

Prospectus Outline

- A. Motivation for thesis topic(s)
 - a. Heat as a human hazard
 - i. Heat as a top threat
 - ii. Future changes
 - 1. Population
 - 2. Climate change
 - b. Bridging a “Public Health / Climate” community gap
 - i. Urban climate studies
 - ii. EHE trends
 - iii. Climate datasets?
- B. EHE trends analysis
 - a. Study introduction / literature review
 - i. Temperature trend analysis lit review
 - 1. Review of important Epidemiological literature
 - 2. Current extreme temperature trends literature
 - 3. EHE trends studies highlighted
 - ii. Hypotheses
 - 1. Spatial average trends exist
 - 2. Spatial structure
 - 3. Temporal structure
 - 4. EHE trends as function of definition
 - 5. Relationships with mean temperature trends
 - b. Methods to be undertaken
 - i. Dataset created from USHCN
 - ii. EHE Characterizations (e.g. intensity, duration, timing, etc.)
 - iii. EHE type definitions
 - iv. Methods overview
 - 1. Temporal disaggregation/station selection
 - 2. Relationships between EHE types
 - 3. Spatial structure
 - v. Summer average trend mean bias, absolute accuracy and spatial structure reproducibility
 - c. Current results
 - i. Spatial structure relevant
 - ii. Significant trends (~40% of all stations)
 - iii. Mild relationships between EHE types
 - iv. Good relationship with summer average trends
- C. Detroit urban climate investigation
 - a. UHI literature review / study introduction
 - i. Urban climate theory
 - ii. Urban climate studies
 - iii. Intersection with health sphere
 - b. Hypotheses

- i. Summertime average daily extreme temperatures vary spatially across the urban/suburban domain
 - ii. The magnitude of variability diagnosable by large-scale weather
 - iii. The spatial pattern diagnosable by land attributes
 - iv. The spatial variability exists during heat-oppressive weather
 - c. Methods & results overview
 - i. Network characterization
 - ii. Analysis of spatial variability
 - 1. Magnitude of spatial variability
 - 2. Forecasting the magnitude of spatial variability
 - 3. Magnitude of spatial variability during hot weather
 - iii. Statistical modeling of the spatial pattern
 - 1. Land-cover variables
 - 2. Modeling efforts
 - d. Main conclusions
 - i. Spatial variability exists
 - 1. On average
 - 2. During hot weather
 - 3. Magnitude can be forecasted
 - ii. Spatial pattern can be modeled
- D. Validation of three high resolution observational climate datasets
 - a. Literature review of high resolution observational datasets / study introduction
 - i. Climate community observational datasets
 - 1. USHCN
 - 2. CRU
 - 3. GISS
 - 4. UDel
 - 5. USCRN
 - ii. Hydrological community observational datasets
 - 1. DAYMET
 - 2. Maurer
 - 3. Di Luzio
 - iii. Utility/problem of high-res. datasets
 - b. Hypotheses
 - i. Maurer, Di Luzio and DAYMET datasets exhibit the same trends as a reference climate dataset
 - ii. The gridded datasets reproduce the spatial structured in trends across the U.S.
 - iii. The error in trends are not spatially autocorrelated
 - iv. The error is not a function of the physical characteristics of the stations
 - c. Methods to be undertaken
 - i. General methods/project design
 - 1. Reference dataset: USHCN v1+v2 (daily) dataset

2. Interpolation to selected USHCN locations
3. Universal base period
 - a. 1981-2010
 - b. Reference dataset
4. Summer season: May 15th – September 15th
5. Quantification of trends/bias/accuracy
 - a. Trends: OLS
 - i. Trend bias: OLS of difference each year from reference data
 - ii. Accuracy: OLS of absolute difference each year from reference data
 - b. Significance: Mann Kendall test
- ii. Comparing trends:
 1. Percentile exceedence trend comparison
 - a. # of summer season Tmin 90th percentile exceedences
 - b. # of summer season Tmax 90th percentile exceedences
 2. EHE trend comparison
 - a. EHE definition:
 - i. 90th percentile Exceedance
 - ii. Duration required
 - iii. Running mean above 90th percentile
 - iv. Tmin and Tmax required
 - b. Variable for comparison:
 - i. # per year
 - ii. mean duration
 - iii. Continental averages
 - iv. Trend bias/accuracy as a function of
 - a. Elevation
 - b. Distance to water
 - v. Spatial Structure
 1. Maps of results
 2. 2D correlation coefficients of gridded results
 - vi. Spatial autocorrelation: statistical tests (Moran's I test)
- d. Hoped for figures and conclusions
 - i. Table of continental averages trends, biases, absolute accuracies and percentages of stations with significant biases
 - ii. Map (table) of typical difference (correlation) between datasets
 - iii. Results of autocorrelation tests
 - iv. Accuracy/bias as a function of elevation, distance to water and resolution
- E. How these conclusions can satisfy the thesis motivation
 - a. How these results will aid in the mission to protect people from heat-health hazards

- i. Knowledge of past trends in relevant HW characteristics allows better decision making for cities
 - ii. Knowledge of the local scale (1-10 km) variability of temperatures in a populated region (Detroit) is important to both heat-health action plan strategies and urban planners concerned with city sustainability w.r.t. heat-health.
- b. Bridging the gap as an interface to translate knowledge
 - i. HW trend characterizations using definitions relevant to the public health's heat-health discussion
 - ii. Characterization (spatial, temporal aspects) of spatial variability at local scale of relevant (to the public health's heat-health discussion) exposure metrics (e.g. daily high/low)
 - iii. Suitability of high-resolution climate datasets often used by the end user.
- c. How our results will advance the climatology discussion
 - i. Detailed knowledge of the past trends in HW characteristics and relationship with average temperature trends
 - ii. Knowledge of the local scale (1-10 km) variability of temperatures in a populated region
 - iii. Validation of the suitability of Hi-Res (4-12km) climate datasets to study changes in extreme temperature trends