

On Geoengineering and Implementing an Albedo Solution with Urban Heat Islands Global Warming and Cooling Estimates

Key Words: Albedo Solution, Global Warming Solution, Global Warming Re-radiation Model, Albedo Modeling, Hotspot Mitigation, UHI Global Warming Estimates

Abstract

Surface albedo geoengineering is vital in Global Warming (GW) as results can reverse trends and reduce the probability of a tipping point. Although an albedo solution is reasonably practical, work in this area appears stagnant and even implementing Urban Heat Island (UHI) cool roofs on a global level has not yet been widely adopted. This paper provides basic modeling and motivation by illustrating the potential impact of reverse forcing. We provide insights into “Earthly areas” that might be utilized to increase the opportunity for reducing warming. Modeling shows that by solar geoengineering select hotspots with aspects like large heat capacities, such as UHIs, and possibly mountain regions, the effective area could be roughly 11 times smaller than nominal non-hotspot regions in influencing global warming. We find that between 0.2% and 1% of the Earth would require modification to resolve most of global warming. This represents about a 1.5% global albedo change. Results are highly dependent on modeling aspects like heat capacity, irradiance, and albedo changes of the area selected. The versatile model was also used to provide UHIs global warming and cooling estimates illustrating their importance.

1.0 Introduction

When we consider climate change solutions, in the race against time, it is advantageous to look at the practical aspects of implementing an albedo solution. Given the slow progress reported with greenhouse gas reduction, and the continual increase in the Earth’s average yearly temperature, it is important to revisit the alternate albedo solution. Unlike geoengineering solutions, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction is highly difficult to result in reversing climate change, especially with reports on large desertification, deforestation occurring [1] and the current rapid warming in the arctic areas. An albedo solution is likely urgently needed.

Implementation is a key focus on geoengineering an albedo surface solution. There have been a number of geoengineering resolutions proposed [2-4] that are either atmospheric or surface-based. In this study, we focus on targeting surface regions and present practical engineering formulas and values.

The target areas that have the highest impacts are likely ones with:

- high solar irradiance
- large heat capacities
- low albedo
- ability to amplify nature’s albedo

To clarify the last target area, we infer that cooling down certain areas may cause natural compounding albedo changes to occur, such as increases in snowfall and ice formations. We can term hotspot regions as Solar Amplified Areas (SAA) relative to Nominal Land Albedo (NLA) areas (approximately 25% albedo, see Sec. 5.2).

Although the task is highly challenging, it is easier to do geoengineering of surface reflectivity compared with building cities. Often, UHIs and impermeable surfaces are haphazardly constructed in terms of solar absorption considerations. While numerous authors [5-17] have found probable significance that UHIs with their coverage contribute to GW (see supportive results in Section 5.2), the only motivated work in this area is a result of health concerns. Therefore, albedo cool roof solutions (where applicable) and other UHI mitigations have not received adequate attention compared to GHG efforts. This oversight is unfortunate and makes the business of an albedo solar solution and its financing less desirable. It is important that not just scientists understand the importance of the albedo solution. There is a lack of knowledge when it comes to the word albedo and its potential contribution. We cannot expect architects, road engineers, car designers, city planners, politicians and so forth, to incorporate proper environmental considerations and solutions, if these concepts are not widely understood. Therefore, a key strategy employed in this study is to demonstrate the advantages, feasibility and importance of cooling solar amplified areas made by man (and possibly nature). We provide simple geoengineering equations that can aid designers. We need to recognize that the whole is equal to the sum of the parts in global warming; humankind’s resolve to greenhouse gas and albedo improvements, both need to be addressed for a realistic solution.

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119

2. Outline for Geoengineering and Implementing an Albedo Solution

We present a brief outline to overview and clarify our modeling objectives and motivate interests.

Section 3: In this section we first identify a key Planck-albedo parameter

$$\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T} \approx 1W / m^2 / \Delta \% \alpha \quad (1)$$

The parameter multiplied by $\% \Delta \alpha$ (percent albedo change) converts to ΔP_T , the reverse forcing from the target area, where the total reverse forcing $\Delta P_{Rev_S}(\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T}, \% \Delta \alpha, \Delta P_T)$ is described

Section 4: In this section an Albedo model is developed to use the ΔP_T goal where

$$\Delta P_T = \frac{A_T}{A_E} \frac{S_o}{4} 0.33 H_{T-N} [(\alpha'_T - \alpha_T)] \quad (2)$$

Here $S_o=1360W/m^2$, the factor, H_{T-N} is the hotspot irradiance sensible heat storage potential. This is a function of the heat capacity, mass, temperature storage, and solar irradiance by comparison to a nominal area (see Appendix B and C). Here α_T is the initial target albedo, α'_T is the modified target albedo, and 0.33 is the estimate fraction of time the target area is not covered by clouds. Then the final goal relative to fraction of Earth's area, A_E , needing modification is

- A_T / A_E , where A_T is the target area

Section 5: In this section, we provide examples on implementation of these models for different target areas including UHIs yielding their warming and cooling estimates.

Therefore, our task is to essentially find reasonable values for ΔP_{Rev_S} , f_2 , H_{T-N} , $\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T}$, A_F , ΔP_T , $\% \Delta \alpha$, in order to estimate a geoengineering GW solution by modifying the select fractional target area A_T/A_E of the Earth.

3.0 Geoengineering a Reverse Forcing Solution

In this section, we present a simple solar geoengineering formula needed for a reverse forcing estimates due to a percent global albedo change from a target area given by

$$\Delta P_{Rev_S} = -\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T} \% \Delta \alpha (1 + f_Y) A_F = -\Delta P_T (1 + f_Y) A_F \quad (3)$$

Here we define

ΔP_{Rev_S} is the reverse power per unit area change

$\% \Delta \alpha$ is the percent global albedo change due to modification of a target area

$\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T}$ = Planck-albedo parameter, 1Watt/m²/% Δ Albedo

$1+f_Y$ = the albedo-GHG re-radiation parameter with f_Y about 0.63 for year $Y=2019$ (see Appendix A)

A_F is an estimate of the anticipated GW feedback amplification reduction factor (Appendix A.4)

$\Delta P_T = \gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T} \% \Delta \alpha$ is the reverse forcing change from the target area T

The Planck-albedo parameter is so named as it relates to blackbody (P_α) absorption. Its value can be estimated when considering an albedo change from two different time periods, having a global albedo change from α_1 to α_2 or we can simplify it as follows [5]

$$\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha} = \frac{(\Delta E_o)_\alpha}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} \frac{1}{100} = \frac{E_o (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} \frac{1}{100} = E_o \alpha_1 / 100 \approx 1W / m^2 / \% \Delta \text{albedo} \quad (4)$$

Here the incoming solar radiation at the top of the atmosphere is $E_o=1360W/m^2/4=340W/m^2$ and when α_1 is 0.294118, the value is $1.000W/m^2/\Delta \% \text{albedo}$. We note the value 29.4118% ($100W/m^2/340W/m^2$) and E_o are given in AR5 [18] in their energy budget diagram.

As an example, in Appendix A, an analysis of the warming was estimated from 1950 to 2019, and results are presented in Table A-1. The change in the long wavelength radiation ΔP_α is estimated as $0.15352W/m^2$ due to an albedo percent change of 0.15% (from 1950 to 2019) so that

120
121
$$\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha} = \Delta P_{\alpha} / \% \Delta \text{albedo} = 1.023 W / m^2 / \Delta \% \text{albedo} \quad (5)$$

122
123 This parameter can provide a relatively simple and reasonable estimate of the reverse forcing that occurs due to a
124 global percent albedo change from a target area modification of the Earth. Then the corresponding estimated power
125 reduction ΔP_T in long wavelength radiation due to an albedo target area reverse forcing is

126
127
$$\Delta P_T = -\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T} \% \Delta \alpha \quad (6)$$

128
129 However, there is also a reduction in the re-radiation from GHG. This factor is $1+f_Y$. Here f_Y is the fraction of re-
130 radiation that occurs from GHG where Y represents the estimated value for that year. This value can reasonably be
131 assessed and its value found in Appendix A is $f_Y=f_{2019} \approx 0.6276$ for 2019.

132
133 Lastly we have included an allowance for anticipated feedback amplification reduction denoted as A_F (see example
134 in the next Section),

135
136 The effect of the target change results can be quantified as

137
138
$$\text{Effect} = -\frac{\Delta P_{\text{Rev}_S}}{\Delta P_{\text{Total_Feedback_amp}}} \quad (7)$$

139
140 Here $\Delta P_{\text{Total+Feedback_amp}}$ is the total forcing with feedback amplification that has occurred.

141 3.1 Example of a Reverse Forcing Goal

142
143 In this section, we consider a goal of 1.5% geoengineering albedo change, with $f_v=0.6276$ and a decrease in water-
144 vapor climate feedback anticipated, we might use a value of $A_F \approx 2.0$ [20]. According to Appendix A, Eq. A-12 this is
145 estimated as 2.022. Then from Eq. 3

146
147
148
$$\Delta P_{\text{Rev}_S} = -1 W/m^2 / \% \times 1.5\% \times (1+f_2) \times 2.022 = -1.5 W/m^2 \times (1+0.6276) \times 2.022 = -4.94 \text{ Watt}/m^2 \quad (8)$$

149
150 This estimate can be compared with the re-radiation model results in Table A-1 showing a forcing with feedback
151 amplification yield $5.12 W/m^2$ since 1950. This would indicate a significant resolution to the current warming trend
152 since 1950, where $\Delta T_s=0.95^\circ K$ that occurred by the end of 2019 (see Eq. A-13). Then the relative effect from Eq. 7
153 is

154
155
$$\text{Effect} = \frac{4.94 W / m^2}{5.12 W / m^2} = 96.4\% \quad (9)$$

156
157 for this particular geoengineering solution (Table A-1). The temperature reduction can be estimated from Eq. 9 as

158
159
$$\Delta T_{\text{Rev}_S} = -0.964 \times \Delta T_s = -0.926^\circ K \quad (10)$$

160
161 As one might suspect, a 1.5% albedo change requires a lot of modified area. Feasibility is discussed in the rest of
162 this paper. We note a number of solar geoengineering solutions have been proposed [2-4].

163 4.0 Converting the Reverse Forcing Goal to a Target Area

164
165 We can write the short wavelength solar absorption as

166
167
168
$$P = \frac{Q}{A} = \frac{S_o}{4} \sum_i \frac{A'_i}{A_E} (1-\alpha_i) + \frac{S_o}{4} H_{T-N} \frac{A'_T}{A_E} (1-\alpha_T) + \frac{S_o}{4} \frac{A_C}{A_E} (1-\alpha_C) \quad (11)$$

169
170 Here A'_i is the i^{th} effective area having an albedo α_i , $S_o=1360 W/m^2$ and A_E is the surface area of the Earth and A_C is
171 effective cloud coverage. We consider a change to a hotspot target effective area A_T with albedo α_T . In addition,
172 because we select a particularly problematic solar absorbing target compared to a nominal area (N), it has hotspot
173 irradiance sensible heat storage potential H_{T-N} , a function of the heat capacity, mass, temperature storage, and solar
174 irradiance. Essentially this has the effect of amplifying the target area. H_{T-N} is described and enumerated in
175 Appendix B and C. As an example, many UHIs, due to their large heat capacity act like large heat sink. This is just

176 one of the many reasons that UHI are often hotter at night than during the day resulting from solar energy stored up
177 during the daytime (see Appendix C).

178
179 The overall equation prior to changing the albedo is subject to the area constraint

$$181 \quad A_E = A_{EU} + A_{EC} = \left(\sum_i A_i' + A_T' \right) + A_C = 0.33 \left(\sum_i A_i + A_T \right) + A_C \quad (12)$$

182 and

$$183 \quad A_{EU} = 0.33 \left(\sum_i A_i + A_T \right), \quad A_{EC} = A_C \quad (13)$$

184
185 Here we have denoted the portion of the Earth covered from direct sunlight by clouds as $A_{EC}=A_C= 67\%A_E$ [21].
186 Then the uncovered portion of the Earth is $A_{EU}=33\%A_E$. This is likely conservative as clouds do let some sunlight
187 through. However, that means that roughly on average only 33% of the time areas on the Earth receive direct sun
188 during daylight hours.

189
190 We now alter the target albedo α_T to α_T' of a SAA and insert the cloud factor so that

$$192 \quad P' = \frac{Q'}{A} = \frac{S_o}{4} \sum_i \frac{0.33A_i}{A_E} (1-\alpha_i) + \frac{S_o}{4} \frac{0.33A_T}{A_E} H_{T-N} (1-\alpha_T') + \frac{S_o}{4} \frac{A_C}{A_E} (1-\alpha_C) \quad (14)$$

193
194 The change in heat absorbed is just a function of the target modification where from Eq. 14

$$196 \quad \left(dP_T \right)_\alpha = \frac{S_o}{4} \frac{0.33A_T H_{T-N}}{A_E} (-d\alpha_T) \quad (15)$$

197
198 where the subscript α indicates all other Earth albedo components are held constant. Using the example goal of the
199 target area $\Delta P_T = -1.5W/m^2$ in Eq. 3 and 8, Equation 15 is just

$$201 \quad \Delta P_T = P - P' = -\frac{S_o}{4} \frac{0.33A_T H_{T-N}}{A_E} [(\alpha_T' - \alpha_T)] = -1.5W / m^2 \quad (16)$$

202
203 However, the same results can be obtained by changing the albedo of a nominal area; so in this case $H_{T-N}=1$ (see
204 Appendix B). The equivalent change for the NLA is

$$206 \quad \Delta P_{T-N} = -\frac{S_o}{4} \frac{0.33A_N}{A_E} \{(\alpha_N' - \alpha_N)\} = -1.5W / m^2 \quad (17)$$

207 5.0 Target Area Estimates

208
209 Comparing the target SAA to the NLA (Eq. 16 and 17) we have

$$211 \quad \frac{\Delta P_T}{\Delta P_{T-N}} \approx \frac{A_T H_{T-N} [(\alpha_T' - \alpha_T)]}{A_N [(\alpha_N' - \alpha_N)]} = 1 \quad (18)$$

212
213 As an example, assume $H_{T-N} \approx 9$ (see Appendix B), $\alpha_N=0.25$ (see Sec. 5.2), $\alpha_T=0.12$ [22], and for $\alpha_N'=\alpha_T'=0.9$, we
214 obtain

$$215 \quad \frac{A_N}{A_T} = \frac{H_{T-N} [(\alpha_T' - \alpha_T)]}{[(\alpha_N' - \alpha_N)]} = \frac{9[(0.9 - 0.12)]}{[(0.9 - 0.25)]} = 10.8 \quad (19)$$

216
217 This indicates that the nominal area would have to be about 11 times larger than the target area for equivalent
218 results.

219

220 In assessing our goal, we have from Eq. 16

$$221 \Delta P_T = \frac{S_o}{4} \frac{0.33 A_T H_{T-N}}{A_E} [(\alpha'_T - \alpha_T)] = -1.5W / m^2 \quad (20)$$

223 For $H_{T-N}=1$, $\alpha'_T=0.9$, and $\alpha_T=0.12$ then

$$226 \Delta P_T = -340 \frac{A_T}{A_E} [0.78] x 0.33 = -1.5W / m^2 \quad (21)$$

227 and

$$228 \frac{A_T}{A_E} = 1.71\% \text{ of Earth} \quad (22)$$

229 For $H_{T-N}=10$, $\alpha'_T=0.9$, and $\alpha_T=0.12$ then

$$232 \frac{A_T}{A_E} = 0.171\% \text{ of Earth} \quad (23)$$

233 Recall that the goal for a $1.5W/m^2$ corresponded to a 1.5% albedo change (see Sec. 3.1). We can check this results
234 for $A_T/A=1.71\%$ when $H_{T-N}=1$, using a related expression to Eq. 20. This is given by

$$237 \Delta \alpha\% = 0.33 \frac{A_T}{A_E} \frac{[(\alpha'_T - \alpha_T)]}{\alpha} = 0.33(1.71\%) \frac{[(0.9 - 0.12)]}{0.294118} = 1.5\% \quad (24)$$

238 as expected where the global albedo is taken as $\alpha=0.294118$ which is indicated in AR5's energy budget figure [18].

241 5.1 Cooling Estimates Compared to Urban Heat Island Areas

242 Since UHI are likely good target areas, we can compare these results to the total global urbanized area. Such
243 estimates of urbanization unfortunately vary widely partly due to the confusing definition of what is urban.
244 However, two studies are of interest. A Schneider study [23] on 2000 data estimated that 0.148% of the Earth was
245 covered by UHI and the associated surrounding urban areas. Due to city growth, this extrapolates to 0.188% [5] in
246 2019. Similarly, another study from GRUMP [24] found global urbanization with a larger value in 2000 of 0.783%
247 that extrapolates to 0.953% [5] of the Earth's area in 2019. These extrapolations are based on an average yearly
248 urbanization growth rates between 1.3% and 1.6% [5]. It is interesting that the IPCC (Satterthwaite et. al. [25]) AR5
249 report references this Schneider et al. [23] results in urban coverage. Lastly, note that UHIs have their own hotspot
250 amplification factors assessed in Appendix C [5] with two estimates provided of 3.1 and 8.4. These are listed in
251 Table 2 for H_{T-N} . Therefore, compared to these 2019 estimates for urban heat island and surrounding areas, the
252 required area changes for different H_{T-N} values (discussed in Appendix C) are summarized in Table 2.

253
254
255 **Table 2** Cooling required areas relative to UHI areas

H_{T-N}	A_T/A (% of Earth)	Schneider Factor (A_T/A) /0.188%	GRUMP Factor (A_T/A) / 0.953
	$\alpha'_T = 0.9$ ($\alpha'_T = 0.5$)	$\alpha'_T = 0.9$ ($\alpha'_T = 0.5$)	$\alpha'_T = 0.9$ ($\alpha'_T = 0.5$)
1	1.714 (3.52)	9.12 (18.7)	1.80 (3.69)
3.1	0.553 (1.13)	2.94 (6.03)	0.58 (1.19)
8.4	0.204 (0.419)	1.08 (2.23)	0.21 (0.44)
9	0.190 (0.39)	1.01 (2.08)	0.20 (0.41)

* A_T/A represent 96% of the solution (see Sec. 5.1)

256 Table 2 results are highly dependent on target albedo change and H_{T-N} which is overviewed in Appendix B and C.
257 Results in Column 2 (for $H_{T-N}>1$) suggest that 0.2% to 1.1% of the Earth would require modification to resolve 96%
258 of global warming depending on the target values for alpha and H_{T-N} . This is roughly a factor of 1 to 6 times the

261 Schneider's UHI size estimate. It is important to develop better estimates for both H_{T-N} and urbanization sizes then
 262 estimated here. Other important factors may exist such as hydro-hotspots.

263

- 264 • UHI surfaces create hydro-hotspots [26] which may contribute to higher values of H_{T-N} . A hydro-hotspot is
 265 a solar hot surface that creates moisture in the presence of precipitation. Such surfaces create excess
 266 moisture in the atmosphere promoting a local greenhouse effect. For example, Zhao et al. [28] observed
 267 that UHI temperatures increase in daytime ΔT by 3.0°C in humid climates but decreasing ΔT by 1.5°C in
 268 dry climates. Therefore, UHI in humid climates could be prioritized.

269

270 We see that H_{T-N} is a highly complex factor for UHIs. We note that the 0.12 albedo value applies to UHI [22], may
 271 be a good upper value when looking for hotspot targets. The albedo and two H_{T-N} values cited here have been
 272 studied by the author [5]. These assessments for H_{T-N} applicable to UHIs are also provided to aid the reader in
 273 Appendix C. Results in Table 2 illustrate feasibility and the probable geoengineering challenges.

274

275 A worldwide effort would provide motivation from a number of key benefits; resolving much of global warming,
 276 providing assurance against a tipping point, and local health benefits by cooling off cities. UHIs pose a number of
 277 challenges in trying to cool off their areas. The Schneider results in Row 2 and 3 indicate that the potential area
 278 needed may be 2.2-6 times their current size while the GRUMP results are a factor of about 5 smaller. Therefore, if
 279 the Schneider estimate was proven to be the most accurate, supplementary target areas would be required to reach
 280 the 96% objective. Note in these estimates we used the target albedo goal of $\alpha_T'=0.5$, as it is unrealistic to realize an
 281 UHI albedo goal of 0.9 due to their complex nature.

282

283 Generally, UHIs meet a lot of the requirements for good targets having high heat capacity with large hotspot areas
 284 and massive sensible heat storage. One helpful aspect to note is that cool roof, cool building and street
 285 implementations also allows for more stable albedo maintenance over time compared to other areas like mountain
 286 regions. However, the complex nature of cities also makes it highly challenging.

287

288 *5.2 Warming Estimates Due to Urban Heat Islands*

289

290 We can use this same model to estimate the global warming contributions due to UHIs. In this case, instead of
 291 $\alpha_T'=0.9$ or 0.5 , we evaluate by restoring the UHIs to their original estimated albedo value of $\alpha_T'=0.25$ (pre-UHI era).
 292 This albedo value is based on a study by He et al. [29] which found that land albedo varies from 0.1 to 0.4 with an
 293 average of 0.25. Then using the H_{T-N} values in Section 5.1 (also see Appendix C), we estimate the percent of the
 294 Earth needed to obtain a 96% solution and compare results to the known UHI coverage areas.

295

296 For $H_{T-N}=3.1$, $\alpha_T'=0.25$, and $\alpha_T=0.12$ then from Eq. 20

297

$$298 \Delta P_T = -340W / m^2 \frac{A_T}{A_E} x 3.1x[(0.25 - 0.12)]x0.33 = -1.5W / m^2 \quad (25)$$

299 and

$$300 \frac{A_T}{A_E} = 3.31\% \quad (26)$$

301

302 of the Earth. Similarly for $H_{T-N}=8.4$, $\alpha_T'=0.25$, and $\alpha_T=0.12$ then

303

$$304 \frac{A_T}{A_E} = 1.22 \% \text{ of Earth} \quad (27)$$

305 Table 3 summarized the warming trend results. Results in Column 5 and 6 are reasonably comparable to Feinberg
 306 2020 [5] (finding between 5% and 44% of GW could be due to UHIs and their coverage). This model shows that
 307 between 6% and 81% of global warming could be due to UHIs and their coverage. Note that this is fairly
 308 independent of the GHG parameter f_2 compared with results if f_1 were used we would see very little difference. This
 309 indicates the relative possible importance of UHIs. We note these large variations are mainly due to the difficulty in
 310 estimating H_{T-N} and a knowledge of UHI area coverages (i.e., Schneider vs. GRUMP study). However, the model
 311 provides a reasonable way to make estimates which can be further refined once better values are known.

312

Table 3 UHI Warming estimates

H_{T-N}	A_T/A (% of Earth)	Schneider Factor (A_T/A)/0.188% (Conservative)	GRUMP Factor (A_T/A)/ 0.953	GW% 1/Schneider Factor / 0.964*	GW% 1/GRUMP Factor / 0.964*
3.1	3.31	17.61	3.47	6	30
8.4	1.22	6.49	1.28	16	81

313

* A_T/A GW represent 96.4% of the solution (see Sec. 3.1), and are adjusted to 100% in Column 5 & 6

314

315 Furthermore, we note the cooling potential in Table 2 is about a factor of 3 to 6 times compared to the warming
316 shown in Table 3. For example in Table 2 and 3, the area warming to cooling ratio 17.6/2.94 yields an effective
317 potential factor of 6 for $\alpha'_T=0.9$, and a factor of 2.9 (17.6/6.03) for $\alpha'_T=0.5$. As stated above, obtaining the full
318 cooling potential ($\alpha'_T=0.9$) for UHIs and their impermeable surfaces is likely unobtainable due to the complex
319 nature of cities therefore the value $\alpha'_T=0.5$ is a better guide.

320

321 5.3 Some Hotspot Target Areas

322

323 There are many hotspots that provide likely target areas. Deserts would be highly difficult to maintain any albedo
324 change. However, mountains, UHI cool roofs in cities, and impermeable surface such as roads might be logical
325 target areas. Some interesting known hotspots include

326

- 327 • Flaming Mountains, China
- 328 • Bangkok, Thailand (planet's hottest city)
- 329 • Death Valley California
- 330 • Titat Zvi, Israel
- 331 • Badlands of Australia
- 332 • Urban Heat Islands & all Impermeable surfaces, humid cities
- 333 • Oceans [2]

334

335 We note that mountain areas (while certainly environmentally unfriendly) in cool regions should not be excluded;
336 natural compounding albedo effects may occur from increases in snow-fall and ice formations. Albedo changes
337 could be performed in summer months and then in winter months compounding effects assessed.

338

339 As a summary, Equations 3 and 20 can be combined to provide a resulting solar geoengineering equation for reverse
340 forcing obtained in this study where

341

$$342 \quad \Delta P_{Rev_S} = -\gamma_{\% \Delta \alpha \Delta T} \% \Delta \alpha (1+f) A_R = - \left\{ \frac{S_o}{4} 0.33 H_{T-N} \frac{A_T}{A_E} [(\alpha'_T - \alpha_T)] \right\} (1+f) A_R \quad (28)$$

343

344 with suggested values $H_{T-N}=6$, $\alpha'_T=0.5-0.9$, $\alpha_T=0.12$, $\Delta P_{Rev_S}=4.9W/m^2$, and $f=0.63$.

345

346 6. Conclusions

347

348 The albedo solution is vital in mitigating global warming and urgently needed. Today, technology has numerous
349 advances that include improvements in materials, drone capability, and artificial intelligence, which could be helpful
350 in geoengineering surfaces. Humankind has addressed many technological challenges successfully. It is not illogical
351 to consider a global albedo solution while time permits before a potential tipping point.

352

353 In this paper we have provided a number of important estimates that include:

354

- 355 • A reverse forcing albedo reduction goal of $-1.5W/m^2$ that can result in $-4.9W/m^2$ of reverse forcing with
356 feedback representing a 96% global warming solution.
- 357 • The target area required is about 0.2% to 1% (Table 2) of the Earth, if proper hotspots are cooled with
358 highly reflective surfaces
- 359 • Changing the albedo has a 2.02 x 1.63 benefit factor due to reduction in feedback and less GHG re-
360 radiation, respectively

- 361 • Selecting proper hotspots can reduce the required target area by an estimated factor of 11 compared to non-
- 362 hotspots areas. Likely target areas may include problematic hotspots such as UHIs and impermeable
- 363 surfaces. While certainly environmentally unfriendly, we may have to consider mountains regions and
- 364 ocean areas [2]
- 365 • The global cooling potential of UHIs is about a factor of three to six times higher than their warming
- 366 contribution if highly reflective surfaces can be realized
- 367 • UHIs and their coverage likely contribute significantly to global warming. This is in agreement with other
- 368 studies [5-17]. This suggests a reasonable risk exists that major greenhouse gas reduction goals [30], may
- 369 fall short of global warming mitigation expectations
- 370 • UHI estimates are highly dependent on H_{T-N} and urbanization estimates
- 371 • UHI in humid climates should be prioritized.

372
373 Finally, we suggest:

- 374
- 375 • Tasking agencies worldwide, such as NASA, to work full time on solar geoengineering, which at this late
- 376 time should be one of our highest priorities
- 377 • Worldwide albedo guidelines for both UHIs and impermeable surfaces similar to on-going CO₂ efforts
- 378 • Worldwide guidelines for future albedo design considerations of cities
- 379 • Changing impermeable surfaces of buildings, roads, sidewalks, driveways, parking lots, industrial areas
- 380 such as airports, distribution centers, and roof tops to reflective surfaces. We note that their cooling
- 381 potential can be much larger compared to their warming contribution (that trap heat), and a full review
- 382 should be performed
- 383 • Manufacturing cars to be more reflective including reducing their internal solar heating. Although,
- 384 worldwide cool vehicles (e.g., silver or white) may not contribute significantly to global warming
- 385 mitigation, recommending them could. It would help raise badly needed albedo awareness similar to
- 386 electric automobiles that help improve CO₂ emissions. It could increase interest in similar projects thereby
- 387 promoting other related changes by city planners and architects for cool roofs, reflective building designs,
- 388 and road engineers for pavement color changes and so forth.

390 Appendix A: Re-radiation Global Warming Model Introduction

391
392 When initial solar absorption occurs, part of the long wavelength radiation given off is re-radiated back to Earth. In

393 the absence of forcing we denote this fraction as f_1 . This presents a simplistic but effective model

$$394 \quad 395 \quad P_{Pre-Industrial} = P_{\alpha}(1 + f_1) = \sigma T_s^4, \text{ where } P_{\alpha} = \frac{S_o}{4}(1 - \alpha) \quad (A-1)$$

396 where T_s is the surface temperature. As one might suspect, f_1 turns out to be exactly β^4 in the absence of forcing, so

397 that f_1 is a redefined variable taken from the effective emissivity constant of the planetary system. We identify this

398 as 0.618034 here. One of the main goals in this appendix is to find the re-radiation f_2 for 2019. That is, in 2019, due

399 to increases in GHGs, we anticipate an increase in the re-radiation fraction so that

$$400 \quad 401 \quad f_2 = f_{2019} = f_1 + \Delta f = \beta_1^4 + \Delta f \approx \beta_2^4 + \Delta f \quad (A-2)$$

402
403 In this way $f_{2019} = f_2$ is a function of f_1 . The RHS of Eq. A-2 indicates that $\beta_1 \approx \beta_2$ (see varication results in Eq. A-16

404 and A-17). Estimating Δf will not cause much error since it is relatively small compared to $(1+f_1)$ which is fairly

405 accurate in geoengineering.

406 407 A.1 Basic Re-radiation Model and Estimating f_1

408
409 In geoengineering, we are working with absorption and re-radiation, we define

$$410 \quad P_{Total} = \sigma T_s^4 = \sigma \left(\frac{T_e}{\beta} \right)^4 \text{ and } P_{\alpha} = \sigma T_{\alpha}^4 = \sigma (\beta T_s)^4 \quad (A-3)$$

411 The definitions of $T_{\alpha} = T_e$, T_s and β are the emission temperature, surface temperature and typically $\beta \approx 0.887$,

412 respectively. Consider a time when there is **no forcing issues** causing warming trends. Then by conservation of

413 energy, the equivalent power re-radiated from GHGs in this model is dependent on P_{α} with

$$414 \quad 415 \quad P_{GHG} = P_{Total} - P_{\alpha} = \sigma T_s^4 - \sigma T_{\alpha}^4 \quad (A-4)$$

416

417 To be consistent with $T_\alpha = T_e$, since typically $T_\alpha \approx 255^\circ\text{K}$ and $T_s \approx 288^\circ\text{K}$, then in keeping with a common definition of
 418 the global beta (the proportionality between surface temperature and emission temperature) for the moment
 419 $\beta = T_\alpha / T_s = T_e / T_s$.

420
 421 This allows us to write the dependence
 422

$$423 \quad P_{GHG} = \sigma T_s^4 - \sigma T_\alpha^4 = \frac{\sigma T_\alpha^4}{\beta^4} - \sigma T_\alpha^4 = \sigma T_\alpha^4 \left(\frac{1}{\beta^4} - 1 \right) = \sigma T_\alpha^4 \left(\frac{1}{f} - 1 \right) \quad (\text{A-5})$$

424
 425 Note that when $\beta^4 = 1$, there are no GHG contributions. We note that f , the re-radiation parameter equals β^4 in the
 426 absence of forcing.

427
 428 We can also define the blackbody re-radiated by GHGs given by some fraction f_1 such that
 429

$$430 \quad P_{GHG} = f_1 P_\alpha = f_1 \sigma T_\alpha^4 \quad (\text{A-6})$$

431
 432 Consider $f = f_1$, in this case according to Equations A-5 and A-6, it requires
 433

$$434 \quad P_{GHG} = \sigma T_\alpha^4 \left(\frac{1}{f_1} - 1 \right) = f_1 \sigma T_\alpha^4 \quad (\text{A-7})$$

435
 436 This dependence leads us to the solution of the quadratic expression
 437

$$438 \quad f_1^2 + f_1 - 1 = 0 \text{ yielding } f_1 = 0.618034 = \beta^4, \beta = (0.618034)^{1/4} = 0.886652 \quad (\text{A-8})$$

439
 440 This is very close to the common value estimated for β and this has been obtained through energy balance in the
 441 planetary system providing a self-determining assessment. In geoengineering we can view the re-radiation as part of
 442 the albedo effect. In Section A.4, we apply the model to demonstrate its capability. Consistency with the Planck
 443 parameter is shown in A.5. We note that the assumption $f = f_1$ only works if planetary energy is in balance without
 444 forcing. In Appendix A.6, we double check this model in another way by balancing energy in and out of our global
 445 system.

446 447 **A.2 Re-radiation Model Applied to 1950 and 2019**

448
 449 Global warming can be exemplified by looking at two different time periods. The model applied for 1950 needs to
 450 be consistent with Eq. A-3 and A-5. Here we will

- 451
- 452 • assume no forcing issues causing a warming trend in 1950 so that from our model
- 453

$$454 \quad P_{Total\ 1950} = P_\alpha + P_{GHG} = P_\alpha + f_1 P_\alpha = P_\alpha (1 + f_1) = 1.618 P_\alpha \quad (\text{A-9})$$

455
 456 where $P_\alpha = S_o \{0.25x(1 - Albedo)\}$ and $S_o = 1360 \text{W/m}^2$. Although 1950 is not truly pre-industrial, we proceed under
 457 the assumption of no changes in GHG and feedback issues at this time to establish our baseline, since
 458 geoengineering a solution to earlier dates would pose even higher challenges. Under this assumption, $1 + f = 1.618$
 459 becomes the 1950 albedo-GHG reference value.

460 461 **A.3 Re-radiation Model Applied to 2019**

462
 463 In 2019 due to global warming trends, to apply the model we assume that feedback can be applied as a separate term
 464 and we make use of some IPCC estimates for GHG forcing as a way to calibrate our model. In the traditional sense
 465 of forcing, we assume some small change to the albedo and most of the forcing due to IPCC estimates for GHGs
 466 where

$$467 \quad P_{Total\ 2019} = P_{\alpha'} + P_{GHG'} = P_{\alpha'} (1 + f_2) \quad (\text{A-10})$$

468
 469 Then we introduce feedback through an amplification factor A_F as follows
 470

$$471 \quad P_{Total\ 2019\ \&\ Feedback} = P_{1950} + (\Delta P) A_F = P_{1950} + (P_{2019} - P_{1950}) A_F = \sigma T_s^4 \quad (\text{A-11})$$

472
 473

474 Here, we assume a small change in the albedo denoted as $P_{\alpha'}$ and f_2 is adjusted to the IPCC GHG forcing value
 475 estimated between 1950 and 2019 of 2.38W/m^2 [39]. Then the feedback amplification factor, is calibrated so that
 476 $T_S=T_{2019}$ (see Table A-1) yielding $A_F=2.022$ [also see ref. 20]. The main difference in our model is that the forcing
 477 is about 6% higher than the IPCC for this period. Here, we take into account a small albedo decline of 0.15% that
 478 the author has estimated in another study due to likely issues from UHIs [5] and their coverage. We note that unlike
 479 f_1, f_2 is not a strict measure of the emissivity due the increase in GHGs.

481 *A.4 Results Applied to 1950 and 2019 with an Estimate for f_2*

482
 483 Since the re-radiation parameter is fixed for $f_1=0.618034$, to obtain the average surface temperature $T_{1950}=13.89^\circ\text{C}$
 484 (287.038°K), the only adjustable parameter left in our basic model is the global albedo. This requires an albedo
 485 value of 0.3008 (see Table 1) to obtain $T_{1950}=287.0385^\circ\text{K}$. This albedo number is reasonable and similar to values
 486 cited in the literature [31].

487
 488 In 2019, the average temperature of the Earth is $T_{2019}=14.84^\circ\text{C}$ (287.99°K) given in Eq. A-13. We have assumed a
 489 small change in the Earth's albedo due to UHIs [5]. The f_2 parameter is adjusted to 0.6276 to obtain the GHG
 490 forcing shown in Column 7 of 2.38W/m^2 [39]. Therefore the next to last row in Table A-1 is a summary without
 491 feedback, and the last row incorporated the $A_F=2.022$ feedback amplification factor.

492
 493

Table A-1 Model results

Year	$T_S(^{\circ}\text{K})$	$T_a(^{\circ}\text{K})$	f_1, f_2	α, α'	$P_{\alpha}, P_{\alpha'}$ (W/m^2)	$P_{\text{GHG}+\text{feedback}}$ P_{GHG} (W/m^2)	P_{Total} (W/m^2)
2019	287.5107	254.55	0.6276	30.03488	238.056	149.404	387.460
1950	287.0410	254.51	0.6180	30.08	237.9028	147.024	384.9348
$\Delta 2019-1950$	0.471	0.41	0.96%	(0.15%)	0.15352	2.38	2.5337
Δ Feedback $A_F=2.022$	0.95	-	-	-	0.3104	4.812	5.12

494

495 From Table A-1 we now have identified the reverse forcing at the surface needed since

496
 497
$$P_{\text{Total } 2019_Feedback_Amp} = P_{1950} + (P_{2019} - P_{1950}) A_F = 384.927\text{W} / \text{m}^2 + (2.5337\text{W} / \text{m}^2) 2.022 = 390.05\text{W} / \text{m}^2 \quad (\text{A}=12)$$

498

499 and

500
$$\Delta T_S = T_{2019} - T_{1950} = (390.05 / \sigma)^{1/4} - 287.0385^\circ\text{K} = 287.9899^\circ\text{K} - 287.0385^\circ\text{K} = 0.95^\circ\text{K} \quad (\text{A-13})$$

501

502 as modeled. We also note an estimate has now been obtained in Table A-1 for $f_2=0.6276$, $A_F=2.022$, and
 503 $\Delta P_{\text{Total_Feedback_amp}}=5.12\text{W/m}^2$.

504

505 *A.5 Model Consistency with the Planck Parameter*

506

507 As a measure of model consistency, the forcing change with feedback, and resulting temperatures T_{1950} and T_{2019} ,
 508 should be in agreement with expected results using the Planck feedback parameter. From the definition of the Planck
 509 parameter λ_o and results in Table A-1, we estimate [19]

510

511
$$\lambda_o = -4 \frac{\Delta R_{OLW}}{T_S} = -4 \left(\frac{237.9028\text{W} / \text{m}^2}{287.041^\circ\text{K}} \right)_{1950} = -3.31524\text{W} / \text{m}^2 / ^\circ\text{K} \quad (\text{A-14})$$

512 and

513
$$\lambda_o = -4 \frac{\Delta R_{OLW}}{T_S} = -4 \left(\frac{238.056\text{W} / \text{m}^2}{287.99^\circ\text{K}} \right)_{2019} = -3.306\text{W} / \text{m}^2 / ^\circ\text{K} \quad (\text{A-15})$$

514

515 Here ΔR_{OLW} is the outgoing long wave radiation change. We note these are very close in value showing minor error
 516 and consistency with Planck parameter value, often taken as $3.3\text{W/m}^2/^\circ\text{K}$.

517

518 Also note the Betas are very consistent with Eq. A-8 for the two different time periods since from Table A-1

519

520
$$\beta_{1950} = \frac{T_{\alpha}}{T_S} = \frac{T_e}{T_S} = \frac{254.51}{287.041} = 0.88667 \text{ and } \beta_{1950}^4 = 0.6180785 \quad (\text{A-16})$$

521

522 and

523

$$524 \quad \beta_{2019} = \frac{T_\alpha}{T_S} = \frac{T_e}{T_S} = \frac{254.55}{287.5107} = 0.88526 \text{ and } \beta_{2019}^4 = 0.6144 \quad (\text{A-17})$$

525 **A.6 Balancing P_{out} and P_{in} in 1950**

526 In equilibrium the radiation that leaves must balance P_α , from the energy absorbed, so that

$$527 \quad \text{Energy}_{Out} = (1-f_1)P_\alpha + (1-f_1)P_{Total} = (1-f_1)P_\alpha + (1-f_1)\{P_\alpha + f_1P_\alpha\}$$

$$528 \quad = 2P_\alpha - f_1P_\alpha - f_1^2P_\alpha = \text{Energy}_{In} = P_\alpha \quad (\text{A-18})$$

529 This is consistent, so that in 1950, Eq. A-18 requires the same quadratic solution as Eq. A-8. It is also apparent that

$$530 \quad P_\alpha = f_1^4 P_{Total_1950} = \beta_1^4 P_{Total_1950} \quad (\text{A-19})$$

531 since

$$532 \quad P_\alpha = f_1(P_\alpha + f_1P_\alpha) \text{ or } 1 = f_1(1+f_1) \quad (\text{A-20})$$

533 The RHS of Eq. A-20 is Eq. A-8. This illustrates f_1 from another perspective as the fractional amount of total radiation in equilibrium. As a final check, the application in Section A.4, Table A-1, illustrate that f_1 provides reasonable results.

534 **Appendix B: Estimating the Potential for Hotspot Irradiance Sensible Heat Storage H_{T-N}**

535 A candidate hotspot irradiance sensible heat storage H_{T-N} was described in Section 6. Here we provide a preliminary suggested model to clarify and enumerate this factor. We note other models may be more appropriate. For example, an alternate method for H_{T-N} applied to UHIs is described in Appendix C. Other more rigorous models can be developed. Such solutions are outside the scope of this paper.

536 In this example model, we consider a ratio for a target (T) area relative to a nominal (N) area defined in Sec. 5. Consider a target area with sensible heat storage q , due to a mass m , having specific heat capacity C_p experiencing a day-night ΔT storage change in time τ , and then the suggested potential for sensible hotspot heat storage H_{T-N} has the form

$$537 \quad H_{T-N} = \frac{q_T}{q_N} \times \frac{I_T}{I_N} = \frac{m_T C_{pT} \Delta T_T}{m_N C_{pN} \Delta T_N} \times \frac{I_T}{I_N} \approx \frac{\tau_T C_{pT} \Delta T_T}{\tau_N C_{pN} \Delta T_N} \times \frac{I_T}{I_N} \quad (\text{B-1})$$

538 Here we provide the option of using temperature change in time τ in place of mass. For example, the time to 63% change in ΔT might be useful (similar to a time constant). We also consider that the irradiance (I) term is needed since not all solar absorption energy is stored.

539 As a numeric example, first consider a 90% irradiance target area (compared to the equator) with nominal mid-latitudes (45°) roughly 70%, compared to say the Arctic and Antarctic Circles at approximately 40% [31]. Then the irradiance ratio is

$$540 \quad \frac{I\%_T}{I\%_N} = \frac{90\%_T}{70\%_N} = 1.3 \quad (\text{B-2})$$

541 For the sensible heat numeric portion, consider a rocky area as the target (such as Flaming Mountains). This can be compared with a nominal vegetative land area. As a rule of thumb, most rocks have a density of 2.65 g/cm³, about 50% difference compared to a nominal soil area of 1.33 g/cm³ [33]. The heat capacity of rocks compared with vegetated land is 2000 to 830J/Kg^oK [34]. Then ΔT is estimated from tables for a day-night cycle [34, 35]. The estimate is

$$542 \quad \frac{q_T}{q_N} = \frac{m_T C_{pT} \Delta T_T}{m_N C_{pN} \Delta T_N} = \frac{\rho_T C_{pT} \Delta T_T}{\rho_N C_{pN} \Delta T_N} = \left(\frac{2.65}{1.33} \right)_\rho \left(\frac{2000}{830} \right)_{C_p} \left(\frac{10^\circ\text{C}}{6.9^\circ\text{C}} \right) = 2 \times 2.4 \times 1.45 = 6.96 \quad (\text{B-3})$$

543 Then including irradiance

$$H_{T-N} \approx 9 \quad (\text{B-4})$$

576 Appendix C: H_{T-N} UHI Amplification Factors

577

578 An analysis of UHI amplification effects that can be applied to H_{T-N} was originally provided by the author [5] and
579 this work is added here to aid the reader.

580 C.1 H_{T-N} UHI Area Amplification Factor

581

582 To estimate H_{T-N} for UHI amplification effects, it is logical to first look at UHI footprint (FP) studies as they provide
583 some measurement information. Zhang et al. [36] found the ecological FP of urban land cover extends beyond the
584 perimeter of urban areas, and the FP of urban climates on vegetation phenology was 2.4 times the size of the actual
585 urban land cover. A more recent study by Zhou et al. [37], looked at day-night cycles using temperature difference
586 measurements in China. This study found UHI effect decayed exponentially toward rural areas for the majority of
587 the 32 Chinese cities. Their comprehensive study spanned from 2003 to 2012. Zhou et al. describes China as an
588 ideal area to study as it has experienced the most rapid urbanization in the world during the decade evaluated.
589 Findings state that the FP of UHI effect, including urban areas, was 2.3 and 3.9 times that of urban size for the day
590 and nights, respectively. We note that the average day-night amplification footprint coverage factor is 3.1.

591 The UHI Amplification Factor (AF) is highly complex, making it difficult to assess from first principles as it would
592 be some function of

$$593 AF_{UHI \text{ for } 2019} = f\left(\overline{Build}_{Area} \times \overline{Build}_{C_p} \times \overline{R}_{wind} \times \overline{LossE}_{vtr} \times \overline{Hy} \times \overline{S}_{canyon}\right) \quad (\text{C-1})$$

594 were

595 \overline{Build}_{Area} = Average building solar area

596 \overline{Build}_{C_p} = Average building heat capacity

597 \overline{R}_{wind} = Average city wind resistance

598 \overline{LossE}_{vtr} = Average loss of evapotranspiration to natural cooling & loss of wetland

599 \overline{Hy} = Average humidity effect due to hydro-hotspot

600 \overline{S}_{canyon} = Average solar canyon effect

601

602 To provide some estimate of this factor, we note that Zhou et al. [36] found the FP physical area (km^2), correlated
603 tightly and positively with actual urban size having a correlation coefficients higher than 79%. This correlation can
604 be used to provide an initial estimate of this complex factor. Therefore, as a model assumption, it seems reasonable
605 to use area ratios for this estimate.

$$606 AF_{UHI \text{ for } 2019} = \frac{\sum(UHI \text{ Area})_{2019}}{\sum(UHI \text{ Area})_{1950}} \quad (\text{C-2})$$

607

608 Area estimates have been obtained in the Feinberg [5] yielding the following results for the Schneider et al. [23] and
609 the GRUMP [24] extrapolated area results:

$$610 AF_{UHI \text{ for } 2019} = \frac{(Urban \text{ Size})_{2019}}{(Urban \text{ Size})_{1950}} \approx \begin{cases} \left(\frac{[0.188]_{2019}}{[0.059]_{1950}} \right)_{Schneider} = 3.19 \\ \left(\frac{[0.952]_{2019}}{[0.316]_{1950}} \right)_{GRUMP} = 3.0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{C-3})$$

611 Between the two studies, the UHI area amplification factor average is 3.1. Coincidentally, this factor is the same
612 observed in the Zhou et al. [37] study for the average footprint. This factor may seem high. However, it is likely
613 conservative as other effects would be difficult to assess: increases in global drought due to loss of wet-lands,
614 deforestation effects due to urbanization, and drought related fires. It could also be important to factor in changes of
615 other impermeable surfaces since 1950, such as highways, parking lots, event centers that trap heat, and so forth.

616

617 The area amplification value of 3.1 is then considered as one of our model assumptions for H_{T-N} .

618

619

620

621 **C.2 Alternate Method Using the UHI's Dome Extent**

622

623 An alternate approach to check the estimate of Equation C-3, is to look at the UHI's dome extent. Fan et al. [38]
 624 using an energy balance model to obtain the maximum horizontal extent of a UHI heat dome in numerous urban
 625 areas found the nighttime extent of 1.5 to 3.5 times the diameter of the city's urban area (2.5 average) and the
 626 daytime value of 2.0 to 3.3 (2.65 average).

627

628 Applying this energy method (instead of the area ratio factor in Eq. C-3), yields a diameter in 2019 compared to that
 629 of 1950 with an increase of 1.8. This method implies a factor of $2.5 \times 1.8 = 4.5$ higher in the night and $2.65 \times 1.8 = 4.8$
 630 in the day in 1950 with an average 4.65. This increase occurs 62.5% of the time according to Fan et al., where their
 631 steady state occurred about 4 hours after sunrise and 5 hours after sunset yielding an effective UHI amplification
 632 factor of 2.9. We note this amplification factor is in good agreement with Equation C-3. Fan et al. [38] assessed the
 633 heat flux over the urban area extent to its neighboring rural area where the air is transported from the urban heat
 634 dome flow. Therefore the heat dome extends in a similar manner as observed in the footprint studies. If we use the
 635 dome concept, we obtain some vertical extent which is a logical when considering GW. We can make an assumption
 636 that the actual surface area for the heat flux is increased by the surface area of the dome. We actually do not know
 637 the true diameter of the dome, but it is larger than the assessment by Fan et al. Using the dome extend due to Fan et
 638 al. [38] applied to the area of diameter D , the H_{T-N} amplification factor should be correlated to the ratios of the dome
 639 surface areas:

$$640 \quad AF_{UHI \text{ for } 2019} = \left(\frac{D_{2019}}{D_{1950}} \right)^2 = 2.9^2 = 8.4 \quad (C-4)$$

641

642 Thus, this equation is a second value for H_{T-N} , where it is reasonable to use the ratios of the dome's surface area for
 643 an alternate approach in estimating the effective UHI amplification factor [5]. We will have two values, 3.1 and 8.4
 644 to work with that provides an upper and lower bounds for effective H_{T-N} amplification area.

645 **Disclosures:**

646 Funding: This study was unfunded.

647 Conflicts of Interest: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

648

649 **References**

- 650 1. Deforestation, Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deforestation>
- 651 2. Dunne D, (2018) Six ideas to limit global warming with solar geoengineering, CarbonBrief,
 652 <https://www.carbonbrief.org/explainer-six-ideas-to-limit-global-warming-with-solar-geoengineering>
- 653 3. Cho A, (2016) To fight global warming, Senate calls for study of making Earth reflect more light, Science,
 654 [https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/04/fight-global-warming-senate-calls-study-making-earth-reflect-](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/04/fight-global-warming-senate-calls-study-making-earth-reflect-more-light)
 655 [more-light](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/04/fight-global-warming-senate-calls-study-making-earth-reflect-more-light)
- 656 4. Levinson, R., Akbari, H. (2010) Potential benefits of cool roofs on commercial buildings: conserving energy,
 657 saving money, and reducing emission of greenhouse gases and air pollutants. *Energy Efficiency* 3, 53–109.
 658 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-008-9038-2>
- 659 5. Feinberg A, (2020) Urban Heat Island Amplification Estimates on Global Warming Using an Albedo Model,
 660 Vixra 2003.0088, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32758.14402/15
- 661 6. McKittrick R. and Michaels J. (2004) A Test of Corrections for Extraneous Signals in Gridded Surface
 662 Temperature Data, Climate Research
- 663 7. McKittrick R., Michaels P. (2007) Quantifying the influence of anthropogenic surface processes and
 664 inhomogeneities on gridded global climate data, J. of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres.
- 665 8. Schmidt GA, (2009) Spurious correlations between recent warming and indices of local economic activity,
 666 *Int. J. of Climatology*
- 667 9. Zhao ZC (1991) Temperature change in China for the last 39 years and urban effects. *Meteorological*
 668 *Monthly* (in Chinese), 17(4), 14-17.
- 669 10. Feddema JJ, Oleson KW, Bonan GB, Mearns LO, Buja LE, Meehl GA, and Washington WM (2005) The
 670 importance of land-cover change in simulating future climates, *Science*, 310, 1674– 1678,
 671 [doi:10.1126/science.1118160](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1118160)
- 672 11. Ren G, Chu Z, Chen Z, Ren Y (2007) Implications of temporal change in urban heat island intensity observed
 673 at Beijing and Wuhan stations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* , 34, L05711,doi:10.1029/2006GL027927.
- 674 12. Ren, GY, Chu ZY, and Zhou JX (2008) Urbanization effects on observed surface air temperature in North
 675 China. *J. Climate*, 21, 1333-1348
- 676 13. Jones PD, Lister DH, and Li QX, (2008) Urbanization effects in large-scale temperature records, with an
 677 emphasis on China. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D16122, doi: 10.1029/2008JD009916.

- 678 14. Stone B (2009) Land use as climate change mitigation, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 43(24), 9052– 9056,
679 doi:10.1021/es902150g
- 680 15. Zhao, ZC (2011) Impacts of urbanization on climate change. in: 10,000 Scientific Difficult Problems: Earth
681 Science, 10,000 scientific difficult problems Earth Science Committee Eds., Science Press, 843-846. 30%
- 682 16. Yang X, Hou Y, Chen B (2011) Observed surface warming induced by urbanization in east China. *J.*
683 *Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 116, doi:10.1029/2010JD015452.
- 684 17. Huang Q, Lu Y (2015) Effect of Urban Heat Island on Climate Warming in the Yangtze River Delta Urban
685 Agglomeration in China, *Intern. J. of Environmental Research and Public Health* 12 (8): 8773 (30%)
- 686 18. Hartmann DL, Klein AMG, Tank M, Rusticucci LV, Alexander S, Brönnimann Y, Charabi FJ, Dentener EJ,
687 Dlugokencky D, Easterling DR, Kaplan A, Soden BJ, Thorne PW, Wild M, and Zhai PM (2013)
688 Observations: Atmosphere and Surface. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution*
689 *of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*
690 [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and
691 P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.*
- 692 19. Kimoto K (2006) On the Confusion of Planck Feedback Parameters, *Energy & Environment* (2009)
- 693 20. Dessler AE, Zhang Z, Yang P (2008) Water-vapor climate feedback inferred from climate fluctuations, 2003–
694 2008, *Geophysical Research Letters*, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL035333>
- 695 21. Earthobservatory, NASA (clouds albedo 0.67) <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/85843/cloudy-earth>
- 696 22. Sugawara H, Takamura T (2014) Surface Albedo in Cities (0.12) Case Study in Sapporo and Tokyo,
697 Japan. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* 153, 539–553 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-014-9952-0>
- 698 23. Schneider A, Friedl M, and Potere D (2009) A new map of global urban extent from MODIS satellite data.
699 *Environmental Research Letters*, 4(4), 044003, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/4/4/044003
- 700 24. Global Rural Urban Mapping Project (GRUMP, 2005) Columbia University Socioeconomic Data and
701 Applications Center, Gridded Population of the World and the Global Rural-Urban Mapping
702 Project (GRUMP).
- 703 25. Satterthwaite DE, Aragón-Durand F, Corfee-Morlot J, Kiunsi RBR, Pelling M, Roberts DC, and Solecki W,
704 (2014) Urban areas. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and*
705 *Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental*
706 *Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*
- 707 26. Feinberg A (2020) Review of Global Warming Urban Heat Island Forcing Issues Unaddressed by IPCC
708 Suggestions Including CO2 Doubling Estimates, viXra:2001.0415
- 709 27. Armour K (2017) Energy budget constraints on climate sensitivity in light of inconstant climate feedbacks,
710 *Nature Climate Change*
- 711 28. Zhao L, Lee X, Smith RB, Oleson K (2014) Strong, contributions of local background climate to urban heat
712 islands, *Nature*. 10;511(7508):216-9. doi: 10.1038/nature13462
- 713 29. He T, Liang S, and Song DX (2014), Analysis of global land surface albedo climatology and spatial-temporal
714 variation during 1981–2010 from multiple satellite products, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 119, 10,281–10,298,
715 doi:10.1002/2014JD021667
- 716 30. IPCC (2018) Summary for Policymakers. In: *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the*
717 *impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission*
718 *pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable*
719 *development, and efforts to eradicate poverty, Masson-Delmotte, Zhai VP, Pörtner HO, Roberts D, Skea J,*
720 *Shukla PR, Pirani A, Moufouma-Okia W, Péan C, Pidcock R, Connors S, Matthews JBR, Chen Y, Zhou X,*
721 *Gomis MI, Lonnoy E, Maycock T, Tignor M, and Waterfield T*
- 722 31. Stephens G, O'Brien D, Webster P, Pilewski P, Kato S, Li J, (2015) The albedo of Earth, *Rev. of Geophysics*,
723 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014RG000449>
- 724 32. Simmon R, NASA, Earth Observatory, <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/EnergyBalance/page2.php>
- 725 33. Bulk Density, USDA-NRCS,
726 https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_053260.pdf
- 727 34. NASA, Heat Capacity and Energy Storage, <https://www.e-education.psu.edu/earth103/node/1005>
- 728 35. List of cities by average temperature, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_cities_by_average_temperature
- 729 36. Zhang X, Friedl MA, Schaaf CB, Strahler AH, and Schneider A (2004) The footprint of urban climates on
730 vegetation phenology. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 31, L12209
- 731 37. Zhou D, Zhao S, Zhang L, Sun G and Liu Y (2015) The footprint of urban heat island effect in
732 China, *Scientific Reports*. 5: 11160
- 733 38. Fan Y, Li Y, Bejan A (2017) Horizontal extent of the urban heat dome flow. *Sci Rep* 7, 11681
734 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-09917-4>
- 735 39. Butler JH, Montzka SA, (2020) The NOAA Annual Greenhouse Gas Index, Earth System Research Lab.
736 Global Monitoring Laboratory, <https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/aggi/aggi.html>