

This file has been cleaned of potential threats.

If you confirm that the file is coming from a trusted source, you can send the following SHA-256 hash value to your admin for the original file.

5ef91bc685540569ff4d07e378965b6f716acc3bf07ef281e1af3124762d226e

To view the reconstructed contents, please SCROLL DOWN to next page.

Environmental Research Letters



PERSPECTIVE

Greenhouse gas emissions from Brazil's Amazonian hydroelectric dams

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED

17 December 2015

REVISED

9 January 2016

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

11 January 2016

PUBLISHED

27 January 2016

Philip M Fearnside

National Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA), Av. André Araújo, 2936, Manaus, Amazonas, CEP 69067-375, Brazil

E-mail: pmfearn@inpa.gov.br**Keywords:** hydropower, global warming, methane, tropical forest, tropical dams, reservoirs, climate change

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence](#).

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

**Abstract**

Tropical dams are often falsely portrayed as 'clean' emissions-free energy sources. The letter by de Faria *et al* (2015 *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10** 124019) adds to evidence questioning this myth. Calculations are made for 18 dams that are planned or under construction in Brazilian Amazonia and show that emissions from storage hydroelectric dams would exceed those from electricity generation based on fossil fuels. Fossil fuels need not be the alternative, because Brazil has vast potential for wind and solar power as well as opportunities for energy conservation. Because dam-building is rapidly shifting to humid tropical areas, where emissions are higher than in other climatic zones, the impact of these emissions needs to be given proper weight in energy-policy decisions.

Tropical hydroelectric dams have significant greenhouse gas emissions. Although this has now been known for over two decades, it has yet to have any perceptible effect on dam-building decisions. In Brazil, incorporation of discussion of greenhouse gases into environmental impact assessments for dam projects has not changed this (e.g., Fearnside 2011). Public perception of hydropower continues to be that this is 'clean energy'.

The paper by de Faria *et al* (2015) provides emissions calculations for 18 dams that are proposed or under construction in Brazilian Amazonia and makes a significant advance towards generalized procedures that can be applied to other tropical dams. The study confirms high emissions from tropical hydropower, showing that they can often exceed the global warming impact of generation from fossil fuels.

Tropical dams emit substantially more than dams in the temperate and boreal zones (e.g., Barros *et al* 2011). The study by de Faria *et al* (2015) restricts its data and conclusions to tropical dams, thus avoiding the all-to-common practice of mixing results from different biomes. Because most existing dams and measurements are in locations outside of the humid tropics, information from these regions tends to make dams look better than they are likely to be in the tropical areas such as Amazonia where major dam-building plans are concentrated today.

Dams emit carbon dioxide (CO₂), but only part of this emission is a net contribution to global warming because part of the CO₂ emitted is removed from the atmosphere through photosynthesis by plants in the reservoir and its drawdown zone and is merely being returned to the atmosphere in the same form. However, part of the CO₂ comes from nonrenewable sources, such as the trees flooded when the reservoir is initially flooded and from soil carbon—this portion representing a contribution to global warming.

Tropical dams also emit methane (CH₄), which has much more impact on global warming per ton of gas emitted than CO₂. Each ton of methane has a very large effect on global warming relative to CO₂ while it remains in the atmosphere: 595 times more per ton of each gas present in today's atmosphere, including feedbacks (Hartmann *et al* 2013, supplementary material, appendix 2, p 2SM-4; Myhre *et al* 2013, supplementary material, appendix 8, p 8SM-13). However, each ton of CH₄ remains in the atmosphere for only 12.4 years on average (Myhre *et al* 2013, p. 714), or roughly ten times less than an average ton of CO₂. This makes the time horizon (and any valuation given to time through discounting or other means) critical in comparison of dams with fossil fuels (e.g., Fearnside 2012a). Because fossil fuels emit virtually all of their carbon as CO₂, the shorter the time horizon the greater the relative impact attributed to dams. The

fact that dams have a large peak of emissions in the initial years after a reservoir is filled, in contrast with the constant emission of CO₂ each year as fossil fuels are burned in a thermoelectric plant, also makes time critical in comparing these energy sources (Fearnside 1997). The International Hydropower Association, an industry group, has long pressed for all calculations being done on a 100-year basis (e.g., Goldenfum 2012).

The Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) calculates an impact of CH₄ 34 times that of CO₂ per ton of gas considering a 100-year time horizon, and 86 times when considering a 20-year time horizon (Myhre *et al* 2013, p. 714). It is the 20-year horizon that is relevant to global efforts to prevent mean global temperature from exceeding either the limit of 2 °C above the pre-industrial average, agreed in Copenhagen in 2009 as the definition of 'dangerous' interference with the climate system or the aspiration for limiting warming to 1.5 °C endorsed in the 2015 Paris agreement (Fearnside 2015a). The de Faria *et al* letter's main conclusions are based on the 100-year time horizon, but, as the authors point out, the impact of dams relative to fossil fuels is much greater if a 20-year horizon is considered. Values calculated for a 20-year horizon show this clearly (table S-23 and figure S-14).

Tropical dams produce methane because the water column in reservoirs is often stratified by temperature, with a thermocline separating cold water at the bottom (the hypolimnion) from the warmer surface water (the epilimnion). Oxygen in the bottom water is quickly exhausted, and decomposition of organic matter must therefore end with formation of CH₄ rather than CO₂. In the case of run-of-river dams where reservoir volume is small and river streamflow is large, the water moves through the main channel of the reservoir at sufficient speed to prevent stratification. However, bays and flooded tributaries can stratify, producing methane (Fearnside 2015b). The de Faria *et al* paper confirms lower emissions in run-of-river dams than in storage dams. While most of the dams in the study are run-of-river, both Brazil's president and the country's top electrical officials have publically defended a shift of priority to storage dams in Amazonia (Borges 2013).

The de Faria *et al* study shows that even the minimum estimated emissions are substantial. They also show that the real total emissions are much higher than these minimum values, but that data are still lacking for reliable quantification of components omitted from the minimum calculations. The authors produce a 'bottom-up' and a 'top-down' calculation for each dam. The bottom-up calculation is based on amounts of carbon calculated to be initially present in the reservoir and subsequently oxidized through different pathways, while the top-down calculation is based on data from existing dams: flux measurements in the reservoirs and downstream emissions calculated from the difference in methane concentration above and

below the dams. Use of difference in concentrations to infer degassing from water emerging from the turbines is an important distinction from a series of studies in Brazil financed by hydropower companies, which used floating chambers at a distance downstream of the dams to estimate degassing (e.g., Ometto *et al* 2011), a technique that misses most of these emissions (Fearnside and Pueyo 2012). The top-down 100-year calculation produces a mean result 2.7 times higher than the bottom-up calculation in the case of 'low' residence-time reservoirs such as run-of-river dams and 6.1 times higher in the case of 'high' residence-time reservoirs such as traditional storage dams (based on table S-22). These large differences show the magnitude of the factors that the authors judged to be too poorly quantified to incorporate into their process-based bottom-up calculation.

The bottom-up calculation assumes zero carbon inputs from the sources that are poorly quantified, these factors representing 84% of the emission in the case of reservoirs with high residence times. As the authors point out, the large discrepancy between the results of the bottom-up and top-down calculations means that more research is needed in both data collection and modeling. Of course, omitting uncertain components that are believed to be important in the real-world system makes modeled results less realistic rather than making them more reliable (e.g., Watt 1966). In this case, carbon sources omitted from the bottom-up calculation include methane from renewable sources from organic matter washed into watercourses in the catchment area and the annual flooding of herbaceous vegetation that grows in the reservoir's drawdown zone (e.g., Fearnside 2009). The authors recognize the effect of omissions in making the bottom-up calculations underestimate, and therefore representations of a minimum level of impact from tropical dams. Their finding of significant emissions even at these minimum levels should serve as a warning to decision makers. Brazil is not forced to choose between hydropower and fossil fuel because the country has vast untapped potential for solar and wind generation, in addition to opportunities for energy conservation (Moreira 2012).

The perception of dams as clean is still actively promoted by the hydropower industry and by government energy authorities in countries such as Brazil (e.g., Fearnside 2012b). The letter by de Faria *et al* should help to change this perception.

Acknowledgments

The author's research is supported exclusively by academic sources: Conselho Nacional do Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq: Proc. 305880/2007-1; 304020/2010-9; 573810/2008-7; 575853/2008-5), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (FAPEAM: Proc. 708565) and

Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA: PRJ15.125).

References

- Barros N, Cole JJ, Tranvik LJ, Prairie Y T, Bastviken D, Huszar V L M, del Giorgio P and Roland F 2011 Carbon emission from hydroelectric reservoirs linked to reservoir age and latitude *Nature Geosci.* **4** 593–6
- Borges A 2013 Dilma defende usinas hidrelétricas com grandes reservatórios *Valor Econômico* (http://valor.com.br/imprimir/noticia_impreso/315168)
- de Faria F A M, Jaramillo P, Sawakuchi H O, Richey J E and Barros N 2015 Estimating greenhouse gas emissions from future Amazonian hydroelectric reservoirs *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10** 124019
- Fearnside P M 1997 Greenhouse-gas emissions from Amazonian hydroelectric reservoirs: the example of Brazil's Tucuruí Dam as compared to fossil fuel alternatives *Environ. Conserv.* **24** 64–75
- Fearnside P M 2009 As hidrelétricas de Belo Monte e Altamira (Babaquara) como fontes de gases de efeito estufa *Novos Cadernos NAEA* **12** 5–56
- Fearnside P M 2011 Gases de efeito estufa no EIA-RIMA da hidrelétrica de Belo Monte *Novos Cadernos NAEA* **14** 5–19
- Fearnside P M 2012a The theoretical battlefield: accounting for the climate benefits of maintaining Brazil's Amazon forest *Carbon Manage* **3** 145–8
- Fearnside P M 2012b Desafios para midiatização da ciência na Amazônia: o exemplo da hidrelétrica de Belo Monte como fonte de gases de efeito estufa ed A Fausto Neto *A Midiatização da Ciência: Cenários, Desafios, Possibilidades* (Campina Grande, PB, Brazil: Editora da Universidade Estadual da Paraíba) pp 107–23
- Fearnside P M 2015a Emissions from tropical hydropower and the IPCC *Environ. Sci. Policy* **50** 225–39
- Fearnside P M 2015b Tropical hydropower in the clean development mechanism: Brazil's Santo Antônio Dam as an example of the need for change *Clim. Change* **131** 575–89
- Fearnside P M and Pueyo S 2012 Underestimating greenhouse-gas emissions from tropical dams *Nat. Clim. Change* **2** 382–4
- Goldenfum J A 2012 Challenges and solutions for assessing the impact of freshwater reservoirs on natural GHG emissions *Ecohydrol. Hydrobiol.* **12** 115–22
- Hartmann D L *et al* 2013 Observations: atmosphere and surface climate change 2013: the physical science basis ed T F Stocker *et al Contribution of Working Group 1st to the 5th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 159–254
- Moreira P F (ed) 2012 *Setor Elétrico Brasileiro e a Sustentabilidade no Século 21: Oportunidades e Desafios* 2nd edn (Brasília, DF, Brazil: Rios Internacionais) p100 (<http://internationalrivers.org/node/7525>)
- Myhre G *et al* 2013 Anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing. climate change 2013: the physical science basis ed T F Stocker *et al Contribution of Working Group 1st to the 5th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 661–740
- Ometto J P *et al* 2011 Carbon dynamic and emissions in Brazilian hydropower reservoirs ed E H de Alcantara *Energy Resources: Development, Distribution, and Exploitation* (Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science) pp 155–88
- Watt K E F 1966 The nature of systems analysis *Systems Analysis in Ecology* ed K E F Watt (New York: Academic Press) pp 1–14