Integrating anthropogenic heat flux with global climate models

Mark Flanner¹ Dave Lawrence¹ Keith Oleson¹ Sam Levis¹ Ben Sanderson¹ Imran Sheikh²



CCSM LMWG meeting June 16, 2009

¹ National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder CO
² University of California - Berkeley

AHF or "Waste heat"

- All human energy use is dissipated as heat within Earth's land-atmosphere-ocean system
 - Second Law of Thermodynamics, entropy tendency
 - Opacity of Earth's land/atmosphere to most radiation
- Heat conversion (Example: coal->electricity)
 - 1) Combustion at plant, waste heat
 - 2) Transmission inefficiency
 - 3) Mechanical work, incandescent light, etc
 - Work generally done against friction, dissipated as heat
 - No/temporary change in net gravitational, electrical, chemical, mechanical potential energy of Earth
 - LED light: p-n junction emits photon, but 99.9% of these photons are absorbed within planet
- Primary energy consumption = heat energy

AHF as a climate forcer

- Non-renewable sources of chemical & atomic energy (coal, oil, gas, nuclear) are being converted to heat orders of magnitude more quickly than in the absence of humans
 - Anthropogenic climate forcing term
 - "Thermal" rather than "radiative" forcing
- Renewable sources (wind, hydro) are redistributed kinetic and potential energy, and thus do NOT introduce excess heat to the Earth system
 - Exception 1, Solar: Altered surface albedo from inefficient photovoltaic panels
 - Exception 2, Geothermal: Enhanced "conductivity" of heat to Earth's surface from interior

Methods for incorporating AHF into GCMs

• A) Prognostic scheme

 e.g., embedded in urban model (Oleson et al., 2008), function of desired building environment relative to ambient

– Advantages:

- Sensible, latent heat flux changes are consistent with the "urban fabric"
- Captures important feedback (e.g., enhanced A/C use from warmer ambient air induced by A/C use)
- Will simulate enhanced AHF from increasing urbanization in land-use change simulations

• B) Prescribe "top-down" estimates of AHF

- Advantages
 - Includes all primary energy (e.g., transportation, agricultural, industrial)
 - Yields most realistic present-day spatial distribution of AHF to test climate sensitivity

Methods for Approach B

- Country- and source-specific primary energy consumption data
 - e.g., chemical energy released from combustion
 - Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration
- Apportion energy dissipation within each nation according to population density
 - Source: Columbia University, 2.5-minute resolution
 - Most energy is dissipated quickly, and close to human settlement. Coarse GCM resolution averages out errors
- Prescribe crude annual and diurnal cycles to dissipated energy
- Introduce all energy to lowest layer of atmosphere
 - Future sensitivity studies: Heat dissipation in urban fabric, ground, different heights in atmosphere



Results

Flanner (2009), Geophys. Res. Lett.

• Global, 2005: +0.028 W/m²

- Continental U.S: +0.39 W/m²
- Western Europe: +0.68 W/m²
- Netherlands: 4.2 W/m² (*de Laat et al.*, 2008)
- Japan: 2.1 W/m²



Future AHF

Table 1. Projected Non-Renewable Energy Growth RatesThrough 2030^a

Country Classification	Annual Growth Rate (% yr ⁻¹)
OECD ^b North America	1.2
OECD Europe	0.8
OECD Asia	1.0
non-OECD Eurasia	1.7
non-OECD Asia	3.6
non-OECD Middle East	2.4
non-OECD Africa	2.5
non-OECD Central and S. America	2.5

^aSource: EIA International Energy Outlook: "High Economic Growth Case," Report #: DOE/EIA-0484(2008).

^bOrganization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Flanner (2009), Geophys. Res. Lett.

2005 global-mean AHF: 0.03 W/m² 2040 global-mean AHF: 0.06 W/m² 2100 global-mean AHF: 0.19 W/m²

2005 Annual-Mean Anthropogenic Heat Flux



Equilibrium temp, PBL height change

Over what scales does this effect matter?

Tuble 21 Statistically Significant Equilibrium Chinate Changes					
	Continental	_		Gridcells With	
	United States	Europe	East Asia	$Q_{\rm H} > 3.0 \ {\rm W} \ {\rm m}^{-1}$	
2005 Annual-mean T _s (°C)	_	_	_	+0.15 (n = 14)	
2005 Annual-mean h_{pbl} (m)	+16	_	_	+32	
2040 Annual-mean T_s (°C)	_	_	_	$+0.24 \ (n = 60)$	
2040 Annual-mean $h_{\rm pbl}$ (m)	_	_	_	+29	
2040 Aerosol residence time	_	_	_	+2.5%	
2100 Annual-mean T_s (°C)	+0.44	+0.54	+0.88	+0.76 (n = 414)	
2100 Annual-mean $h_{\rm pbl}$ (m)	+15	+21	+45	+53	

Table 2. Statistically Significant Equilibrium Climate Changes^a

^aChanges significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level. T_s , 2-meter air temperature; h_{pbl} , Planetary boundary layer height.

- Continental-scale warming is not apparent until 2100
- Local (gridcell)-scale warming and PBL expansion are apparent now
- Most pollutants are emitted from high-AHF regions Large ensemble needed to answer when/where effects are most important.

Geographic pattern of changes



2100 AHF Change in DJF Minimum Temp.



Conclusions

- AHF is a small, but "missing" energy term in contemporary climate models
- AHF is a climate forcing term:
 - All non-renewable primary energy use
 - 2005 global-mean: +0.03 W/m²
 - 2005 Netherlands: +4.2 W/m²
 - 2100 global-mean: +0.19 W/m² (= present N₂O forcing)
- Significant present-day warming and PBL expansion in gridcells with AHF > 3.0 W/m²
 - Most pollutants emitted concurrently with combustion (e.g., large AHF); may be lofted higher in atmosphere

 Current energy growth rates produce continentalscale surface warming of 0.4-0.9°C around 2100

 No significant signal produced from 2005 or 2040 scenarios

Could be important for regional climate projections

Original work

VOLUME 11

JOURNAL OF APPLIED METEOROLOGY

Numerical Climatic-Change Experiments: The Effect of Man's Production of Thermal Energy

WARREN M. WASHINGTON

National Center for Atmospheric Research,¹ Boulder, Colo. 80302 (Manuscript received 3 January 1972, in revised form 26 April 1972)

ABSTRACT

We describe in this paper a set of general circulation model experiments on possible climatic changes caused by man's generation of thermal energy or pollution. Three experiments were carried out: one in which we introduced only a small initial error, one in which we added the expected ultimate levels of thermal energy generation, and one in which we added a *negative* amount of thermal energy. In all three experiments, we obtained the same results, indicating that the thermal pollution effect is probably small compared to the natural fluctuations of the model. We also discuss some limitations of the present model for inferring the proper climatic-change response.