

Alexandra Jonko and Karen Shell • College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University • Contact: ajonko@coas.oregonstate.edu • College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University •

Figure 1 Clear-sky and all-sky Albedo Feedback in W/m²/K, calculated for 2 x CO₂, 4 x CO₂ and 8 x CO₂ using 30 year averages. In the clear-sky case, the feedback decreases significantly with increasing CO_2 concentrations. This decrease is dampened in the all-sky case, likely as cloud albedo increases and compensates for decreasing sea-ice albedo.

Abstract Radiative feedbacks in the climate system are a major source of uncertainty in estimates of climate sensitivity. These feedbacks are associated with effects of changes in water vapor, clouds, lapse rate and surface albedo on the Earth's radiation budget.

Figure 2 Water Vapor Feedback, as Figure 1. The feedback magnitude decreases somewhat. However, variability is too large for the change to be significant.

Reference Soden, Brian J., Isaac M. Held, Robert Colman, Karen M. Shell, Jeffrey T. Kiehl, Christine A. Shields, 2008: Quantifying Climate Feedbacks using Radiative Kernels, *J. Clim.*, **21**, 3504-3520.

Figure 3 Lapse Rate Feedback, as Figure 1. The feedback magnitude increases with increased CO₂ concentrations. The larger variability of all three feedbacks for lower CO_2 concentrations is likely due to the division by a smaller value of temperature change, dT_s.

We use the radiative kernel technique [Soden et al., 2008] to quantify feedbacks to examine the effect of increasing CO_{2} forcing. We compare feedbacks resulting from the climate response to instantaneous doubling, quadrupling and octupling of CO_{2} levels in the fully coupled National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Community Climate System Model (CCSM).

where *X* represents feedback variables (albedo, water vapor, lapse rate and clouds). Each individual feedback can be decomposed into a radiative kernel $\frac{\partial (F-Q)}{\partial y}$, representing the response of top-of-atmosphere radiative fluxes to incremental changes in $X_{\!\scriptscriptstyle\! j}$ and a climate response of $X_{\!\scriptscriptstyle\! j}$, $\frac{aX_{\!\scriptscriptstyle\! i}}{dT_{\!\scriptscriptstyle S}}$. ∂ (*F* −*Q*) $\frac{\partial X_i}{\partial x_i}$ $\boldsymbol{\varTheta}$ $\frac{\partial (F - Q)}{\partial (F - Q)}$ +*Re* nd ∆(*F* −*Q*) ∆*Ts*

lt(∂
∂ respo ∂*Ts* $\overline{\mathsf{n}}$ S€ \overline{f} **(F** \overline{f} ∂*Xi dXi dTs* +*Re*

We find a significant decrease in albedo feedback, and increase in lapse rate feedback with increasing CO₂ forcing. The differences in water vapor feedback, however, are smaller than the feedback's variability.

Radiative Kernel Technique Individual feedbacks are computed according to the linear decomposition of the feedback parameter γ

$$
\gamma = \frac{\Delta(F-Q)}{\Delta T_s} = \frac{\partial(F-Q)}{\partial T_s} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial(F-Q)}{\partial X_i} \frac{dX_i}{dT_s} + Re
$$

The kernel is calculated using the model's radiative transfer algorithm. The climate response is obtained from the difference in X_i and T_i *s* between a control and experiment model simulation.

Because cloud radiative forcing is nonlinear with respect to cloud variables, feedbacks cannot be evaluated directly using a cloud kernel. We have not included the cloud feedback in the present study.

Acknowledgements The radiative kernels used in this study, as well as guidance and support, were provided by Karen Shell, Oregon State University. The CCSM3 data has been made available by Gokhan Danabasoglu, NCAR.

Effects of CO₂ Forcing Magnitude on Climate Feedbacks