# The text that follows is a PREPRINT.

Please cite as:

Fearnside, P.M. 1991. Greenhouse gas contributions from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. pp. 92-105 In: J.S. Levine (ed.) <u>Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric,</u> <u>Climatic, and Biospheric Implications</u>. MIT Press, Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A.. 640 pp.

Copyright: MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

The original publication is available from: MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

# **GREENHOUSE GAS CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DEFORESTATION IN BRAZILIAN AMAZONIA**

Philip M. FearnsideNational Institute for Research in the Amazon (INPA)C.P. 47869011 Manaus, AmazonasBRAZIL

Paper presented at the Chapman Conference on Biomass Burning, Williamsburg, Virginia, U.S.A., 19-23 March 1990.

Contribution for: J.S. Levine (ed.) <u>Biomass Burning</u>. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. (in press) 1991

### ABSTRACT

Examination of the often contradictory estimates of the rate and extent of deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia leads to a "best estimate" of the cumulative area of forest cleared through 1988 as 345 X  $10^3$  km<sup>2</sup> (including old clearings), or 8.2% of the 4 X  $10^6$  km<sup>2</sup> forested portion of Brazil's 5 X  $10^6$  km<sup>2</sup> Legal Amazon region. Recent (post-1960) clearing of primary and old secondary forest totaled 268 X  $10^3$  km<sup>2</sup>, or 6.4%. Including clearing in the <u>cerrado</u> increases the total of recent clearing to 460 X  $10^3$  km<sup>2</sup>, or 9.6% of the area originally under forest and <u>cerrado</u>. Forest loss in 1988 was proceeding at 20 X  $10^3$  km<sup>2</sup>/year; inclusion of estimated <u>cerrado</u> loss raises the total to 39 X  $10^6$  km<sup>2</sup>/year, an area almost the size of Holland.

Mean dry weight biomass (above and below ground) is estimated at 211 metric tons (MT)/hectare (ha) for forest areas being cleared in 1988 and 247 MT/ha for the region's forest as a whole (carbon content of biomass is 50%). Pasture biomass averages 10.7 MT/ha. Soil release of carbon (C) from converting forest to pasture is 3.92 MT/ha from the top 20 cm. Were all of the forest and <u>cerrado</u> areas converted to pasture, 51 billion metric tons (gigatons = GT) of C would be released. The annual rate of forest and <u>cerrado</u> loss in 1988 was releasing 270 X  $10^6$  MT of carbon on conversion to cattle pasture. Considering the quantities of carbon dioxide and methane released--and the relatively greater impact of methane carbon on the greenhouse effect-the release of carbon in these two forms at 1988 clearing rates totals from 262 to 282 million metric tons, depending on assumptions regarding methane release from burning and from termites. This is almost three times the annual carbon release from Brazil's use of fossil fuels, but brings little benefit to the country.

#### I.) INTRODUCTION

The greenhouse effect is the sum of heat-absorbing actions of various gases emitted from a variety of human activities and natural processes in different parts of the world. Although carbon dioxide emissions from industrialized countries represent the largest single factor, other sources of greenhouse gases, such as tropical deforestation, also make significant contributions. Policies designed to control global warming must be based on an adequate understanding of the nature and magnitude of the gas sources, the cost and effectiveness of possible policy changes, and the benefits that are being derived from activities that now release greenhouse gases. The Brazilian Amazon, with the largest remaining area of tropical forest, is of central importance not only because deforestation in this region contributes a substantial amount of carbon to the atmosphere, but also because controlling deforestation is amply justified from the perspective of Brazil's own interests, independent of the question of global warming. Slowing forest loss is possible because the process of deforestation in Brazil is largely driven by factors that are subject to government decisions. Separate discussions have been published treating deforestation's causes in Brazil (Fearnside, 1987a), its meager benefits (Fearnside, 1985a, 1986a), heavy environmental costs (Fearnside, 1985b, 1988), and irrationality from the perspective of the long-term interests of the country (Fearnside, 1989a,b). Measures that would help slow forest loss in Brazilian Amazonia have been reviewed both from the perspective of what the Brazilian government could do (Fearnside, 1989c) and that of possible contributions

from other countries (Fearnside, 1990a). Potential impact on other countries makes Amazonian deforestation a focus of worldwide concern (Fearnside, 1989e).

The present and potential contributions to the greenhouse effect from deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon are uncertain because of the small amount and low reliability of data on several key components in the calculation. Brazilian Amazonia's great size and heterogeneity, combined with the relative paucity of data, make these uncertainties a weak point in global carbon budget calculations.

The present contribution of deforestation is a function of the annual rate at which forests are being cleared, biomass of the forests, partitioning of biomass in above and below ground compartments, carbon content of the vegetation, fraction of above-ground carbon transferred to long-term pools such as charcoal, completeness of burning, reburning practices (including transformations to and from charcoal pools), rate of decomposition of unburned biomass, carbon stocks in replacement vegetation, and carbon stocks in soil under original and replacement vegetations. The ratio of gases released by deforestation affects contribution to the greenhouse effect. Calculation of potential release also requires knowing the total area for each vegetation type present.

All of these quantities are uncertain. The uncertainty of the overall result depends both on the uncertainty of each factor and on the sensitivity of the result to changes in that factor. Many uncertainties have multiplicative effects, rapidly degrading the reliability of the calculated releases (Robinson, 1989). Despite these limitations, it is essential that the best estimate possible be made from the available data. Where measurements are missing for needed quantities, such as the biomass of certain vegetation types, then guesses or assumptions based on similar vegetation elsewhere must be used. Use of such low-reliability values is preferable to extrapolating to the region from the few existing high-reliability biomass measurements: it is better to be approximately right than to be precisely wrong. Despite disagreements and conflicting data on such vital factors as forest biomass and deforestation rates, the conclusion remains inescapable that Amazonian deforestation makes a significant contribution to the greenhouse effect. More fundamental than disagreements about the magnitude of deforestation and biomass is lack of consensus over how the results should be interpreted in terms of policy changes.

# II.) DEFORESTATION RATES

Controversy surrounds the existing estimates of the extent and rate of deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. These controversies are analyzed elsewhere, and a "best estimate" is derived which calculates that 8.2% of the originally forested portion of the Brazilian Amazon had been cleared through 1988 (including old clearings), with new clearing in the forest (virgin + old secondary forest) area expanding at 20 X  $10^3$  km<sup>2</sup> per year (Fearnside, 1990d).

Much of the literature on the contribution of tropical deforestation to global warming has been based on the deforestation estimates of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the

United Nations (FAO) for 1980 (Lanly, 1982). This survey is both out of date and unlikely to represent the true extent of deforestation even for the period it covers. The information it reports was obtained by a questionnaire sent to the government of each country, rather than from independent monitoring methods such as remote sensing. In the case of Brazil, the task of responding was given to the Superintendency for Development of the Amazon (SUDAM), the agency responsible for subsidizing and promoting large cattle ranches in the region. Much of the information available at the time (reviewed in Fearnside, 1982) is not reflected in the report.

The deforestation estimate adopted here (Fearnside, 1990d) uses as many as possible of the measurements on 1988 LANDSAT-TM images made by Brazil's National Institute of Space Research (INPE) (Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b). In the state of Acre a discrepancy with previous results of the Brazilian Institute for Forestry Development (IBDF), now part of the Brazilian Institute for Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA), led to using a projection from 1980 and 1987 data in this state. In the state of Rondônia the absolute value for deforestation was derived from the INPE LANDSAT results, but an unexplained jump relative to LANDSAT data interpreted by IBDF from the previous year (Brazil, IBDF, 1989) led to using an estimate for deforestation rate in this state derived from AVHRR results (Malingreau and Tucker, 1988; J.P. Malingreau, personal communication, 1988; D. Skole, INPA seminar, 1989; see Fearnside, 1990d). In all states the INPE data (Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b) were used to estimate the area originally forested, but the alteration of <u>cerrado</u> (central Brazilian scrub savanna) was estimated using a number of assumptions regarding the proportionality of alteration in different vegetation types, or continuation of previous trends.

By the "best estimate" calculation outlined above, the cleared area in the Legal Amazon totals 353 X 10<sup>3</sup> km<sup>2</sup>, 268 X 10<sup>3</sup> km<sup>2</sup> (76%) of which is forest (Table 1). Of the original vegetation cover (Figure 1), 7.4% of the total and 6.4% of the forest had been cleared by 1988. These values do not include "old clearings" (clearings made prior to 1960, which the INPE/Our Nature Program measurements registered as 31,822 km<sup>2</sup> in Pará and 60,724 km<sup>2</sup> in Maranhão). These older secondary forests were not detected in the earlier LANDSAT-MSS studies (see Fearnside, 1982, 1986b) and so cannot be used in the present study for the purpose of establishing trends by comparison with older data. The INPE study's area values for old secondary forest as a separate vegetation type. The area that has lost its original forest cover, including the old secondary forest area, is an area the size of Finland: 345 X 10<sup>3</sup> km<sup>2</sup>, or 8.2% of the original forest area.

The average rate of deforestation can be conservatively estimated by assuming constant rates since the last available satellite measurement of cleared area (Table 2). This procedure underestimates the current rate of deforestation because the calculation averages deforestation over the period between the last two available satellite measurements while all evidence indicates that areas cleared have, in general, been increasing every year. An exception to this trend may be clearing in 1989, mainly due to heavier rains during the dry season than in the two preceeding years. The nearly constant increase in the rate of clearing renders obsolete the many

greenhouse effect calculations that have been based on deforestation estimates for 1980 or earlier.

#### II.) RELEASE OF GREENHOUSE GASES

#### A.) AVAILABLE ESTIMATES

Calculating the potential contribution of deforestation to the greenhouse effect requires comparison of carbon stocks present before and after clearing. Estimates of potential emissions have been evolving as better information becomes available. An estimate (Fearnside, 1985c) based on a seven-category classification of vegetation by Braga (1979) and biomass for dense forest based on the mean results from existing studies where direct measurements were made concluded that conversion of the Legal Amazon to cattle pasture would release 62 billion metric tons (gigatons = GT) of carbon. The biomass for the "upland dense forest" category used was 361.5 MT/ha dry weight total biomass, including live above-ground (251.7 MT/ha), below-ground (86.3 MT/ha), and litter and dead above-ground biomass (23.6 MT/ha). This biomass value from direct measurements is higher by a factor of two than the 155.1 MT/ha value for total biomass derived by Brown and Lugo (1984) from FAO forest volume surveys for "tropical American undisturbed productive broadleafed forests"--a value that has been used in recent global carbon balance calculations (e.g. Detwiler and Hall, 1988).

The Brown and Lugo (1984) forest volume estimate of 155.1 MT/ha is lower than biomass values derived using the same methodology for 15 of 16 locations for which volume information is given in the FAO reports, making it unlikely that a mean value this low applies to dense forests in Brazilian Amazonia (Fearnside, 1986c). Revising the estimate of Fearnside (1985c), principally by incorporating FAO wood volume information into the dense forest mean and by using values for pasture biomass based on monitoring over an annual cycle at Altamira (Pará) and Ouro Preto do Oeste (Rondônia) (Fearnside, 1989d), yields an estimate of 49.7 GT as the potential release from conversion to cattle pasture (Fearnside, 1987b). The biomass calculations in the present paper yield an intermediate value of 51 GT (Tables 3 and 4).

The 16 locations in the FAO data set have a mean total (above + below ground) biomass of 226.1 MT/ha if calculated using the above-ground volume to biomass conversion factor derived by Lugo and Brown (1984) and the above to below ground ratio measured by Klinge <u>et al.</u> (1975; see Fearnside, 1987b). Brown <u>et al.</u> (1989) have recently derived more reliable volume to biomass conversion factors, raising their estimate for mean above-ground biomass for undisturbed tropical American closed broadleaf forests by 28-47%. The mean above-ground biomass of 169.68 MT/ha (Brown <u>et al.</u>, 1989: 898) is equivalent to 222.3 MT/ha total biomass, using the Klinge <u>et al.</u>(1975) conversion factor of 1.31. This is in good agreement with the 226 MT/ha value used here for central Pará (Table 3), where the FAO surveys were concentrated. Both values are probably underestimates: the value used in Table 3 (from Fearnside, 1987b) for having used the lower (and less reliable) volume-to-biomass conversion (from Lugo and Brown, 1984) and the more recent estimate (Brown et al., 1989) for using a weighting scheme by forest

type that results in a weighted mean volume lower than that found in 15 of the 16 localities that form the basis of the survey.

### **B.) LAND USE TRANSFORMATIONS**

The cattle pastures that replace forest last only about a decade before they cease to be productive. The vegetation that succeeds cattle pasture has a higher biomass than pasture, thus reducing somewhat the net release of carbon. However, degradation of soil under pasture, combined with rainfall changes expected should the scale of deforestation greatly expand, are likely to make low-biomass dysclimaxes, including grassy formations, the dominant land cover in a deforested Amazon (Fearnside, 1990b).

The rate of deforestation, together with the biomass of forest being cleared, affects the current (as opposed to potential) contribution of deforestation to the greenhouse effect. The rate of clearing was calculated for each state (Table 2) but must also be apportioned between various forest types within each state. This is done by assuming that within each state, each forest type is cleared in proportion to the area in which it occurs.

The areas of different forest types present and the biomass of each forest type are both uncertain quantities. In Table 3, the values listed have been derived from a variety of sources and have varying degrees of uncertainty. The area figures presented in Table 3 have been rounded off after carbon release calculations were made.

The factor most heavily influencing the total biomass present is the dense forest of the state of Amazonas. This has both the largest area and the highest biomass per hectare of any forest type. It also happens to be the unit where the largest number of direct biomass measurements have been made. This area represents approximately 37% of the total potential carbon release from conversion of the Legal Amazon to cattle pasture.

### C.) THE FATE OF CARBON STOCKS

1.) Biomass Carbon

Char formed in burning is one way that carbon can be transferred to a long-term pool where it cannot enter the atmosphere. A burn of forest being converted to cattle pasture near Manaus resulted in 2.7% of above-ground carbon being converted to char (Fearnside <u>et al</u>., nd-a). This is substantially lower than the 20% assumed by Seiler and Crutzen (1980) when they identified charcoal formation as a potentially important carbon sink. Using the observed lower rate of charcoal formation would make global carbon cycle models indicate a larger contribution of greenhouse gases from tropical deforestation than has been the case using the higher rates of carbon transfer to long-term pools (e.g. Goudriaan and Ketner, 1984).

The burning behavior of ranchers can alter the amount of carbon passing into a long-term pool as charcoal. Carbon budget calculations generally assume that forest is only burned once

and that all unburned biomass subsequently decomposes (e.g. Bogdonoff et al., 1985). This is not the typical pattern in cattle pastures that dominate land use in deforested areas in the Brazilian Amazon. Ranchers reburn pastures at intervals of two to three years to combat invasion of inedible woody vegetation. Logs lying on the ground when these reburnings occur are often burned. Some char formed in earlier burns can be expected to be combusted as well. A typical scenario of three reburnings over a ten-year period would raise the percentage of aboveground C converted to charcoal from 2.6% to 3.6%, given the assumptions outlined in Figure 2 and Table 5, to be discussed later.

The remaining carbon would be released through combustion and decay; the relative importance of each affects the gases released. A one-burn-only scenario would release 27.5% of the preburn above-ground carbon through combustion and 68.9% through decay, whereas the scenario with three reburnings would release 40.6% through combustion and 54.8% through decay. Both combustion and decay release methane, 3.7 times more potent per ton of carbon in provoking the greenhouse effect than is carbon dioxide when the global warming potential over the lifetime of each gas is considered without discounting (Lashof and Ahuja, 1990).

Were a discount rate greater than zero applied, the importance of  $CH_4$  relative to  $CO_2$  would increase (and hence the impact of tropical deforestation relative to fossil fuel emissions). At discount rates of 1%, 2%, 3%, 4%, and 5%, respectively, methane provokes approximately 12, 17, 22, 25, and 28 times more global warming per ton of carbon than does carbon dioxide (Lashof and Ahuja, 1990). An alternative method of giving weight to short-term effects is to consider global warming potential without discounting up to a planning horizon, after which no effects are considered (Arrhenius and Waltz, 1990). Short planning horizons increase the relative impact of methane: considering only the next 30 years rather than the 150 year lifetime of  $CO_2$  raises the relative impact of  $CH_4$  carbon from approximately 4 to 40 times that of  $CO_2$  carbon.

Measurements of emission ratios of  $CH_4$  to  $CO_2$  (expressed as percent volume) indicate values ranging from 0.5 to 2.3% with a geometric mean of 1.1% for samples collected from the ground near burning forest in the Brazilian Amazon (Greenberg <u>et al.</u>, 1984) and ranging from 0.3 to 2.0% with a geometric mean of 0.8% when sampled from aircraft (Crutzen <u>et al.</u>, 1985: 242). The amount of methane released is heavily dependent on the ratio of smoldering to flaming combustion; smoldering releases substantially more  $CH_4$ . Aircraft sampling over fires (mostly from virgin forest clearing) indicates that a substantial fraction of combustion is in smoldering form (Andreae <u>et al.</u>, 1988). Logs consumed by reburning of cattle pastures are virtually all burned through smoldering rather than flaming combustion (personal observation).

Termites are the major agent of decay for unburned wood (Uhl and Saldarriaga, nd). No measurement exists of the percentage of felled biomass that is ingested by termites in Amazonian clearings. The region's principal termite specialist can offer no indication more precise than that "most" of the above-ground wood is ingested (Adelmar Bandeira, personal communication, 1990). A value of 75% has therefore been used as a first approximation (midpoint of the 50-100% range). It is assumed that none of the below-ground wood is ingested

by termites: a conservative assumption given that termites consume underground biomass in other regions, such as Africa (e.g. Wood et al., 1977).

A lively controversy surrounds the question of how much methane is produced by termites (Collins and Wood, 1984; Fraser <u>et al.</u>, 1986; Rasmussen and Khalil, 1983; Zimmerman <u>et al.</u>, 1982, 1984). Support for substantial emission potential from termites in deforested areas in the Amazon is provided by high population densities in fields in Pará where forest biomass remains present (Bandeira and Torres, 1985), and high methane emissions from termite mounds near Manaus (Goreau and de Mello, 1987). The billions of metric tons of wood that these insects would devour as Amazonia is deforested cannot help producing substantial contributions of methane regardless of which production rates prove to be correct.

The release of different greenhouse gases can be calculated based on available information from laboratory and field measurements. Low and high methane release scenarios are shown in Tables 6-8, using a range of available values for release from combustion and from termites.

In the low methane scenario, 1550 g CO<sub>2</sub> is released per kg of fuel burned in mixed flaming and smoldering burns (<u>i.e.</u>, initial burns) and 1400 g CO<sub>2</sub>/kg fuel in smoldering burns (<u>i.e.</u>, in reburns) (both values calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990, from Ward, 1986). Mixed combustion produces 5 g CH<sub>4</sub>/kg fuel (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990, from Ward, 1986). Smoldering combustion produces 7 g CH<sub>4</sub>/kg fuel (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990, from Ward, 1986). Greenberg <u>et al.</u>, 1984). The carbon content of the fuel is assumed to be equal to that in the biomass being cleared (50%). Termites in the low methane scenario release 0.2% of the carbon ingested as methane carbon (Seiler <u>et al.</u>, 1984 cited by Fraser <u>et al.</u>, 1986). The transformations in the low methane scenario are summarized in Figure 3.

In the high methane scenario, mixed and smoldering burns release the same quantities of carbon dioxide as in the low methane scenario. Methane is produced at a rate of 6 g/kg fuel in mixed burns and 11 g/kg fuel in smoldering burns (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990 from Ward, 1986). Termites release 7.8 X  $10^{-3}$  molecules of CH<sub>4</sub> per molecule of CO<sub>2</sub> (Goreau and de Mello, 1987), or 7.9 g CH<sub>4</sub> carbon per kg fuel carbon, assuming that all carbon is released either as CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub>. The methane release from termites in the high methane scenario is that measured in termite mound emissions near Manaus--a value only slightly lower than the emissions of the temperate zone species that led Zimmerman <u>et al.</u> (1982) to postulate massive global emissions from termites.

The effect of methane is to raise the impact of net carbon release from Amazonian deforestation by 14 to 18%, depending on whether the low or high methane scenario is used. The effect is slightly lower if gross carbon release is considered--the uptake of carbon by the replacement vegetation in the net release calculation affects only  $CO_2$  since  $CH_4$  does not enter photosynthetic reactions.

Carbon monoxide (CO) is also produced by burning (Tables 6-8). This gas contributes indirectly to the greenhouse effect by impeding natural cleansing processes in the atmosphere that remove a number of greenhouse gases, including methane. Carbon monoxide removes hydroxyl radicals (OH), which react with  $CH_4$  and other gases, including various chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) that provoke stratospheric ozone depletion, in addition to the greenhouse effect.

For mixed flaming and smoldering combustion in the low release scenario, 120 g CO result per kg of fuel (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990 from Greenberg <u>et al.</u>, 1984), while in the high release scenario the equivalent figure is 150 g (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990 from Crutzen <u>et al.</u>, 1985). Assuming 50% fuel carbon, these values are equivalent to 0.096 and 0.12 kg CO carbon per kg of fuel carbon.

For smoldering combustion in the low release scenario, 220 g CO is released per kg of fuel (Ward, 1986 cited by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990), while in the high release scenario the equivalent figure is 280 g (calculated by Kaufman <u>et al.</u>, 1990 from Greenberg <u>et al.</u>, 1984 and Ward, 1986). Assuming fuel carbon content as above, these values are equivalent to 0.176 and 0.224 kg CO carbon per kg of fuel carbon, respectively. Complete clearing of the Brazilian Legal Amazon would release 5 to 8 GT of CO (Table 8). The global warming potential of a molecule of CO relative to one of  $CO_2$  is 1.4 without discounting and rises to approximately 7 at an annual discount rate of 5% (Lashof and Ahuja, 1990). As with methane, the more conservative zero discount values have been used in computing CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (Table 6).

Some carbon is released in other forms, such as nonmethane hydrocarbons (NMHCs) and graphitic carbon (soot). The data available are not sufficiently reliable to calculate emissions of these by difference. The carbon release from forest given in Table 4 corresponds to a gross release from biomass of 105.6 MT/ha, while the equivalent gross carbon release in the form of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO totals 103.1 MT/ha (from Table 6). The implied difference of 2.5 MT/ha (2.3%) might be presumed to represent release in other forms, but uncertainties such as the carbon content of fuel used in deriving the gas emission relationships make this number highly uncertain. The implied difference is greater than the releases suggested by emission ratios from laboratory measurements on combustion of temperate-zone forest fuels. Using the ratios of particulates to methane and NMHCs adopted by Kaufman et al. (1990; based on Ward and Hardy, 1984 and Ward, 1986), the low and high methane scenarios imply NMHC releases of 0.29 to 0.39 MT/ha and 0.22 to 0.29 MT/ha for flaming and smoldering combustion, respectively, in forest of average biomass (using the combustion efficiency of 0.275 from Fearnside et al., nd-a; see Figure 2). The comparable releases of total particulates would be 1.47 to 1.97 MT/ha and 0.73 to 0.98 MT/ha; considering 7% of the total particulates to be graphitic carbon (the fraction found over Amazonian fires by Andreae et al., 1988), the releases of graphitic C would be 0.10 to 0.14 MT/ha and 0.05 to non=0.07 MT/ha.

Burning also releases some nitrous oxide  $(N_2O)$ , which contributes both to the greenhouse effect and to the degradation of stratospheric ozone. A sampling artifact has made measurements prior to 1989 unusable. However, the amounts produced by biomass burning are

substantially less than had previously been thought (Crutzen, 1990), so that ignoring the impact of  $N_20$  from fire will not unduly bias the results of the present calculations. A greater bias may be introduced by ignoring the biological production of  $N_2O$  in the soil, which may be stimulated by deforestation.  $N_2O$  is released from soils in greater quantities in cattle pasture than in forest (observations in the dry season near Manaus by Goreau and de Mello, 1987; see also Goreau and de Mello, 1988). Burning in nontropical environments has been found to stimulate  $N_2O$  release from soils (Anderson et al., 1988 cited by Kaufman et al., 1990).

#### 2.) Soil Carbon

Soil carbon in pasture is taken to be that in a profile equivalent to what is compacted from a 20 cm profile in the forest. It would not be fair to compare the amount of carbon (expressed in MT/ha) in the top meter of pasture soil to the top meter in forest soil, since soil under pasture undergoes compaction when exposed to sun, rain, and trampling of cattle. As the pores are crushed and soil bulk density increases, the amount of carbon in the top meter may increase as an artifact of including a greater weight of soil in the profile. The carbon in the top 20 cm of soil decreases from 0.91% to 0.56% by weight (see Fearnside, 1985c), based on soil carbon under forest and 10- and 11-year-old pastures at Paragominas (Pará) sampled by Falesi (1976: 31, 42). Considering the soil density as 0.56 g/cm<sup>3</sup> under forest at Paragominas (Hecht, 1981: 95), the layer compacted from the top 20 cm of forest soil releases 3.92 MT/ha of carbon.

The 3.92 MT/ha release from the top 20 cm of soil represents 38% of the preconversion carbon present in this layer. This is higher than the 20% of presosconversion carbon in the top 40 cm of soil that Detwiler (1986) concluded is released, on average, from conversion to pasture (based on a literature review). The difference is not so great as it might seem: since carbon release is greatest nearest the surface, considering soil to 40 cm would thereby reduce the percentage released. One factor acting to compensate for any overestimation possibly caused by using a higher percentage of soil carbon release is the low bias introduced by having considered only the top 20 cm. If soil to one m depth is considered (the usual practice), then the release would be increased to 9.33 MT/ha. The calculation to one m depth considers that the top 20 cm of soil contains 42% of the carbon in a one m profile (based on samples near Manaus: Fearnside, 1987b). Brown and Lugo (1982: 183) have used a similar relationship to estimate carbon stocks to a depth of one m from samples of the top 20 cm, considering 45% of the carbon in a one m profile to be located in the top 20 cm.

Conversion of all forest and <u>cerrado</u> in the Legal Amazon to cattle pasture would release 1.9 GT of carbon from the top 20 cm of soil-about 4% of the total released from converting the region to pasture. Were the soil considered to a depth of one m, and the assumption made that the proportion of carbon released remains constant with depth, the soil release would be 4.5 GT, or 8% of the total. Considering soil to one m would add 0.014 GT per year to the 0.010 GT release from the top 20 cm, given the 1988 rate and distribution of clearing.

Release of soil carbon would be expected when forest is converted to pasture because soil temperatures increase when forest cover is removed, thus shifting the balance between organic

carbon formation and degradation to a lower equilibrium level (Cunningham, 1963; Nye and Greenland, 1960). A number of studies have found lower carbon stocks under pasture than forest (reviewed in Fearnside, 1980). For the same reason, naturally occurring tropical grasslands also have much smaller soil carbon stocks per hectare than do forests (Post <u>et al.</u>, 1982). Lugo <u>et al.</u> (1986), however, have found increases in carbon storage in pasture soils in Puerto Rico, especially in drier sites, and suggest that tropical pastures may be a carbon sink. The present study treats soils as a source of carbon when forests are converted to pasture. All carbon released from soils is assumed to be in the form of  $CO_2$ .

### D.) GLOBAL CONTRIBUTION OF TROPICAL DEFORESTATION

Global carbon emissions from deforestation are uncertain, in part because of the uncertainty associated with Brazil's large contribution to the total. One estimate places the global annual total at 1.67 GT, of which 0.80 GT are ascribed to Brazil (Goldemberg, 1989). The Brazilian contribution of more than double the current estimate of 0.27 GT is probably due to using the AVHRR thermal infra-red burning estimates from 1987 (Setzer et al., 1988) as the rate of deforestation. The global total implies that 0.87 GT of carbon are released annually from non-Brazilian deforestation, and that the global total using the current estimate for Brazil would be 1.14 GT. Brazil's present contribution to the global total from deforestation would be 24%. Assuming a 5 GT/year global release from fossil fuels, deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon contributes 4.4% of the combined total from fossil fuels and deforestation. Using the fossil fuel release as the standard of comparison, as is the usual practice, Brazil's annual rate of deforestation in Amazonia represents 5.4% (Table 9). Using emission estimates for individual gases produces a similar result, since the loss of some carbon in forms not contributing to the greenhouse effect is compensated for by the greater impact of carbon in the form of methane. Using CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent carbon release of 0.259-0.267 GT (for the low and high methane scenarios in Table 6), the contribution represents 5.2-5.3% of the global fossil fuel total.

#### VI.) DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia already makes a significant contribution to the greenhouse effect, and continuation of deforestation trends could lead to an even greater potential contribution to this global problem. Uncertainties concerning clearing rate, biomass, and other factors do not change the basic conclusion regarding the significance of deforestation. This can be seen by examining a series of hypothetical examples (Table 9): were the average biomass of 210.7 MT/ha found to be incorrect, biomass values from other sources would result in contributions that, expressed as percentages of a 5 GT global annual total fossil fuel release, range from 2.8% to 4.6% if only the forest is considered, or 3.3% to 5.1% if the entire Legal Amazon is considered. The conclusion that the effect is significant is therefore quite robust.

Brazil emits  $100 \times 10^{6}$  MT of carbon annually from burning fossil fuels (Goldemberg, 1989). This contribution to the greenhouse effect is balanced against the benefits of the country's industry and transportation powered by oil and coal, all domestic use of natural gas, etc. In contrast, each year's clearing of forest and <u>cerrado</u> in the Brazilian Amazon is now contributing

to the atmosphere  $270 \times 10^{6}$  MT of carbon--almost three times as much as Brazil's use of fossil fuels (Table 4). The benefits of deforestation, however, are minimal: it leaves in its wake only destroyed rain forests and degraded cattle pastures.

The contrast between costs and benefits of biomass burning and fossil fuel combustion are also tremendous on a percapita basis. Brazil's  $140 \times 10^6$  population emits 714 kg of carbon per person per year from fossil fuels. A single rancher who clears 2,000 ha of forest (with an average biomass of 210.7 MT/ha, see Table 3) is emitting as much carbon as a city of 280,000 people burning fossil fuels (calculation patterned after Brown, 1988). Even a small farmer who clears one hectare per year is releasing 100 MT of carbon, the equivalent of 140 people in Brazil's cities. The gulf between the costs and benefits of deforestation compared to fossil fuel use makes slowing forest loss an obvious place for Brazil to start reducing its contribution to global warming.

Immediate action is needed to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in order to minimize the global warming that continuation of current trends would provoke. While research and monitoring efforts must be fortified and continued, ample scientific evidence is already in hand to justify strong measures by governments throughout the world. Reducing fossil fuel burning and slowing the rate of tropical deforestation are areas that can be readily identified as targets for such measures. Governments must not wait for the availability of more research results nor for the appearance of observable temperature changes before taking action, or the opportunity will be lost to avert the most damaging impacts of the greenhouse effect.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Studies on burning in Altamira were funded by National Science Foundation grants GS-422869 (1974-1976) and ATM-86-0921 (1986-1988), and in Manaus by World Wildlife Fund-US grant US-331 (1983-1985). I thank J.M. Robinson and S.V. Wilson for comments on the manuscript.

### VI.) LITERATURE CITED

Anderson, I.C., J.S. Levine, M.A. Poth and P.J. Riggan. 1988. Enhanced emission of biogenic nitric oxide and nitrous oxide from semi-arid soils following surface biomass burning. Journal of <u>Geophysical Research</u> 93: 3893-3898.

Andreae, M.O., E.V. Browell, M. Garstang, G.L. Gregory, R.C. Harriss, G.F. Hill, D.J. Jacob, M.C. Pereira, G.W. Sachse, A.W. Setzer, P.L. Silva Dias, R.W. Talbot, A.L. Torres, and S.C. Wofsy. 1988. Biomass-burning emissions and associated haze layers over Amazonia. Journal of <u>Geophysical Research</u> 93(D2): 1509-1527.

Arrhenius, E.A. and T.W. Waltz. 1990. The greenhouse effect: Implications for economic development. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 78. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, DC. 18 pp.

Bandeira, A.G. and M.F.P. Torres. 1985. Abundância e distribuição de invertebrados do solo em ecossistemas da Amazônia Oriental. O papel ecológico dos cupins. <u>Boletim do Museu Paraense</u> <u>Emílio Goeldi: Zoologia</u> 2(1): 13-38.

Benchimol, S. 1989. <u>Amazônia: Planetarização e Moritória Ecológica</u>. Centro de Recursos Educacionais (CERED), São Paulo. 144 pp.

Blake, D.R. and F.S. Rowland. 1988. Continuing worldwide increase in tropospheric methane, 1978 to 1987. <u>Science</u> 239: 1129-1131.

Bogdonoff, P., R.P. Detwiler and C.A.S. Hall. 1985. Land use change and carbon exchange in the tropics: III. Structure, basic equations, and sensitivity analysis of the model. <u>Environmental Management</u> 9(4): 345-354.

Braga, P.I.S. 1979. Subdivisão fitogeográfica, tipos de vegetação, conservação e inventário florístico da floresta amazônica. <u>Acta Amazonica</u> 9(4) suplemento: 53-80.

Brazil, Instituto de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE). 1989a. <u>Avaliação da Cobertura Florestal na</u> <u>Amazônia Legal Utilizando Sensoriamento Remoto Orbital</u>. INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo. 54 pp.

Brazil, Instituto de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE). 1989b. <u>Avaliação da Cobertura Florestal na</u> <u>Amazônia Legal Utilizando Sensoriamento Remoto Orbital, 2a. edição</u>. INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo. 45 pp.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1982. <u>Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal Natural do Estado de Mato Grosso: Relatório Técnico</u>. IBDF, Brasília. 66 pp.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1983a. <u>Desenvolvimento Florestal no Brasil</u>. PNUD/FAO/BRA-82-008. Folha Informativa No. 5. IBDF, Brasília.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1983b. <u>Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal Natural do Território de Roraima: Anexo Relatório</u> <u>Técnico</u>. IBDF, Brasília. 79 pp.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF).
1985. <u>Monitoramento da Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal Natural da Área do Programa</u>
<u>POLONOROESTE nos Estados de Rondônia e Mato Grosso: Relatório Técnico</u>. IBDF, Brasília.
77 pp.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1988. <u>Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal do Estado de Acre: Relatório Técnico</u>. IBDF, Brasília. 57 pp.

Brazil, Ministério da Agricultura, Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1989. <u>Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal do Estado de Rondônia: Relatório Técnico</u>. IBDF, Brasília. 77 pp.

Brazil, Ministério das Minas e Energia, Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral (DNPM), Projeto RADAMBRASIL. 1973-1983. <u>Levantamento de Recursos Naturais, Vols. 1-23</u>. DNPM, Rio de Janeiro.

Brazil, Ministério do Interior, Superintendência do Desenvolvimento da Amazonia (SUDAM) and Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF). 1988. <u>Levantamento da</u> <u>Alteração da Cobertura Vegetal Primitiva do Estado do Pará</u>. SUDAM/IBDF, Brasília. 28 pp.

Brazil, Secretaria de Planejamento (SEPLAN), Programa Grande Carajás (PGC), Companhia de Desenvolvimento de Barcarena (CODEBAR) and Ministério do Interior, Superintendência do Desenvolvimento da Amazônia (SUDAM). 1986. <u>Problemática do Carvão Vegetal na Área do Programa Grande Carajás</u>. CODEBAR/SUDAM, Belém. 117 pp.

Brown, I.F. 1988. Bacias hidrográficas. Presentation at the 2a. Semana do Ambiente. 5-9 December 1988, Piracicaba, São Paulo.

Brown, I.F. 1990. Uncertainties in tropical forest biomass. An example from Rondônia. Paper presented at the Chapman Conference on Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications. 19-23 March 1990, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Brown, S., A.J.R. Gillespie and A.E. Lugo. 1989. Biomass estimation methods for tropical forests with applications to forest inventory data. <u>Forest Science</u> 35(4): 881-902.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1982. The storage and production of organic matter in tropical forests and their role in the global carbon cycle. <u>Biotropica</u> 14(3): 161-187.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1984. Biomass of tropical forests: A new estimate based on forest volumes. <u>Science</u> 223: 1290-1293.

Cardenas, J.D.R., F.L. Kahn and J.L. Guillaumet. 1982. Estimativa da fitomassa do reservatório da UHE de Tucuruí. pp. 1-11 In: Brazil, Ministério das Minas e Energia, Centrais Elétricas do Norte S.A. (ELETRONORTE) and Brazil, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA). Projeto Tucuruí, Relatório Semestral Jan.-Jun. 1982. Vol. 2: Limnologia, Macrófitas, Fitomassa, Degradação de Fitomassa, Doenças Endêmicas, Solos. INPA, Manaus. 32 pp.

Collins, N.M. and T.G. Wood. 1984. Termites and atmospheric gas production. <u>Science</u> 224:84-85.

Crutzen, P.J. 1990. Biomass burning: A large factor in the photochemistry and ecology of the tropics. Paper presented at the Chapman Conference on Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications. 19-23 March 1990, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Crutzen, P.J., A.C. Delany, J. Greenberg, P. Haagenson, L. Heidt, R. Lueb, W. Pollock, W. Seiler, A. Wartburg and P. Zimmerman. 1985. Tropospheric chemical composition measurements in Brazil during the dry season. Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry 2: 233-256.

Cunningham, R.H. 1963. The effect of clearing a tropical forest soil. <u>Journal of Soil Science</u> 14: 334-344.

Detwiler, R.P. 1986. Land use change and the global carbon cycle: The role of tropical soils. <u>Biogeochemistry</u> 2: 67-93.

Detwiler, R.P. and C.A.S. Hall. 1988. Tropical forests and the global carbon cycle. <u>Science</u> 239: 42-47.

Falesi, I.C. 1976. <u>Ecossistema de Pastagem Cultivada na Amazônia Brasileira</u>. Centro de Pesquisa Agropecuária do Trópico Umido (CPATU), Belém. 193 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1980. The effects of cattle pasture on soil fertility in the Brazilian Amazon: Consequences for beef production sustainability. <u>Tropical Ecology</u> 21(1): 125-137.

Fearnside, P.M. 1982. Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon: How fast is it occurring? Interciencia (2): 82-88.

Fearnside, P.M. 1985a. Agriculture in Amazonia. pp. 393-418 In: G.T. Prance and T.E. Lovejoy (eds.) <u>Key Environments: Amazonia</u>. Pergamon Press, Oxford, U.K. 442 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1985b. Environmental change and deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. pp. 70-89 In: J. Hemming (ed.) <u>Change in the Amazon Basin: Man's Impact on Forests and Rivers</u>. Manchester University Press, Manchester, U.K. 222 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1985c. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem. <u>Interciencia</u> 10(4): 179-186.

Fearnside, P.M. 1986a. <u>Human Carrying Capacity of the Brazilian Rainforest.</u> Columbia University Press, New York. 293 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1986b. Spatial concentration of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. <u>Ambio</u> 15(2): 72-79.

Fearnside, P.M. 1986c. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem: Reply to Lugo and Brown. Interciencia 11(2): 58-64.

Fearnside, P.M. 1987a. Causes of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. pp. 37-53 In: R.F. Dickinson (ed.) <u>The Geophysiology of Amazonia: Vegetation and Climate Interactions</u>. John Wiley & Sons, New York. 526 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1987b. Summary of progress in quantifying the potential contribution of Amazonian deforestation to the global carbon problem. pp. 75-82 In: D. Athié, T.E. Lovejoy and P. de M. Oyens (eds.) <u>Proceedings of the Workshop on Biogeochemistry of Tropical Rain</u> <u>Forests: Problems for Research</u>. Universidade de São Paulo, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura (CENA), Piracicaba, São Paulo. 85 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1988. An ecological analysis of predominant land uses in the Brazilian Amazon. <u>The Environmentalist</u> 8(4): 281-300.

Fearnside, P.M. 1989a. Extractive reserves in Brazilian Amazonia: Opportunity to maintain tropical rain forest under sustainable use. <u>BioScience</u> 39(6): 387-393.

Fearnside, P.M. 1989b. Forest management in Amazonia: The need for new criteria in evaluating development options. <u>Forest Ecology and Management</u> 27(1): 61-79.

Fearnside, P.M. 1989c. A prescription for slowing deforestation in Amazonia. <u>Environment</u> 31(4): 16-20, 39-40.

Fearnside, P.M. 1989d. <u>A Ocupação Humana de Rondônia: Impactos, Limites e Planejamento</u>. Programa POLONOROESTE Relatório de Pesquisa No. 5. Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Brasília. 76 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1989e. Climate environment and international security: The case of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. pp. 685-694 In: A. Berger, S. Schneider and J.Cl. Duplessy (eds.) <u>Climate and Geo-Sciences: A Challenge for Science and Society in the 21st Century</u>. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands. 724 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1990a. Practical targets for sustainable development in Amazonia. pp. 167-174 In: N. Polunin and J. Burnett (eds.) <u>Maintenance of the Biosphere: Proceedings of the Third</u> <u>International Conference on the Environmental Future</u>. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, U.K. 228 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1990b. Fire in the tropical rain forest of the Amazon Basin. pp. 106-116 In: J.G. Goldammer (ed.) <u>Fire in the Tropical Biota: Ecosystem Processes and Global Challenges</u>. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany 497 pp..

Fearnside, P.M. 1990c. Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. pp. 211-238 In: G.M. Woodwell (ed.) <u>The Earth in Transition: Patterns and Processes of Biotic Impoverishment</u>. Cambridge University Press, New York 530 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1990d. The rate and extent of deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. <u>Environmental Management</u> 17(3): 213-216.

Fearnside, P.M., M.M. Keller, N. Leal Filho and P.M. Fernandes. nd-a. Rainforest burning and the global carbon budget: Biomass, combustion efficiency and charcoal formation in the Brazilian Amazon (in preparation).

Fearnside, P.M., N. Leal Filho, P.M.L.A. Graça, G.L. Ferreira, R.A. Custodio and F.J.A. Rodrigues. nd-b. Pasture biomass and productivity in Brazilian Amazonia (in preparation).

Fearnside, P.M., N. Leal Filho, F.J.A. Rodrigues, P.M.L.A. Graça and J.M. Robinson. nd-c. Tropical forest burning in Brazilian Amazonia: Measurements of biomass, combustion efficiency and charcoal formation at Altamira, Pará (in preparation).

Fraser, P.J., R.A. Rasmussen, J.W. Creffield, J.R. French and M.A.K. Khalil. 1986. Termites and global methane--another assessment. Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry 4: 295-310.

Goldemberg, J. 1989. A Amazônia e seu futuro. A Folha de São Paulo, 29 January 1989, p. A-3.

Goreau, T.J. and W.Z. de Mello. 1987. Effects of deforestation on sources and sinks of atmospheric carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, and methane from central Amazonian soils and biota during the dry season: A preliminary study. pp. 51-66 In: D. Athié, T.E. Lovejoy and P. de M. Oyens (eds.) <u>Proceedings of the Workshop on Biogeochemistry of Tropical Rain Forests:</u> <u>Problems for Research</u>. Universidade de São Paulo, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura (CENA), Piracicaba, São Paulo. 85 pp.

Goreau, T.J. and W.Z. de Mello. 1988. Tropical deforestation: Some effects on atmospheric chemistry. <u>Ambio</u> 17(4): 275-281.

Goudriaan, J. and P. Ketner. 1984. A simulation study for the global carbon cycle, including man's impact on the biosphere. <u>Climatic Change</u> 6: 167-192.

Greenberg, J.P., P.R. Zimmerman, L. Heidt and W. Pollock. 1984. Hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions from biomass burning in Brazil. Journal of Geophysical Research 89(D1): 1350-1354.

Hecht, S.B. 1981. Deforestation in the Amazon Basin: Magnitude, dynamics, and soil resource effects. <u>Studies in Third World Societies</u> 13: 61-108.

Jordan, C.F. and C.E. Russell. 1983. Jari: Productividad de las plantaciones y perdida de nutrientes debido al corte y la quema. <u>Interciencia</u> 8(5): 294-297.

Kaufman, Y.J., A.W. Setzer, C. Justice, C.J. Tucker, M.C. Pereira and I. Fung. 1990. Remote sensing of biomass burning in the tropics. pp. 371-394 In: J.G. Goldammer (ed.) <u>Fire in the Tropical Biota: Ecosystem Processes and Global Challenges</u>. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany 497 pp.

Klinge, H. and W.A. Rodrigues. 1974. Phytomass estimation in a central Amazonian rain forest. pp. 339-350 In: H.E. Young (ed.) <u>IUFRD Biomass Studies</u>. University Press, Orono, Maine.

Klinge, H., W.A. Rodrigues, E. Brunig and E.J. Fittkau. 1975. Biomass and structure in a Central Amazonian rain forest. pp. 115-122 In: F.B. Golley and E. Medina (eds.) <u>Tropical</u> <u>Ecological Systems: Trends in Terrestrial and Aquatic Research</u>. Springer-Verlag, New York. 398 pp.

Lanly, J.P. 1982. <u>Tropical Forest Resources</u>. FAO Forestry Paper 30, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

Lashof, D.A. and D.R. Ahuja. 1990. Relative global warming potentials of greenhouse gas emissions. <u>Nature</u> 344: 529-531.

Lugo, A.E., M.M. Sanchez and S. Brown. 1986. Land use and organic carbon content of some subtropical soils. <u>Plant and Soil</u> 96: 185-196.

Mahar, D.J. 1989. <u>Government Policies and Deforestation in Brazil's Amazon Region</u>. The World Bank, Washington, D.C. 56 pp.

Malingreau, J.P. and C.J. Tucker. 1988. Large-scale deforestation in the southeastern Amazon basin of Brazil. <u>Ambio</u> 17(1): 49-55.

Martinelli, L.A., I.F. Brown, R.L. Victoria, M.Z. Moreira, C.A.C. Ferreira and W.W. Thomas. nd. Estimativa de biomassa e produção de  $CO_2$  via desmatamento em floresta tropical úmida, Usina Hidroelétrica de Samuel, Rondônia (unpublished manuscript).

Nye, P.H. and D.J. Greenland. 1960. <u>The Soil Under Shifting Cultivation</u>. Technical Comunication No. 51, Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux of Soils, Harpenden, U.K. 156 pp.

Post, W.M., W.R. Emanuel, P.J. Zinke and A.G. Strangenberger. 1982. Soil carbon pools and world life zones. <u>Nature</u> 298: 156-159.

Rasmussen, R.A. and M.A.K. Khalil. 1983. Global production of methane by termites. <u>Nature</u> 301: 700-702.

Robinson, J.M. 1989. On uncertainty in the computation of global emissions from biomass burning. <u>Climatic Change</u> 14(3): 243-261.

Seiler, W., R. Conrad and D. Scharffe. 1984. Field studies of methane emission from termite nests into the atmosphere and measurements of methane uptake by tropical soils. Journal of <u>Atmospheric Chemistry</u> 1: 171-186.

Seiler, W. and P.J. Crutzen. 1980. Estimates of gross and net fluxes of carbon between the biosphere and the atmosphere from biomass burning. <u>Climatic Change</u> 2: 207-247.

Setzer, A.W., M.C. Pereira, A.C. Pereira Júnior and S.A.O. Almeida. 1988. <u>Relatório de</u> <u>Atividades do Projeto IBDF-INPE "SEQE" - Ano 1987</u>. Instituto de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), Pub. No. INPE-4534-RPE/565. INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo. 48 pp.

Stark, N. and M. Spratt. 1977. Biomass and nutrient storage in rainforest oxisols near San Carlos de Rio Negro. <u>Tropical Ecology</u> 18(1): 1-9.

Tardin, A.T., D.C.L. Lee, R.J.R. Santos, O.R. de Assis, M.P. dos Santos Barbosa, M. de Lourdes Moreira, M.T. Pereira, D. Silva and C.P. dos Santos Filho. 1980. <u>Subprojeto Desmatamento,</u> <u>Convênio IBDF/CNPq-INPE 1979</u>. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE) Relatório No. INPE-1649-RPE/103. INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo. 44 pp.

Uhl, C. and J. Saldarriaga. nd. The disappearance of wood mass following slash and burn agriculture in the Venezuelan Amazon (unpublished manuscript).

Ward, D.E. 1986. Field scale measurements of emission from open fires. Technical paper presented at the Defense Nuclear Agency Global Effects Review, Defense Nuclear Agency, Washington, D.C.,

Ward, D.E. and C.C. Hardy. 1984. Advances in the characterization and control of emissions from prescribed fires. Paper presented at the 77th annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association, San Francisco, CA.

Wood, T.G., R.A. Johnson and C. Ohiagu. 1977. Populations of termites (Isoptera) in natural and agricultural ecosystems in southern Guinea savanna near Mokwa, Nigeria. pp. 139-148 In: F. Malaisse (ed.) <u>Structure, Fonctionnement et Amenagement d'Ecosystemes Tropicaux</u>. Faculté des Sciences, Université Nationale du Zai"re, Lubumbashi, Zai"re. 334 pp. (<u>Geo-Eco-Trop</u> Vol. 1, No. 2).

Zimmerman, P.R., J.P. Greenberg and J.P.E.C. Darlington. 1984. Termites and atmospheric gas production. <u>Science</u> 224: 86.

Zimmerman, P.R., J.P. Greenberg, S.O. Wandiga and P.J. Crutzen. 1982. Termites: A potentially large source of atmospheric methane, carbon dioxide, and molecular hydrogen. <u>Science</u> 218: 563-565.

# FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1 - Forest and savanna in the Brazilian Legal Amazon (redrawn from Brazil, INPE, 1989a).

Figure 2 - Carbon transformations in a typical burning sequence. See Table 5 for parameters.

Figure 3 - The fate of biomass carbon and its contribution to the greenhouse effect. The first branch in the diagram summarizes the results of Figure 2.

IN THE BRAZILIAN LEGAL AMAZON FROM 1900 THROOG					
State	Original v0.036egetation (km <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>(a)</sup> Recentl				Recently
	Forest	<u>Cerrado</u>	Humid savanna	Total original vegetation	
Acre	152,589	0	0	152,589	8,634
Amapá	99,525	0	42,834	142,359	842
Amazonas	1,562,488	0	5,465	1,567,953	12,837
Maranhão	139,215	121,017	0	260,232	34,140
Mato Grosso	572,669	235,345	72,987	<sup>(c)</sup> 881,001	67,216
Pará	1,180,004	22,276	44,553	1,246,833	91,200
Rondônia	215,259	27,785	0	243,044	30,634
Roraima	173,282	0	51,735	225,017	2,187
Tocantins Goiás	/ 100,629	169,282	0	269,911	20,279
Legal Amazon	4,195,660	575,705	217,574	4,988,939	267,969

TABLE 1:ORIGINAL VEGETATION AND BEST ESTIMATE OF AREASIN THE BRAZILIAN LEGAL AMAZON FROM 1960 THROUG

(Table 1, part 2) RECENTLY CLEARED Н 1988 cleared area (km<sup>2</sup>) Percent recently Source cleared \_\_\_\_\_ <u>Cerrado</u><sup>(b)</sup> Total Of Of forest forest + <u>cerrado</u> 0 8,634 5.7 5.7 (d) 0 842 0.8 0.8 (e) 0 12,837 0.8 0.8 (e) 20,664 54,803 24.5 21.1 (e) 134,277 201,493 11.7 24.9 (e) 1,722 92,922 7.7 7.7 (e) 989<sup>(f)</sup>31,623 14.2 13.0 (e) 2,187 1.3 1.3 0 (e) 34,114 54,393 20.2 20.2 (e) \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ 191,765 459,734 6.4 9.6 \_\_\_\_\_

22

#### TABLE 1 NOTES:

(a) Original vegetation in accord with the INPE map (Figure 1), with the savanna areas apportioned between humid savanna and <u>cerrado</u> in their approximate proportions in the savanna areas shown for each state. The forest in Tocantins/Goiás has been increased by 68,573 km<sup>2</sup> presumed to have been included in the INPE survey but not in the map of original vegetation. "Forest" includes both "primary (virgin) forest" and "old secondary forests" (from clearings prior to 1960 in Pará and Maranhão). Totals are areas of political units, including water surfaces, as in the INPE and IBDF reports (making the percentages underestimates). The area of Tocantins/Goiás is that used by Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b; it is at variance with the 235,793 km<sup>2</sup> used in previous INPE reports (<u>e.g.</u> Tardin <u>et al.</u>, 1980) for the same geographical area.

(b) <u>Cerrado</u> clearing, which was not measured in the INPE study (Brazil, INPE, 1989b), has been estimated assuming that this vegetation type is cleared in the same proportion as the forest within each state, the exceptions of Rondônia (where proportionality is assumed excluding <u>cerrado</u> areas in Amerindian reservations) and Mato Grosso (where data exist for <u>cerrado</u> clearing in the western part of the state in 1983, and the ratio of <u>cerrado</u> to forest clearing observed there is assumed to apply to the entire state through 1988).

(c) Pantanal (Mato Grosso humid savanna) area from IBGE data reproduced in Benchimol (1989: 56). The remainder of the savanna area in Mato Grosso shown in Figure 1 (with correction for state area) is considered cerrado.

(d) Linear projection from the last two years of available satellite data (see Fearnside, 1990c).

(e) Brazil, INPE, 1989b, with corrections for state area and cerrado clearing (see text).

(f) Rondônia cerrado clearing assumes that  $6,946 \text{ km}^2$  of cerrado (25% of the 27,785 km<sup>2</sup> of cerrado in the state according to the INPE map) is exposed to clearing. The remainder is in an Amerindian reserve.

Last previous data			
		Clearing total (km	
		8,133	
1978	Tardin <u>et al</u> ., 1980	171	
1978	Tardin <u>et al</u> ., 1980	1,791	
1980	IBDF, 1983a	10,671	
1980	IBDF, 1982	52,786	
1986	SUDAM/IBDF, 1988	85,203 <sup>(a)</sup>	
1987	IBDF, 1989	22,913	
1981	IBDF, 1983b	1,170	
1980	IBDF, 1983a	9,120	
	Year 1987 1978 1978 1978 1980 1980 1986 1986 1987 1981	Year       Source         1987       IBDF, 1988         1978       Tardin et al., 1980         1978       Tardin et al., 1980         1980       IBDF, 1983a         1980       IBDF, 1983a         1980       IBDF, 1983a         1980       IBDF, 1982         1986       SUDAM/IBDF, 1988         1987       IBDF, 1989         1981       IBDF, 1983b	

# TABLE 2: AVERAGE CLEARING RATES IN THE BRAZILIAN LEGAL AM

# (Table 2, part 2)

AZON

Clearing	Average	e clearing rate	in 1988 (km²/year	
total by 1988 (km <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>2</sup> )	Forest	Cerrado	Total	
8,634	£ 501	0	501	
842	2 67	0	67	
12,837	1,105	0	1,105	
54,803	3 , 437	<sup>(a)</sup> 2,080	5,517	
201,493	3 5,580	13,008	18,588	
92,922	2 3,788	72	3,860	
31,623	3,916	<sup>(b)</sup> 126	4,042	
2,187	145	0	145	
54,393	3 1,759	2,959	4,718	
450.724		10 045	20 542	
459,734	£ 20,298	18,245	38,543	

#### TABLE 2 NOTES:

(a) Pará and Maranhão clearing include reclearing in the area of old (pre-1960) secondary forest. Old secondary forest zones total 31,822 km<sup>2</sup> in Pará and 60,724 km<sup>2</sup> in Maranhão; of these an estimated 2,255 km<sup>2</sup> and 2,459 km<sup>2</sup> were cleared by 1986 and 1988 respectively in Pará, and 10,369 km<sup>2</sup> were cleared by 1988 in Maranhão. Estimates in these states for years prior to 1986 had been unable to distinguish the old secondary forest from virgin forest, and the clearing in the old secondary forest region is therefore included without correction. For 1986 and 1988 in Pará and for 1988 in Maranhão the clearing within the old secondary forest area is assumed to have occurred in the same proportion as that in virgin forest.

(b) Rondônia clearing rate assumed to follow the trend from the 1985 to 1987 period shown by AVHRR. Uncorrected deforestation values: 27,658 km<sup>2</sup> by 1985 (Malingreau and Tucker, 1988); 36,900 km<sup>2</sup> by 1987 (Jean-Paul Malingreau, personal communication, 1988); corrected for <u>cerrado</u> and 18% adjustment for pixel size effect (based on comparison made by David Skole, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, of 10 m resolution SPOT data with SPOT data degraded to 1.1 km resolution to simulate AVHRR): 24,195 km<sup>2</sup> by 1985 and 32,280 km<sup>2</sup> by 1987.

State	Forest type	Approximate area $(km^2 \times 10^3)$	Approxima Biomass (MT/ha)
Acre Amapá	Bamboo Other low biomass Dense Mangrove Dense	30 31 92 1 99	20 209 418 200 354
Amazonas	Flooded Jurua/Purus Western Amazonas	30 400 200	216 149 119
	Bamboo Other low biomass	30 226	20 232
	Dense	677	464
Maranhão	Old secondary Other	61 78	100 175
Mato Grosso	Northern	100	143

# TABLE 3: APPROXIMATE BIOMASS AND FOREST AREA BY STATE

	Transition	473	83
Pará	Old secondary Central	32 465	100 226
	West	249	356
	North	158	354
	Vine/low biomass	277	175
Rondônia	Dense (Samuel)	215	418
Roraima	Montane	26	266
	Other	147	119
Tocan- tins/ Goiás	Transition	101	83
Legal Amazon	All forests		247
			211
	Cerrado	576	70.7

(Table 3, part 2)

Area Biomass te source source \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ W.G. Sombroek, pers. comm. 1989 (25% of remainder) (75% of remainder) Braga, 1979 guess remainder Jordan and Russell, 1983 for Jari Commercial volume guess  $100 \text{ m}^3/\text{ha}$ W.G. Sombroek, pers. comm., 1989. 25% of forest on assumed 50% of fragile soils dense forest (W.G. Sombroek, pers. comm., 1989) Mean from four locations around Manaus: Fazenda Dimona (327.7 MT/ha) Fearnside et al., nd-a; Fazenda Porto Alegre Fearnside et al., nd-a Reserva Ducke and environs (367.5 MT/ha see Fearnside, 1987b, Klinge and Rodrigues, 1974, Reserv Egler (507.5 MT/ha)Klinge et al., 1975. Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b guess guess based on 144.7  $m^3/ha$ trunk volume for forests in Grande Carajas region Brazil, SEPLAN/CODEBAR/SUDA Based on 120  $m^3$ /ha merchant quess bole found by Jaime Antonio and Edezio Cardoso Carvalho W.G. Sombroek, pers. comm.

Based on 70  $m^3$ /ha merchanta guess bole found by Jaime Antonio and Edezio Cardoso Carvalho W.G. Sombroek, pers. comm. Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b quess guess FAO forest volume surveys (mean of 16 localities: see review in Fearnside, 1986c, Tucurui reservoir area: guess Cardenas et al., 1982. Jari Project: guess Jordan and Russell, 1983 guess Assumed 25% of dense forest Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b 300 MT/ha above-ground biom for Samuel reservoir: Brown, 1990; Martinelli et al., nd Braga, 1979 Seiler and Crutzen, 1980 fo montane forest in general Assumed same as western Ama remaining forest Assumed all forest Assumed same as transition reported in Brazil, INPE, 1989a,b forest in Mato Grosso \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ (mean weighted by area present) (mean weighted by clearing rate) \_\_\_\_\_

------

а

the

M, 1986

able Ubially

, 1989.

ble Ubially

, 1989.

1987b).

ass

r

zonas.

	E CARBON RELEASE FROM LEGAL AMAZON	CLEARING IN THE
	Carbon release if all converted to pasture (GT)	Carbon re at curren of cleari (GT/year)
Forest biomass	47.3	0.196
Cerrado biomass	1.9	0.059
Soil (top 20 cm)	1.9	0.015
Total	51.0	0.270

(Table 4, part 2)

lease t rate ng

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TABLE 5: LIST OF PARAMETERS FOR CARBON TRANSFORMATIONS

Parameter	Value	Units	Source
Total biomass	210.67	MT/ha dry weight	Table 2
Carbon content of biomass	0.50	fraction of dry weight	Brown and Lugo, 1984
Above-ground fraction	0.76		Klinge <u>et al</u> ., 1975
Combustion efficiency in initial burn	0.28	fraction of C released	Fearnside <u>et al</u> ., nd-a
Char C fraction in initial burn	0.04		Fearnside <u>et al</u> ., nd-a
Fraction of char on biomass following initial burn	0.89		preliminary data from Fearnside <u>et al</u> ., nd-b
Exposed to soil char C transfer fraction during first interval	0.30		guess
Fraction surviving decay in first interval	0.41		Calculated from Uhl and Saldarriaga nd (a)
Combustion efficiency in first reburn	0.275	fraction of C released	Assumed equal to initial burn
Fraction converted to char in first reburn	0.027		Assumed equal to initial burn
Char C combustion fraction in first reburn	0.20		guess

Fraction surviving decay in second interval	0.57		Calculated from Uhl and Saldarriaga nd (b)
Combustion efficiency in second reburn	0.28	fraction of C released	Assumed equal to initial burn
Fraction of C converted to char in second reburn	0.04		Assumed equal to initial burn
Fraction of char on biomass after first reburn	0.89		Assumed equal to initial burn
Exposed to soil char C transfer fraction during second interval	0.30		guess
Char C combusted fraction in second reburn	0.20		guess
Fraction of char on biomass after second reburn	0.89		Assumed equal to initial burn
Exposed to soil char C transfer fraction during third interval	0.30		guess
Fraction surviving decay in third interval	0.77		Calculated from Uhl and Saldarriaga, nd (b)
Combustion efficiency in third reburn	0.28	fraction of wood C released	Assumed equal to initial burn
Fraction of C to char in third reburn	0.04		Assumed equal to initial burn
Char C combustion	0.20		guess

fraction in third reburn Soil C release from top 20 cm	3.92 MT/ha	Fearnside, 1985c, 1987b
Replacement vegetation biomass	10.67 MT/ha	Fearnside <u>et al</u> ., nd-c; Fearnside, 1989d

-----

(Table 5, part 2)

Comments

\_\_\_\_\_

Weighted mean for areas being cleared in 1988

Near Manaus, Amazonas

Near Manaus, Amazonas

Near Manaus, Amazonas

Near Altamira, Pará

First interval = 4 years

Second interval = 3 years

Third interval = 3 years

Pasture: average biomass throughout year at Ouro Preto do Oeste, Rondônia

\_\_\_\_\_

#### TABLE 5 NOTES:

(a) Uhl and Saldarriaga (nd) report an average of 97.3 MT of above-ground dry weight biomass remaining three to four years after clearing a Venezuelan forest whose original above-ground biomass was believed to be 290 MT/ha based on estimates in the area by Stark and Spratt (1977). Assuming the combustion efficiency (0.275) and charcoal formation fraction (0.027) measured in Brazil (Fearnside <u>et al</u>., nd-a), the postburn above-ground biomass exposed to decay in Venezuela would be reduced to 200 MT/ha. Loss to decay over the 3.5-year interval (using the midpoints of the range of site ages) would therefore be 51%. Loss in a four-year interval following the initial burn would be 59%.

(b) Uhl and Saldarriaga (nd) report average biomass as 56 MT/ha for 6 to 7 year-old sites; 45.3 MT/ha for 8 to 10 year old sites, 22.7 MT/ha for 12 to 20 year old sites and 7 MT/ha for 30 to 40 year old sites. Assuming a linear decline in wood mass within each age interval (and using midpoints of age ranges as the limits of the intervals), the loss per year as a percentage of the wood mass at the beginning of each interval would be 14.7% for 0 to 3.5 years, 14.2% for 3.5 to 6.5 years, 7.6% for 6.5 to 9 years, 7.2% for 9 to 16 years and 3.6% for 16 to 35 years. These loss rates have been used to calculate loss values for the intervals used in the present calculation (0 to 4 years, 4 ~to 7 years and 7 to 10 years).

## TABLE 6: CARBON RELEASES IN THE BRAZILIAN LEGAL AMAZON<sup>(a)</sup> LOW METHANE SCENARIO

	Complete cle	aring of I	Legal Amaz	zon (GT)
	Carbon M dioxide C C	m	Carbon Nonoxide C	Total C
Forest	45.40	0.19	1.97	47.56
Cerrado	1.73	0.01	0.08	1.82
Total	47.13	0.20	2.05	49.37

#### HIGH METHANE SCENARIO

	Complete cle	earing of	Legal Amazon	n
	Carbon M dioxide C C	lethane	Carbon monoxide C	Total C
Forest	45.25	0.39	2.49	48.13
Cerrado	1.72	0.02	0.10	1.84
Total	46.97	0.40	2.59	49.97

#### (Table 6, part 2)

	Annual ne	et release	e in 1988 (	GT/year)
$CO_2$ equiv- alent C	Carbon dioxide		Carbon monoxide C	Total C
48.86	0.187	0.001	0.008	0.196
1.88	0.054	0.000	0.002	0.056
50.74	0.241	0.001	0.011	0.253

	Annual net	release	from 1988	clearing rate
CO <sub>2</sub> equiv- alent C	Carbon dioxide	Methane C	Carbon monoxide C	Total C
50.18	0.187	0.002	0.010	0.198
1.93	0.055	0.000	0.003	0.058
52.11	0.242	0.002	0.013	0.256

#### (Table 6, part 3)

	Gross release per hectare (MT C/h for complete clearing of the Lega				
CO <sub>2</sub> equiv- alent C	СН4	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO		
0.202	0.45	113.54	4.71		
0.057	0.13	35.35	1.35		
0.259					

	Gross release per hectare (MT C/h for complete clearing of the Lega				
CO <sub>2</sub> equiv- alent C	СН <sub>4</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO		
0.208	0.92	113.18	5.93		
0.059	0.26	35.25	1.70		
0.267					

a cleared) Gross release per hectare (MT C/ha cleared) for clearing in 1988 CH<sub>4</sub> CO<sub>2</sub> CO 0.38 97.58 4.02 0.13 35.35 1.35

a cleared) l Amazon	Gross release per hectare (MT C/ha cleared) for clearing in 1988				
	CH4	CO <sub>2</sub>	СО		
	0.79	97.27	5.07		
	0.26	35.25	1.70		

\_\_\_\_\_

TABLE 6 NOTES:

(a) Net release from biomass and soils. Gross releases would increase  $CO_2$  carbon by 5.34 MT/ha, but would not affect other gases. For the low and high methane scenarios, respectively, gross release of  $CO_2$  equivalent carbon would be 53.58 and 57.54 GT for clearing the Legal Amazon, or 0.283 and 0.341 GT for annual release in 1988.

TABLE 7:	GREENHOUSE LEGAL AMAZ		SSIONS FROM	DEFORESTATI	ON
				CH <sub>4</sub>	
	LOW METHAN	IE SCENARI FOREST	IO		
		CERRADO	Burning Total		0. 0.
			Burning Total		0. 0.
	HIGH METHA	NE SCENAI FOREST	RIO		
			Burning Total		0. 1.
		CERRADO	Burning Total		0. 0.
	(a) Calcu	lated us	ing average	biomass for	fo

# TABLE 7: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION

OF 1	THE BRAZIL	IAN	
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO	
	115.45 454.16		
12 17	33.10 141.41	3.37 3.37	
59 23	115.45 452.73		
17 35	33.10 140.99	4.25 4.25	
 rest	s in the 1	Legal Amazon.	

(Table 7, part 2)

49

TABLE 8:GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM COMPLETE DEFORTHE BRAZILIAN LEGAL AMAZON (GT OF GAS)

	$CH_4$
LOW METHANE SCENARIO FOREST	0.
CERRADO	0.
TOTAL	0.
HIGH METHANE SCENARIO FOREST	0.
CERRADO	0.

TOTAL 0.

#### (Table 8, part 2) ESTATION OF

	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO
25	190.55	4.94
01	8.14	0.19
26	198.69	5.13
51	189.95	6.22
15	59.16	1.78
66 	249.11	8.01

TABLE 9:

CARBON RELEASE SCENARIOS FROM THE PRESENT RATE OF CLEARING AMAZON GIVEN DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING AVERAGE FOR

Average forest biomass (MT/ha)	Biomass carbon release <sup>(a)</sup> (MT/ha)	From forest clearin % of 5 global (GT/year) fuel r
262.6 <sup>(d)</sup>	120.1	0.252
252.0	115.2	0.242
225.0	102.9	0.217
222.5	101.7	0.214
200.0	91.5	0.194
174.0	79.6	0.169
155.1 <sup>(e)</sup>	70.9	0.152

52

### (Table 9, part 2)

IN THE BRAZILIAN LEGAL

EST BIOMASS

Carbon release

GT fossil		% of 5 GT global fossil fuel release	
5.0	0.318	6.4	
4.8	0.308	6.2	
4.3	0.283	5.7	
4.3	0.281	5.6	
3.9	0.260	5.2	
3.4	0.236	4.7	
3.0	0.218	4.4	
			·

TABLE 9 NOTES:

(a) Assumes that the replacement vegetation is cattle pasture (10.67 MT/ha dry weight biomass; see Fearnside, 1987b: 79); carbon content of vegetation 0.50 (after Brown and Lugo, 1982, 1984).

(b) Includes 3.92 MT/ha carbon release from the top 20 cm of soil.

(c) Includes release from <u>cerrado</u> (average biomass 70.7 MT/ha) and for soils assumed equal to forest release. <u>Cerrado</u> carbon release at current clearing rate is 0.059 GT/year (exclusive of soil release).

(d) Value derived from FAO forest volume estimates and from available direct measurements (Fearnside, 1987b).

(e) Value derived from FAO forest volume estimates for tropical American productive closed broadleaf forests (Brown and Lugo, 1984).





