)	4.9	0.81	3.97	Forest (Snow)	4.874	0.81	3.95
Grass lands (0.26)	3.8	0.26	0.99	Grass lands (0.26)	3.78	0.26	0.98
Grass Lands Snow	7	0.81	5.67	Grass Lands Snow	6.963	0.81	5.64
Desert (0.4)	9.7	0.4	3.88	Desert (0.4)	9.648	0.4	3.86
Sum % of Earth Area	100.009			Sum % of Earth Area	100.0017		
Weighted Earth			28.37	Weighted Earth			28.28
Clouds (0.47)	66.6	0.476	31.68	Clouds (0.47)	66.6	0.476	31.68
			Global Weighted Albedo in				Global Weighted Albedo in
Global=Average(Clouds & Weighted Earth) %			30.03	Global=Average(Clouds & Weighted Earth) %			29.98

205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213

4.1 WAASU Model Global Warming Estimates

From the above global WAASU model the estimates of the Earth’s power absorption and temperature are then straightforward using the fundamental equation

$$P_{Total} = 1361 \text{ W/m}^2 \{0.25 \times (1 - \text{Albedo})\} = \sigma T^4 \tag{3}$$

Table 5 Results of GW Temperature Budget Change With City Surface Areas and Albedos

Year	Urban Extent Global Area %	UHI Effective Global Surface Area %	Albedo Roads	Albedo Cities	Global Weighted Albedo	Temperature (no GH gases)*	UHI Radiative Forcing	Percent Of Global Warming
Nominal Case IPCC Schneider 2009 Study								
1950	0.059	0.059	0.04	0.12	30.03	-18.599	0	Par
2019	.188	0.583	0.04	0.12	29.98	-18.554	0.17 W/m ²	4.79%
2019	.188	1.166	0.04	0.12	29.93	-18.508	0.340 W/m ²	9.57%
What if	0.188	0.583	0.04	0.5	30.09	-18.654°C	-0.204 W/m ²	-5.75% (Cooler)
Worst Case GRUMP 2005 Study								
1950	0.316%	0.316	0.04	0.12	30.03	-18.599°C	0	Par
2019	0.952%	2.95	0.04	0.12	29.82	-18.408°C	0.715 W/m ²	20.1%
2019	0.952%	5.9	0.04	0.12	29.6	-18.201	1.463 W/m ²	41%
What if	0.952%	2.95%	0.04	0.5	30.37	-19.10°C	-1.16 W/m ²	-32.6% (Cooler)

214
 215

216 Results are compiled in Table 5. The table also includes “what if” estimates, if we could change urbanization to be
 217 more reflective with cool roofs. The values here are relative to the conservative footprint amplification values. The
 218 general results are summarized:

- 219
 220 Conservative Area Coverage:
- 221 • Nominal Schneider case from 1950 to 2019 is 0.045C (-18.554-(-0.18.599)) due to urban amplification
 - 222 coverage. This represents 4.79% (0.045C/0.95C) contribution to global warming
 - 223 • Worst GRUMP case from 1950 to 2019 is 0.191C (-18.408-(-0.18.599)) due to urban amplification
 - 224 coverage. This represents 20.1% (0.191C/0.95C) contribution to global warming
 - 225 • “What if” corrective action results using cool roofs shows that changing city albedos range from 5.75% to
 - 226 32.6% cooler for reducing global warming

- 227 Aggressive half-sphere dome area coverage:
- 228 • Nominal Schneider case from 1950 to 2019 is 0.009C (-18.508-(-0.18.599)) due to urban amplification
 - 229 coverage. This represents 9.57% (0.091C/0.95C) contribution to global warming
 - 230 • Worst GRUMP case from 1950 to 2019 is 0.398C (-18.201-(-0.18.599)) due to urban amplification
 - 231 coverage. This represents 41% (0.398C/0.95C) contribution to global warming

232
 233 We note that the global warming goes as the UHI footprint coverage as one might expect showing model
 234 consistency. For example, the Schneider nominal case, when the UHI effective surface area doubles, the percent of
 235 global warming approximately doubled. This shows the strength of the model and the ability of it to adapt with
 236 renormalization (see Appendix B).

237 238 **5. Conclusions and Suggestions**

239 In this paper we were able to estimate using UHI effect (with urban area) amplification coverage estimates with the
 240 aid of a Zhou et al. (2015) footprint study. These estimates inserted into our WAASU model found that between 4.8
 241 and 20% of global warming is related to UHI effect. We also noted that the effect on global warming was
 242 proportional to the UHI footprint coverage. This was noted since the amplification factors doubled using a half
 243 spherical coverage in the aggressive assessment; the model then found global warming results roughly also doubled
 244 from 9.47% to 41%. As area estimates and amplification factors are sensitive to the final results, it is clear refined
 245 estimates are needed. However, given what we feel are conservative results, the study still points to the need for
 246 albedo enhancements like cool roofs in cities and urban areas to help stop related global warming anomalies.

- 247
 248 Below we provide suggestions and corrective actions which include:
- 249 • Creating IPCC goals to include the need for albedo enhancements in existing UHIs and roads
 - 250 • A directive for future albedo design requirements of city and roads
 - 251 • Recommend an agency like NASA be tasked with finding applicable solutions to cool down UHIs.
 - 252 • Recommendation for cars to be more reflective. Here although world-wide cars likely do not embody much
 - 253 of the Earth’s area, recommending that all new manufactured cars be higher in reflectivity (e.g., silver or
 - 254 white) would help raise awareness of this issue similar to electric cars that help improve CO2 emissions

255
 256 *We stress again that the IPCC is the main governing force and the only agency capable of promoting such albedo*
 257 *changes for cities and roads. Therefore, whether it is just for UHI known health reasons or due to studies similar to*
 258 *ours, we strongly urge the IPCC to set albedo goals and include such goals in their global meetings.*

259
 260 **Appendix A** Growth Rates and Natural Aggregates Information

261 Below is a plot of the world population growth rate that varies from about 2.1 to 1.1. This is used to make growth
 262 rate estimate of urban coverage. We note that natural aggregate used to build cities and roads are reasonably
 263 correlated to population growth in Figure A2a. Also of interest (Fig. A2b) is the fact that one can see some
 264 correlation to global warming with the use of natural aggregates.




Figure A1 Population growth rate by year from 1960 to 2018, World Bank, 2018




Figure A2 a) Natural aggregates correlated to U.S. Population Growth (USGS 1900-2006) b) Natural aggregates correlated to global warming (NASA 2020)

Appendix B: Albedo Model Examples Similar to Section 4 & Renormalization Information

Table B1 shows Albedo Model with Albedo of 29.93% results with Urban Cov of 1.166% (Schneider case) renormalized to 1.1531 along with other renormalized results. Table B2 showing Albedo results of 29.82% with Urban Cov. 2.95% (GRUMP case) renormalized to 2.875% along with renormalized results. We see in Table 5 there is good agreement with the albedo model's ability to adapt with renormalization as global warming due to UHI effect is proportional to the urban coverage as one might expect. That is, the albedo model is relative to global solar normalized area.

Table B1 Albedo results 29.93%

Surface	Enter % of Earth Area	Enter Albedo (0-1)	Weighted Albedo in % Results
Water	70.216		
Sea Ice	14.834	0.66	9.79
Open Ocean	55.382	0.06	3.32
Land	29.78395		
Roads (0.04)	0.04945	0.04	0.00
Urban Cov (0.12)	1.1531	0.12	0.14
Forest (0.17)	3.4614	0.17	0.59
Forest (Snow)	4.846	0.81	3.93
Grass lands (0.26)	3.758	0.26	0.98
Grass Lands Snow	6.923	0.81	5.61
Desert (0.4)	9.593	0.4	3.84
Sum % of Earth Area	99.99995		
Weighted Earth			28.19
Clouds (0.47)	66.6	0.476	31.68
			Global Weighted Albedo in
Global=Average(Clouds & Weighted Earth) %			29.93

Table B2 Albedo Results 29.82%

Surface	Enter % of Earth Area	Enter Albedo (0-1)	Weighted Albedo in % Results
Water	69.2		
Sea Ice	14.62	0.66	9.65
Open Ocean	54.58	0.06	3.27
Land	30.801		
Roads (0.04)	0.049	0.04	0.00
Urban Cov (0.12)	2.875	0.12	0.35
Forest (0.17)	3.22	0.17	0.55
Forest (Snow)	4.87	0.81	3.94
Grass lands (0.26)	3.61	0.26	0.94
Grass Lands Snow	6.82	0.81	5.52
Desert (0.4)	9.357	0.4	3.74
Sum % of Earth Area	100.001		
Weighted Earth			27.97
Clouds (0.47)	66.6	0.476	31.68
			Global Weighted Albedo in
Global=Average(Clouds & Weighted Earth) %			29.82

Renormalization is done as follows:

- 284 1. Model starts with 1950 Table 5a albedo 30.03%, then 2019 Urban Coverage area is entered
 285 2. For example, if the new Urban area is 1.116% larger, now the “Sum of % of Earth Area” will be
 286 101.116% in 2019
 287 3. All areas are renormalized to 101.116%. For example, Ice at 15% in 1950 becomes
 288 $15\% \times (100/101.116) = 14.834\%$
- 289 **4. References**
- 290 5. Barr J. M., 2019 The Economics of Skyscraper Height (Part IV): Construction Costs Around the
 291 World, <https://buildingtheskyline.org/skyscraper-height-iv/>
 292 6. Basara J. ,P. Hall Jr. , A.Schroeder , B.Illston ,K.Nemunaitis 2008, Diurnal cycle of the Oklahoma City
 293 urban heat island, *J. of Geophysical Research*
 294 7. Cao C.X. , Zhao J., P. Gong, G. R. MA, D.M. Bao, K.Tian, Wetland changes and droughts in
 295 southwestern China, *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, Oct 2011,
 296 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19475705.2011.588253>
 297 8. Cormack L. 2015 Where does all the stormwater go after the Sydney weather clears? The Sydney
 298 Morning Herald, [https://www.smh.com.au/environment/where-does-all-the-stormwater-go-after-the-](https://www.smh.com.au/environment/where-does-all-the-stormwater-go-after-the-sydney-weather-clears-20150430-1mx4ep.html)
 299 [sydney-weather-clears-20150430-1mx4ep.html](https://www.smh.com.au/environment/where-does-all-the-stormwater-go-after-the-sydney-weather-clears-20150430-1mx4ep.html)
 300 9. Feddema, J. J., K. W. Oleson, G. B. Bonan, L. O. Mearns, L. E. Buja, G. A. Meehl, and W. M.
 301 Washington (2005), The importance of land-cover change in simulating future climates, *Science*, **310**,
 302 1674– 1678, doi:10.1126/science.1118160
 303 10. Galka M. 2016, Half the World Lives on 1% of Its Land, Mapped,
 304 <https://www.citylab.com/equity/2016/01/half-earth-world-population-land-map/422748/>, , (2016
 305 publication on 2000 data set, <http://metrocosm.com/world-population-split-in-half-map/>
 306 11. Global Rural Urban Mapping Project (GRUMP) 2005, Columbia University Socioeconomic Data and
 307 Applications Center, Gridded Population of the World and the Global Rural-Urban Mapping
 308 Project (GRUMP).
 309 12. Hirshi M. ,Seneviratne S. , V. Alexandrov, F. Boberg, C. Boroneant, O. Christensen, H. Formayer, B.
 310 Orłowsky & P. Stepanek, Observational evidence for soil-moisture impact on hot extremes in Europe,
 311 *Nature Geoscience* 4, 17-21 (2011)
 312 13. Huang Q. , Lu Y. 2015 Effect of Urban Heat Island on Climate Warming in the Yangtze River Delta
 313 Urban Agglomeration in China, *Intern. J. of Environmental Research and Public Health* 12 (8): 8773
 314 14. McKittrick R. and Michaels J. 2004. A Test of Corrections for Extraneous Signals in Gridded Surface
 315 Temperature Data, *Climate Research*
 316 15. McKittrick R., Michaels P. 2007 Quantifying the influence of anthropogenic surface processes and
 317 inhomogeneities on gridded global climate data, *J. of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*
 318 16. McKittrick Website Describing controversy: [https://www.rossmckittrick.com/temperature-data-](https://www.rossmckittrick.com/temperature-data-quality.html)
 319 [quality.html](https://www.rossmckittrick.com/temperature-data-quality.html)
 320 17. NASA 1900-2006 updated, 2020 <https://climate.nasa.gov/vital-signs/global-temperature/>
 321 18. NASA 2000, Gridded population of the world, , [https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/set/gpw-v3-](https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/set/gpw-v3-population-count/data-download)
 322 [population-count/data-download](https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/set/gpw-v3-population-count/data-download)
 323 19. Ren, G.; Chu, Z.; Chen, Z.; Ren, Y. **2007** Implications of temporal change in urban heat island
 324 intensity observed at Beijing and Wuhan stations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* , **34**,
 325 L05711,doi:10.1029/2006GL027927.
 326 20. Schmidt G. A. 2009 Spurious correlations between recent warming and indices of local economic
 327 activity, *Int. J. of Climatology*
 328 21. Schneider,A., M. Friedl, and D. Potere, 2009:A new map of global urban extent from MODIS satellite
 329 data. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4(4), 044003, doi:10.1088/ 1748-9326/4/4/044003
 330 22. Satterthwaite D.E., F. Aragón-Durand, J. Corfee-Morlot, R.B.R. Kiunsi, M. Pelling, D.C. Roberts, and
 331 W. Solecki, 2014: Urban areas. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part*
 332 *A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of*
 333 *the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*
 334 23. Stone B. 2009 Land use as climate change mitigation, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 43(24), 9052– 9056,
 335 doi:10.1021/es902150g
 336 24. US Population Growth 1900-2006, u-s-history.com/pages/h980.html
 337 25. USGS 1900-2006, Materials in Use in U.S. Interstate Highways,
 338 <https://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2006/3127/2006-3127.pdf>
 339 26. World Bank, 2018 population growth rate, worldbank.org
 340 27. Yang, X.; Hou, Y.; Chen, B. 2011 Observed surface warming induced by urbanization in east China.
 341 *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos*, 116, doi:10.1029/2010JD015452.
 342 28. Zhang, X., Friedl, M. A., Schaaf, C. B., Strahler, A. H. & Schneider, A. 2004 The footprint of urban
 343 climates on vegetation phenology. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31**, L12209
 344 29. Zhao L, Lee X, Smith RB, Oleson K, Strong 2014, contributions of local background climate to urban
 345 heat islands, *Nature*. 10;511(7508):216-9. doi: 10.1038/nature13462

346 30. Zhou D. , Zhao S. , L. Zhang, G Sun and Y. Liu, 2015, The footprint of urban heat island effect in
347 China, *Scientific Reports*. 5: 11160
348 **31.** Zhou Y. , SmithS. , Zhao K. , M. Imhoff, A. Thomson, B. Lamberty,G. Asrar, X. Zhang, C. He and C.
349 Elvidge, A global map of urban extent from nightlights, *Env. Research Letters*, 10 (2015), (study uses
350 a 2000 data set).
351 32.
~~352~~
~~353~~
354