



	In situ air tomporaturo and humidity
1	m-situ an temperature and numuity
2	measurements over diverse landcovers in
3 4 5	<b>Greenbelt, MD Nov. 2013 – Nov. 2015</b> Mark L. Carroll <sup>1,2,a</sup> , Molly E. Brown <sup>3</sup> , Margaret R. Wooten <sup>1,2</sup> , Joel E. Donham <sup>4</sup> , Alfred B. Hubbard <sup>1,2</sup> , William B. Ridenhour <sup>5</sup>
6 7 8 9 10 11	<ol> <li>Science Systems and Applications Inc</li> <li>NASA-GSFC Biospheric Sciences Lab</li> <li>University of Maryland, College Park MD</li> <li>NASA-GSFC Medical and Environmental Management Division</li> <li>NASA-GSFC Engineering and Construction Branch</li> <li>Corresponding author mark.carroll@nasa.gov</li> </ol>
12 13	Abstract As our climate changes through time there is an ever increasing need to quantify how and where
14	it is changing so that mitigation strategies can be implemented. Urban areas have a
15	disproportionate amount of warming due, in part, to the conductive properties of concrete and
16	asphalt surfaces that make up an urban environment. The NASA Climate Adaptation Science
17	Investigation working group at Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt MD conducted a study
18	to collect temperature and humidity data at 15 minute intervals from 12 sites on center. These
19	sites represented the major surface types on center: asphalt, building roof, grass field, forest, and
20	rain garden. The data show a strong distinction in the thermal properties of these surfaces on the
21	center and the difference between the average value for the center compared to a local
22	meteorological station. The data have been submitted to Oak Ridge National Laboratory
23	Distributed Active Archive Center (ORNL-DAAC) for archival in comma separated value (csv)
24	file format http://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsviewer.pl?ds_id=1319.

# 25 Keywords

26 Remote sensing, urban heat island, temperature, field data, microclimate.





### 27 Introduction

28	While leaders around the world are deliberating about the best ways to slow the rate of
29	climate change through reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, the time to develop and
30	implement adaptation strategies is now. Executive Order (EO) 13693 directs Federal agencies to
31	incorporate climate-resilient design and management elements into the operation, repair, and
32	renovation of existing agency buildings and the design of new agency buildings. Climate change
33	in the Washington DC metro area will impact facility operations (e.g., stormwater management,
34	energy supply and demand, cost of utilities), natural resource management (e.g., forest
35	maintenance, invasive species control), mission infrastructure (e.g., labs, testing facilities, and
36	computing capabilities), as well as the quality of life in the community (e.g., drinking water
37	availability, wildfire risk). It is critical to plan for climate change impacts as part of established
38	planning and budgeting cycles within and beyond NASA. US government agencies will need to
39	implement short-term tactical changes while simultaneously planning for longer-term strategic
40	adaptation measures. The Climate Adaptation Science Investigator (CASI) initiative focuses on
41	bringing together NASA scientific expertise with its facilities and environmental planning
42	organizations to ensure that the Center develops adaptation strategies for a changing climate.
43	The CASI working group was formed in 2010 with representatives from each center. The
44	CASI team at Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) Greenbelt began working together in the fall
45	of 2011 to discuss and consider problems and solutions for climate change impacts at GSFC-
46	Greenbelt. This team meets monthly to consider how CASI can have a positive impact on the
47	Center. After reviewing the information from other CASI workshops, the GSFC-CASI team
48	concluded that there were two aspects of climate change that posed a direct and tangible risk to
49	the ability of the Center to meet its mission in the future: the impact of rising temperatures on
50	energy needs and the potential increase in frequency of high-intensity rainfall events. We held a





- 51 two-day workshop to address these concerns with internal stakeholders at the GSFC Greenbelt
- 52 campus. The primary goal of the workshop was to identify a path forward that would integrate
- 53 climate change considerations in the Center Facilities Master Plan.
- 54 Based on climate predictions from NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS), it is
- 55 likely that GSFC-Greenbelt will experience increased temperatures and intensifying rainfall
- 56 events. These two stresses will exacerbate problems with energy sustainability and with
- 57 stormwater management (Table 1).

58

- 59 Table 1. Qualitative Changes in Extreme Events for GSFC Based on global climate model
- 60 simulations, published literature, and expert judgment. Source: NASA GISS Likelihood
- definitions based on IPCC: >90% Very likely, >66% Likely, >50% More likely than not, 33
- 62 to 66% About as likely as not (Rosenzweig et al. 2014).
- 63

Event	<b>Direction of Change</b>	Likelihood		
Heat Stress	Increase	Very Likely		
Ice storms/freezing rain	Increase	About as likely as not		
Snowfall frequency and	Decrease	Likely		
amount				
Intense Precipitation Events	Increase	Likely		
Drought	Increase	More likely than not		

64

65 While the impacts of atmospheric climate change have been the subject of significant research,

69 An urban heat island occurs when dense concentrations of built surfaces retain heat

70 differently than their suburban or rural surroundings. Numerous studies have investigated this

71 phenomena on large cities using satellite data and models (Chun and Guldmann 2014; Sun and

<sup>66</sup> Urban Heat Island effects have been demonstrated to be equal in magnitude to climate change

effects. The GSFC-CASI team performed a study to collect data to evaluate the contribution of

various land cover types at the GSFC facility to urban heat island formation.





- Augenbroe 2014; Zhang et al. 2012), however these studies yield little information to support
- recific interventions on the local scale that would reduce urban heating. To improve
- violation relation re
- deployed and monitored 12 environmental monitoring sensors (temperature and relative
- humidity) on 5 different surface types around the center. The UHI study served as a bridging
- 77 activity between the other GSFC-CASI activities related to building energy management analysis
- and the stormwater hydrological analysis. The goals of the UHI study were to collect data for a
- 79 minimum of 1 year and have duplicate measurements over representative surface types on center.

### 80 Study site and equipment

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center is a controlled access facility (i.e. requires a badge to enter) 81 82 located in the heavily developed suburbs of Washington, DC. Greenbelt, MD, is a mixed use 83 area with retail and commercial office space intermixed with residential, both high density and single family homes (figure 1). The center itself is comprised of approximately 1300 acres with 5 84 main land cover types: urban/building, urban/road, forest, grass/field, wetland. The National 85 86 Land Cover Database (NLCD; Homer et al., 2015) was used for land cover analysis. This dataset is designed to provide decadal land cover data for the conterminous United States. It is primarily 87 based on decision-tree classification of Landsat data and is available at 30 m spatial resolution. 88 89 In this study, the NLCD 2011 was downloaded and cropped to GSFC using property boundary shapefiles provided by the GSFC facilities management division. The area of each significant 90 91  $(\geq 5\% \text{ of total area})$  land cover class represented in GSFC is displayed in Table 2, and the relative 92 areas of each significant class are displayed in a pie chart in figure 2.

93





**Table 2:** Total area of each land cover type for GSFC as determined by the NLCD.

Class	Loggers	Area (acres)
Developed, Open Space	5,6	184.14
Developed, Low Intensity	1,3,7	155.45
Developed, Medium Intensity		130.1
Developed, High Intensity	2,4,8,9	68.94
Deciduous Forest	12	346.49
Evergreen Forest	11	138.33
Mixed Forest	10	158.57
Other		113.2

95

96 For this study we purchased 12 "HOBO U23 Pro v2 External Temperature/Relative Humidity

97 Data Logger - U23-002" to record data on the center. The loggers were programmed to record

98 temperature and humidity at 15 minute intervals beginning at the start of an hour. In this way all

99 loggers were recording at the same time. The loggers were mounted on posts at 2 meters height

above the ground with the actual logger mounted inside a radiation shield to minimize direct

sunlight on the probe (figure 3). The twelve loggers were deployed on 5 different surface types

102 (figure 1) around the center: asphalt parking lot, bright surface roof, grass field, forest, and

103 stormwater mitigation feature.

104 Data

105 The loggers were initialized in the office in September 2013. They were placed in a box with

ventilation for 2 weeks on a shelf in the office to assess the amount of agreement between the

107 loggers in a controlled environment. The box was moved to a garage with no temperature

108 controls for an additional 2 weeks prior to being deployed in the field in late October, 2013. Data

- 109 was downloaded every 2 3 weeks. A portable data shuttle was used to download data in the
- 110 field and transfer it to a PC and a log of observations and dates of download was maintained
- 111 (Appendix A). The loggers were retrieved in November 2015 after collecting data for 2 years
- 112 continuously. Upon retrieval the loggers were placed in a box and stored in the same garage as





- prior to being deployed for 2 weeks. The box was moved to the climate controlled office for 2
- 114 more weeks after which data collection stopped. The information collecting during the pre- and
- 115 post- deployment can be used to determine sensor to sensor agreement both before deployment
- and after retrieval. This will allow a user to assess the impact of 2 years in the field on sensor
- agreement and to put appropriate error bars on the analysis of the data.
- 118 Direct logger data is stored in proprietary file format with one file per logger per download.
- 119 These data were converted to Microsoft Excel file format and compiled to a single data file with
- all 12 loggers and all dates for ease of use. The data are stored in 5 files 1 for each significant
- 121 period of collection: office pre-calibration, garage pre-calibration, live data collection, garage
- 122 post-calibration, and office post-calibration.
- 123 The full log of events is in the table in Appendix A but several notable events during the data
- 124 collection are listed here:
- Data gap for all loggers occurred in January 2014 due to failure of data retrieval device
- Data gap for logger 6 occurred in April 2015
- Parking lot loggers were moved several times for safety during winter storm events
- Field loggers moved due to special event
- Effort was made to find suitable alternate location during each event

### 130 Discussion

- 131 GSFC-Greenbelt is a controlled access facility which means that admission is granted for official
- 132 business only and is not open to the general public. This creates an ideal environment to take
- 133 long running measurements on various surface types with minimal concern for vandalism and
- unintended interference from the general population. If a similar network was deployed in a





- typical urban environment the loggers could be exposed to more human interaction and generally
- a greater level of activity from vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- 137 The period during which the data were collected was ideal for capturing a wide range of
- temperature conditions. The East coast experienced record cold as well as very warm conditions
- during 2014 (Trenary et al. 2015). Summer temperatures in 2015 were the hottest on record,
- although the weather in the Greenbelt area was only slightly above average.
- 141 Three diagnostic plots were generated to display the characteristics of the temperature and
- 142 relative humidity data collected from the loggers. These plots represent 1) relative difference
- 143 between GSFC and a local meteorological station; 2) relative difference between the loggers
- based on land cover type; 3) the min, max, and mean values for the center regardless of surface
- 145 type.
- 146 The loggers were programmed to record data at 15 minute intervals. To analyze the data, the
- 147 mean, maximum, and minimum were calculated individually for each logger. The results for all
- 148 12 loggers were then averaged to generate one set of summary data for GSFC. These are
- displayed in figure 4 a-b for the second year of data collection, and the mean values served as the
- 150 GSFC data for figure 4 c-d. The other data used for figure 4 c-d was a local meteorological
- 151 dataset, collected at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC;
- 152 http://www.ba.ars.usda.gov/weather/ba-weather). BARC maintains seven meteorological
- stations, and for this analysis data from the closest of these, Station #3 which is approximately 4
- 154 km from GSFC, was used. This data is also collected at 15 minute intervals, but daily summary
- statistics are available from the BARC data portal, so daily mean values were downloaded for the
- time period of the GSFC dataset. The difference between the average daily mean values for all of
- 157 GSFC and the daily mean values for BARC was calculated, and the results are shown in figure 4





- 158 c-d for the second year of GSFC data collection. These plots show only the second year to
- improve readability, but it should be noted that the first year contains a data gap of
- approximately one month in length that is therefore not displayed. Finally, as described above,
- 161 each logger was deployed in a distinct land cover type. The daily means were averaged together
- according to land cover, meaning that each value is the average of the daily mean values for all
- 163 of the loggers deployed in that land cover type. The difference between this land cover average
- and the average value for all of the GSFC loggers was then calculated, and these results are
- displayed in figure 4 e-f for the second year of GSFC data collection.
- 166 Figure 4 shows, in general terms, what the data can describe. The data have been submitted to
- 167 Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center (ORNL-DAAC) for archival
- in comma separated value (csv) file format <u>http://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsviewer.pl?ds\_id=1319</u>.
- 169 The data could be used as a validation dataset for a satellite-based study or could be used as a
- stand-alone study of the impact of surface type on heating in a campus setting.

#### 171 References

- 176 L., Graham, W., Hall, C., Higuchi, S., Iraci, L., Jedlovec, G., Kaye, J., Loewenstein, M., Mace, T., Milesi, C.,
- 177 Patzert, W., Stackhouse, P.W., & Toufectis, K. (2014). Enhancing Climate Resilience at NASA Centers: A
- 178 Collaboration between Science and Stewardship. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 95*,
   179 1351-1363
- 180
- 181 Sun, Y., & Augenbroe, G. (2014). Urban heat island effect on energy application studies of office
  182 buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, *77*, 171-179
- 183
- 184 Trenary, L., DelSole, T., Doty, B., & Tippett, M.K. (2015). Was the Cold Eastern Us Winter of 2014 Due to
- 185 Increased Variability?. . Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 96
- 186

<sup>172</sup> Chun, B., & Guldmann, J.M. (2014). Spatial statistical analysis and simulation of the urban heat island in
173 high-density central cities. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 125*, 76-88
174
175 Rosenzweig, C., Horton, R.M., Bader, D.A., Brown, M.E., DeYoung, R., Dominguez, O., Fellows, M., Friedl,





- 187 Zhang, P., Imhoff, M., Bounoua, L., & Wolfe, R.E. (2012). Exploring the influence of impervious surface
- 188 density and shape on urban heat islands in the northeast United States using MODIS and Landsat.
- 189 *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing, 38,* 441-451

190





Date	Time	Offload?	Action	Comments	
10/31/2013		х	Collection01: 10/28/13-10/31/13		
11/14/2013	12:51pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to field		
11/19/2013	9:15am		Loggers 2&4 moved back to lot		
11/19/2013		Х	Collection02: 10/31/13-11/19/13		
12/04/21013		Х	Collection03: 11/19/13-12/04/13		
12/18/2013		Х	Collection04: 12/04/13-12/18/13		
1/2/2014	4:18pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to field		
1/6/2014	8:28am		Loggers 2&4 moved back to lot		
1/15/2014		Х	Collection05: 12/18-1/15		
12/18/2013- 01/03/2014			missing data		
1/20/2014	6:52-6:54pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to field		
1/27/2014	2:54pm		Loggers 2&4 moved back to lot		
1/30/2014	10:32am		Relaunched shuttle		
1/30/2014		Х	Collection06: 01/15/14-01/30/14		
2/12/2014	4:35pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to field		
2/18/2014	1:00pm		Loggers 2&4 moved back to lot (not yet in correct spot)		
2/18/2014	1:30pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to spots in lot		
2/18/2014			Logger 2 surrounded by ice until 2/19?		
2/20/2014			Logger 3 (salt dome pond) observed being frozen over		
2/20/2014		Х	Collection07: 01/30/14-02/20/14		
2/24/2014	9:03-9:27am		Logger 2 out of commission (Joel fixed tilt)		
3/2/2014	12:00pm		Loggers 2&4 moved to field		
3/4/2014	11:30am		Loggers 2&4 moved back to lot		
3/12/2014	2:45-2:50pm		Logger 3 down (Joel restood)		
3/14/2014		х	Collection08: 02/20/14-03/14/14		
4/2/2014			Logger 9 observed missing shield		
4/2/2014		Х	Collection09: 03/14/14-04/02/14		
4/23/2014		Х	Collection10: 04/02/14-04/23/14		
5/1/2014	11:22-11:26am		Replaced shield on Logger 9		
5/15/2014		Х	Collection11: 04/23/14-05/15/14		
6/18/2014		Х	Collection12: 05/15/14-06/08/14		
6/18/2014			USB to shuttle broke off, sent to HOBO for repair		

### 192 Appendix A: Log of events recorded for study period





7/22/2014		Х	Collection13: 06/18/14-07/22/14	
8/27/2014		Х	Collection14: 07/22/14-08/27/14	
10/1/2014		х	Collection15: 08/27/14-10/01/14	
11/6/2014		Х	Collection16: 10/01/14-11/06/14	
12/8/2014	1:45-3:25 pm		Joel drilled holes in bases (drainage) and secured solar shields	
12/10/2014	•	х	Collection17: 11/06/14-12/10/14	
1/13/2015	9:18am		Loggers2&4 moved to field (construction)	
1/15/2015		Х	Collection18: 12/10/14-01/15/15	
1/15/2015			Noticed pond frozen, probably been so for a few weeks	
1/21/2015			Snowfall beginning around 12:15pm	
1/22/2015	11:40am		Loggers2&4 moved back to lot, but switched locations*	* loggers 2&4 remained switched for the remainder of data record
2/25/2015		Х	Collection19: 01/15/15-02/25/15	
4/7/2015		x	Collection20: 02/25/15-04/07/15	Logger 6 for collection20: no data (data was corrupt)
5/26/2015		Х	Collection21: 04/07/15-05/26/15	
5/28/2015	1:23pm		Loggers5&6 moved from field	
5/28/2015	2:00pm		Loggers5&6 moved to field by Goddard Day Care temporarily	
7/1/2015		Х	Collection22: 05/26/15-07/01/15	
8/6/2015	2:25-2:35pm		Logger6 moved back to field	
8/6/2015		Х	Collection23: 07/01/15-08/06/15	
9/2/2015		Х	Collection24: 08/06/15-09/02/15	
9/3/2015	9:00-9:20am		Logger5 moved back to field	
9/8/2015	12:23-12:28pm		Loggers2&4 moved to lot parking between B6 and B11	
10/20/2015		Х	Collection25: 09/02/15-10/20/15	
11/19/2015		Х	Collection26: 10/20/15-11/19/15	
	indicates loggers	were moved	from or back to usual spot	

193





## 195 Figures



٢	<b>Bioretention Pond</b>	٢	Field 2	1	Parking Lot 1	P	Roof 1	1	Pond	P	Woods 2
2	Rain Garden	1	Field 1	1	Parking Lot 2	P	Roof 2	1	Woods 1	٢	Woods 3

196

Figure 1 Map of Goddard Space Flight Center. Flags indicate locations for logger placement on center. Loggers were
 strategically placed in low traffic areas of the center to minimize the potential for disturbance.







199

Figure 2 Distribution of land cover types on Goddard Space Flight Center as determined by the National Land Cover
 Dataset (NLCD).



202

203 Figure 3 Photo of logger installed in rain garden adjacent to parking lot for building 32 at NASA-GSFC.







