Total Aboveground Biomass and Structure of Tropical Forest Delineated by Projeto RADAMBRASIL in Northern Rondônia, Brazil.

by

Dian Lyn Cummings

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Presented March 24, 1998
Commencement June 1999

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Dian Lyn Cummings for the degree of Master of Science in Forest Science presented on March 24, 1998. Title: Total Aboveground Biomass and Structure of Tropical Forests Delineated by Projeto RADAMBRASIL in Northern Rondônia, Brazil.

Signature redacted for privacy.

Abstract approved: ______________________

David A. Perry

Tropical forests are of global importance with respect to their influence on biogeochemical cycles, climatic patterns, and as large reservoirs of biodiversity. Yet, few studies have quantified their structure, biomass, and carbon pools; basic information necessary to better understand the global function of tropical forests. The RADAMBRASIL project was conducted in the 1970's to inventory Brazil's natural resources. Describing a relationship between total aboveground biomass (TAGB) and the RADAMBRASIL forest inventories could add to the usefulness of RADAMBRASIL data base for the estimation of TAGB and carbon pools of the Amazon Basin.

Our study quantified TAGB and forest structure of 20 undisturbed primary forest stands that were a part of Projeto RADAMBRASIL. This study was located in Rondônia, Brazil; an area in which a large portion of Amazonian deforestation occurred. TAGB ranged from 533 Mg ha^{-1} in a dense forest site to 288 Mg ha^{-1} in an open forest site with a mean TAGB of 341 Mg ha^{-1}. TAGB and structure in each

stand was described by partitioning and measuring the vegetation components. Non-tree components included palm, vines, litter, rootmat, and dead vegetation. The non-tree component of TAGB was highly variable (i.e.; 12% and 41%).

We tested the hypothesis that there was a high correlation between these enumerated TAGB estimates from our study and predictive models that use commercial volumes from RADAMBRASIL to estimate TAGB (Fearnside, 1992 and Brown and Lugo 1992). No significant correlation was found between the modeled TAGB and the field measured TAGB. The Brown and Lugo model underestimated the mean for dense forests by > 100 Mg ha^{-1} (28%), conversely the Fearnside model overestimated the mean for open forests by > 100 Mg ha^{-1}(35%). No correlation was found between the TAGB estimates from this study and commercial volume reported in RADAMBRASIL, therefore no model was possible for TAGB based on commercial volume.

Determining relationships between classifications from forest inventories and actual biomass data could improve models of global climate change and biogeochemical cycles. Given results from this study, current estimates of TAGB for Amazonian rainforests that are lower than 290 Mg ha^{-1} based upon forest inventories should be viewed with caution.

Acknowledgments

There are many people and organizations who contributed to the successful completion of this research and thesis. David A. Perry guided me through graduate school as my major professor, refined the thesis manuscript and assisted in the field research. J. Boone Kauffman secured funding, assisted in the field and provided direction on research. Funding and field support came from the Fire and Smoke Chemistry Team, Intermountain Forest Research Lab., USDA Forest Service, Missoula, Montana. I especially thank Darold Ward for his support without which the research would not have been possible. My committee members ; Steven Garman, Ronald Nielson, Logan Norris, and Marcos Kogan all offered excellent comments and constructive criticism of my thesis for which I thank them. In Brazil, the Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente (IBAMA) assisted with both personnel and logistics. Benjamin Dos Santos of IBAMA was invaluable in securing permission to work on forest plots and data collection. The Instituto Brasileiro do Geographia, e Estatística (IBGE) provided information, personnel, and transportation. Helana Lucarelli, of IBGE helped find information on RADAMBRASIL as well as securing permission to conduct our study. Bento Barros Da Silva of IBGE was of great value both in the field and on the road. Sr. Irma of Jamari, Rondônia was an asset in the field with an unerring sense of direction and skill with a facão. R. Flint Hughes provided help and humor both in the field and at the University. Katherine Human also provided assistance in the field and an interesting family history of the area in which we worked.

Contribution of Authors

Dr. David A. Perry was involved with data collection, guidance, preparation and writing of each manuscript. Dr. J. Boone Kauffman was involved in design, data collection, preparation and editing of each manuscript. Dr. R. Flint Hughes assisted in data collection as well as providing biomass equations and advice during analysis and manuscript preparation.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

List of Appendix Tables

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my supportive and long suffering family. First, to my husband Boone Kauffman who has anxiously awaited the completion my work then to my son Cimarrón Illahee Kauffman Cummings who hasn't forgotten that above all else I'm his mother. I especially dedicate this thesis to my mother and father, Helen and Thomas Cummings who took the time to help me develop an interest in how things work then gave me the independence to follow my own destiny, and my brothers and sister who toughened me up in my childhood never realizing they were preparing me for future field research.

Total Aboveground Biomass and Structure of Tropical Forests Delineated by Projeto RADAMBRASIL in Northern Rondônia, Brazil.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Brazilian Amazon contains the largest contiguous tropical forest in the world (World Resources, 1990) with a forested area estimated to have been 4 million km^2 prior to development for modern agriculture (Fearnside, 1993). Social, economic, and political pressures have contributed to the rapid loss of forest in the Amazon; deforestation rates averaged 15-22 x 10^5 ha y^{-1} from 1978 to 1988 (Skole et al, 1994; Fearnside, 1992a). As the forest disappeared farms, pastures, and cities spring up in the wake of its passing. The vast tracts of intact tropical forest that remain play an important part in global biogeochemical cycles (Schlesinger, 1991).

Global climate change has been a topic of scientific debate and concern (Detwiler and Hall, 1988, Dunnette and O'Brien, 1992, Houghton, 1995, and Schlesinger, 1991). Most scientists agree that there is a rise in the Earths' temperature due to increases in radiatively active gasses arising from human and natural activities. The dominant greenhouse gas is carbon dioxide (CO_2) which has steadily risen in the atmosphere during the last two centuries (Neftel et al., 1985, and Keeling, et al., 1989). The majority of the rise in the atmospheric CO_2 level is due to emissions resulting from fossil fuel combustion related to industrialization, however, a significant portion (as much as 40%) is associated with deforestation and the resultant biomass burning (Crutzen and Andrea,1990). There is general agreement among scientists that approximately one third of the atmospheric increase in CO_2 during the last century is the result of deforestation (Houghton and Skole, 1990). Prior to 1940, a majority of the CO_2 arising from deforestation came from temperate and boreal forests (Houghton, 1995). However, from 1940 to the present, deforestation in the tropics has become the dominant source (Houghton, 1995).

Based upon estimates of CO_2 inputs and current models of carbon mass balance, more carbon emissions occur than can be accounted for by accumulations in the atmosphere and oceans. Therefore, it is hypothesized that a carbon sink exists somewhere other than the atmosphere and oceans (SCEP, 1970; Bacastow and Keeling, 1973; Broecer et al., 1979; Keeling et al., 1989; Tans et al., 1990; Saninto et al., 1992). The theory of a "missing" carbon sink has inspired a profusion of research into its location. Research to accurately determine the dynamics of carbon cycling and carbon sinks in terrestrial ecosystems has led to numerous estimates of carbon flux for tropical ecosystems (Houghton, 1995; Hall and Uhlig, 1991; Fearnside, 1991,1997; Detwiler and Hall, 1988; Crutzen and Andrea, 1990; Dixon et al., 1994; Grace et al., 1995; Lugo and Brown, 1992). Tropical forests as carbon sinks may mitigate the rate of global climate change. Therefore, accurate determinations of carbon pools and flux in the tropical forests are essential for predictions of global climatic change.

There are many sources for discrepancies or errors in calculating carbon flux due to deforestation. Data are lacking on the: (1) area deforested; (2) biomass and C concentration per unit area; and (3) combustion factors and emissions factors from biomass burning. Accurate estimates of total biomass are important because small differences can have a multiplicative effect through each model used to determine carbon flux. There is a need for improvement in the dynamics and magnitude of all factors contributing to carbon flux calculations. This logically must begin with an improvement in our understanding of total aboveground biomass (TAGB) of tropical forests of the Amazon basin as well as scale models used in their estimation. Houghton (1991) identified several factors used in the models to estimate carbon flux that lead to uncertainties in the results derived from the models, including rates of deforestation, stocks of carbon per unit area, land use, and exchanges of biotic CO_2 not associated with deforestation. Determination of carbon stocks in deforested areas and losses of carbon associated with burning are ultimately dependent on accurate estimates of the biomass of primary forest.

This study quantified TAGB and forest structure of 20 forest inventory sites of Projeto RADAMBRASIL (Departamento National da Producão Mineral, Brasil, (DNPM) 1978). The specific objectives of this thesis are: (1) to determine the TAGB and structure of 20 intact primary forest sites (chapter 2); (2) to determine if TAGB and structural partitioning within the forest stands differs among forest types (chapter 2); (3) to determine if a quantifiable correlation exists between TAGB measured in this study and modeled estimates derived from the RADAMBRASIL data set (chapter 3); and (4) identify a correlation between TAGB from this study and RADAMBRASIL commercial volume to be used in a model to predict TAGB. Improved TAGB estimates will increase the accuracy of estimations of carbon pools per unit area and the potential loss of carbon associated with deforestation and biomass burning.

Chapter 2

Total Aboveground Biomass and Structural Characteristics of Amazonian Rainforests in Northern Rondônia, Brazil.

Dian Lyn Cummings, J. Boone Kauffman, David A. Perry and R. Flint Hughes

Keywords: Tropical forest biomass, Tropical forest structure, Brazil, Rondonia, Amazon forests.

Abstract

Tropical rainforests are significant global terrestrial C sinks and deforestation contributes to rising levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Quantifying the total C pools of tropical forests and levels of C emissions arising from deforestation has been limited by several factors, including accurate calculation of the amount of deforested area, forest fragmentation effects on biomass pools, content and quantity of emissions from fires, and the biomass of intact forests. The total aboveground biomass (TAGB) was measured at 20 sites from the RADAMBRASIL (Departamento National da Producão Mineral, Brazil, (DNPM) 1978) forest inventory of the Brazilian Amazon and quantified. The sites were located in open, dense, and ecotone forest types (as classified in Projeto RADAMBRASIL). TAGB at each site was calculated through the measurement of individual vegetation components. The TAGB of open forest ranged from 288 to 346 Mg ha^{-1} with a mean of 313 Mg ha^{-1} , for dense forest from 298 to 533 Mg ha^{-1} with a mean of 377 Mg ha^{-1}, and for ecotone forests from 298 to 422 Mg ha^{-1} with a mean of 350 Mg ha^{-1}. The average biomass of combined live non-tree components for all 20 sites was 22 Mg ha^{-1}, while combined coarse wood debris (CWD), forest floor (litter/rootmat), and standing dead averaged 38 Mg ha^{-1}, and the TAGB for all live trees averaged 280 Mg ha^{-1}. There was a difference in biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh between the open and the dense forest, open forests averaged 239 Mg ha^{-1} and dense forests 307 Mg ha^{-1}. Between sites there was a high degree of variation in the distribution of TAGB among components. In one ecotone forest, non-tree components comprised 41% of the TAGB while it was as low as 12% in a dense

forest site. The mean for non-tree components was 18%, an important result because the non-tree components are often omitted from biomass estimates. Information on the distribution of biomass in tree and non-tree components can improve predictions of carbon released from deforestation processes.

Introduction

Understanding the function of tropical forests as C sinks, and how deforestation effects global carbon cycles and emissions of greenhouse gasses depend on accurate estimates of forest biomass. However, information on total aboveground biomass is scarce for Amazonian forests. Indirect estimates based on commercial volume from forest inventory data collected in the Projeto RADAMBRASIL (Departamento National da Producão Mineral, Brazil, (DNPM) 1978), as well as direct field measurements of individual trees have been utilized to predict total aboveground biomass (TAGB) (Brown and Lugo, 1992; Fearnside, 1989, 1992, 1993; Jordan and Uhl, 1978; Klinge and Herrera, 1978; Russell, 1983; Brown et al., 1995). Estimates for TAGB in the Brazilian Amazon have ranged from 155 to 666 Mg ha^{-1} (Brown et al., 1995; Brown, 1997; Brown and Lugo, 1984,1992; Brown et al.,1989; Fearnside, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1993; Kauffman et al.,1995; Klinge et al., 1975; and Ravilla Cardenas, 1987). Differences in TAGB estimates arise in part from the methods and in part due to the heterogeneity of the forests.

Early studies involved destructive sampling to develop predictive models for tree biomass based on dbh or dbh and height. Jordan and Uhl (1978) measured tree diameters and heights, then harvested and weighed the trees to formulate regression equations for biomass. Based on their models from destructive sampling they reported an average live biomass of 335 Mg ha^{-1} for a "tierra firme" forest in the Venezuelan Amazon. The application of direct and destructive measurement is limited by the time and cost associated with cutting and weighing large trees over a large area of tropical forests. To reduce the dependence on destructive or direct field measurements, commercial volumes derived from forest inventories have been used to estimate total tree biomass (Brown et al., 1989, Brown and Lugo, 1992, Brown, 1997). Although the tierra firme forest sampled by Jordan and Uhl (1978) was considered to be of low stature and biomass for the Amazon, their estimate was almost 100 Mg ha^{-1} more than the mean biomass for Amazonia (227 Mg/ha; Brown and Lugo, 1992) arrived at through models based solely on forest inventories. However, the Brown and Lugo (1992) estimates ignored components of TAGB other than trees $\geq$10 cm dbh. Based on a compilation of results from nine studies for which direct measurements of biomass were made, and the estimates of Brown and Lugo (1992), Fearnside (1992b) gave an average TAGB estimate for the Brazilian Legal Amazon of 335 Mg ha^{-1}. TAGB was quantified for six slashed primary forests by Kauffman et. al. (1995) and Guild et al. (1998). Their biomass estimate ranged from 293 Mg ha^{-1} to 436 Mg ha^{-1} with an average of 362 Mg ha^{-1}. The latter two studies partitioned the biomass into litter, rootmat, dicots, attached foliage and wood debris.

Projeto RADAMBRASIL (DNPM, 1978) included a forest inventory conducted by the Brazilian government to asses the value of forest resources.

RADAMBRASIL inventory data was reported as the volume (m^3 ha^{-1}) of trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh for each plot and provided a summary of the volume for each forest type. Most of the study plots were one hectare in size (10 x 1000 m). Data from RADAMBRASIL are contained in 50 volumes which cover the forested area of Brazil. The forest type delineation (the classification and area covered by a forest type; i.e. open, dense and ecotone) varied from volume to volume. Based on information from scientists who have interviewed RADAMBRASIL personnel, there are inconsistencies between methods used by field crews and methods of analysis for the different regions and volumes (Nepstad, D; Lucarelli. H personal communication; Fearnside, 1992a, Brown, et al., 1995).

Projeto RADAMBRASIL Vol.16, Folha SC.20 Porto Velho (DNPM, 1978) identified 57 forest sub-types in the state of Rondônia, Brazil. Information from the inventory is currently being used in global models of carbon pools and flux (Dixon et al., 1995; Houghton, 1991; Fearnside, 1992b, 1993, 1997). However, due to the low estimates of TAGB derived from models using the RADAMBRASIL data set compared to data collected in ecological studies, it's use is controversial (Brown and Lugo, 1992; Fearnside, 1992a). The utilization and scaling-up of more detailed measurements to the larger data base of RADAMBRASIL would increase the accuracy of global carbon models essential to predicting climate change. The objectives of this chapter were to quantify TAGB and structure of 20 intact tropical forest sites previously inventoried by Projeto RADAMBRASIL in northern Rondônia, Brazil and to determine if there were differences among forest types.

Study Sites

Study sites were located in the northwestern portion of the state of Rondônia and the southern extreme of Amazonas state, Brazil (Figure 2.1). Forests in this part of Amazonia are representative of forests within the "crescent" of deforestation occurring along the southern and eastern fringe of the Amazon (Skole et. al., 1994). Forests were classified by Projeto RADAMBRASIL as seasonal tropical evergreen forests transitional between evergreen tropical forests and semi deciduous tropical forests (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). Under the Holdridge system, they would be classified as tropical moist forests (Holdridge, 1971). Based on climatological data from Porto Velho (the closest station to the sites) average annual rainfall is ≈ 2300 mm with the majority falling between November and April (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). Mean temperature is 25.2° C (average maximum of 31.1° C, and average minimum of 20.9° C), and average relative humidity is 85% (Departimento Nacional de Meterologia, Brasil, 1992). Soils at the individual sites range from upland red-yellow and yellow oxisols, red-yellow ultisols, to alluvial soils with hydromorphic lateritic, and gley characteristics (DNPM, BRAZIL, 1978). The elevation at the sites ranged from 61 to 310 m.

We sampled 20 sites across 9 forest classifications from Projeto RADAMBRASIL (Vol.16; Folia SC. 20 Porto Velho; Geologia, Geomorfologia, Pedologia, Vegetaçao e Uso Potencial da Terra (RADAMBRASIL); DNPM, Brazil, 1978) (Table 2.1). Each of the 20 sites were forest inventory sites sampled as part of RADAMBRASIL in the early 1970's. Study plots were labeled using the original numbers of the forest inventory plots of the RADAMBRASIL study.



Figure 2.1 Map of study locations. The study sites were located in southern Amazonas and Rondonia, Brazil.

Rondonia, Brazil

(Longitude 62° to 66° and Latitude 8° to 11°)

Biomass study site locations ★

Location of the map area.



*Excerpted from Brazil, 1978. PROJETO RADAMBRASIL FOLIA SC.20, Mapa Fitoecológico

Table 2.1. Forest type classification and location of the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites sampled in this study. Region, subregion and formations are those identified by RADAMBRASIL. Locations are ± 100 m.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Topographic - Formation	RADAMBRASIL site number and relative location	
Open tropical forest	Amazonian alluvial	Alluvial terraces	225 Lon 63°29'56.1" Lat 8°26'20.9"	226 Lon 63°19'36.9" Lat 8°8'25.5"
	Broken surface of the upper Xigu/Tapajos/Madeira	Submontane rolling hills	70 Lon 65°39'0.6" Lat 9°39'34.9" 74 Lon 63°15'9.9" Lat 9°2'30.1"	75 Lon 63° 9'15.1" Lat 9°18'7.4" 76 Lon 63°3'16.4" Lat 9°36'56.0"
		Submontane broken surface	89* Lon 62°15'36.7" Lat 9°41'47.6"	113* Lon 62°20'51.7" Lat 10°11'2.1"
Dense tropical forest	Amazonian alluvial	Alluvial plane, periodically flooded	1* Lon 63°19'38.4" Lat 8°10'58.1"	2* Lon 63°20'14.2" Lat 8°11'23.9"
	Low plates of Amazonia	Rolling low lands	229 Lon 63°59'47.3" Lat 9°1'30.9"	
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	Submontane low hills	24 Lon 63°5'9.5" Lat 10°22'44.7"	25 Lon 63°7'37.9" Lat 10°22'51.3"
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	Submontane broken surface	43* Lon 65°53'8.8" Lat 9°41'44.4"	44* Lon 63°49'49.9" Lat 9°2'12.4"
Areas of ecological tension (open forest)	Forest /savanna edge	Low land plates	186* Lon 63°58'45.1" Lat 8°33'23.0" 188 Lon 63°57'45.0" Lat 8°23'53.9"	190* Lon 63°31'34.5" Lat 8°35'19.7" 195 Lon 63°36'38.0" Lat 8°42'35.8"
Areas of human influence (open forests)	Platform cover above 600 m	Submontane table lands	218 Lon 65°18'45.5" Lat 10°47'44.7"	

*Due to difficulty obtaining GPS readings under canopy these sites are ± 200 m. Sites 1,2 and 190 may ± 2 km from listed location.

The RADAMBRASIL classification system was based on a hierarchy of ecological regions (i.e., forest types), subregions (i.e., ecological/geomorphology sub-groupings) and formations (i.e., topographic differences). The most coarse resolution classifies our study sites into 3 forest types: (1) "open" (characterized by well spaced individual trees, numerous palms and the presence of vines); (2) "dense" (normally having 3 strata; one of large trees, one of small regenerating trees and one of shrubs and herbaceous material); and (3) "ecotone" (edge forests in contact with savanna and different classes of forest formations) tropical forest. A fourth forest type (represented by 1 plot) classified as anthropogenic disturbance also was identified as open forest. Open forests are the most abundant forest type in Rondônia (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). The 8 subregions (based on the geomorphology of the area) represented in this study ranged from open, Amazonian alluvial terraces to dense southern Amazonian submontane low hills (Table 2.1).

Many of the plots had minor levels of human impact. However the level of disturbance in sample plots did not appear to be greater than that reported at the time of the RADAMBRASIL inventory. For example, subsistence palm and tree harvest for local use and trails used for rubber tapping were reported in the original inventory. Some sites (i.e.;1 ,2, 225, 226 and 218) were located near areas of long term (> 100 yrs.), low density (euro American) settlement and therefore we can assume that there has been ongoing low level impacts on forest structure and composition. Five of the 20 sites had at least 1 stump indicating past selective tree harvest; site 75 and 229 each contained 3 stumps, site 76 had 2, site 25 had 1, and site 113 had 6 stumps. All the stumps originated > 20 years prior to our study.

Methods

Plot site selection

There were a total of 229 forest inventory sites in Volume 16, Porto Velho, which covered the area of northern Rondônia and Southern Amazonas for Projeto RADAMBRASIL (DNPM, 1978), but we limited ourselves to the northern part of the region due to logistics. Selection of RADAMBRASIL plots for resampling in this study was based on continued existence of the forested plot site (many sites had been deforested) and accessibility. Plots were accessible by a combination of automobile, boat, and hiking. The aforementioned criteria eliminated all but 59 possible sites. The 20 plots selected for use in this study were assumed to be representative of undisturbed Rondonian forests; there was no a priori knowledge of either biomass or structure (other than the RADAMBRASIL classification) of these study sites. Geographical locations of the sites were determined from maps and coordinates provided by D. Skole, University of New Hampshire, and located in the field using a Global Positioning System (GPS) (Table 2.1). We also used a RADAMBRASIL map and satellite photos of the area to assist in plot location. In cases where the area containing the original RADAMBRASIL sites had likely been deforested (i.e. adjacent to a road), we moved our plots to the closest intact forest still within the same forest type, usually a short distance (≈ 200 m) from the road.

Our assumptions that if the data from the inventory RADAMBRASIL are replicable and relevant to estimate TAGB, then the slight differences in relocation should not be an important influence on results.

Total aboveground biomass components

TAGB was estimated by measuring all organic materials above mineral soil. Partitioning of TAGB was based on structural and ecologically significant components and practicality of measurement (Figure 2.2). Trees were separated into 6 diameter classes based on dbh (0-10, 10-30 ,30-50, 50-70, 70-100, 100-200 and 200-300 cm dbh). Tree diameter was measured at 1.37 m above the ground (dbh) or immediately above the tree buttress or stilt roots when present. Palms were divided into three categories (basal palms with no trunks, $<$10 cm dbh, and $\geq$10 cm dbh) and vines or lianas into two size classes ($<$10 cm dbh and $\geq$10 cm dbh). Other components included small dicots (plants $<$1.37 m in height), litter/rootmat (forest floor), standing dead trees and palms, and dead and downed coarse wood debris (CWD), the latter divided into two categories 2.5 - 7.5 cm diameter and $\geq$7.5 cm diameter (diameter of CWD measured at the point of intersection with the transects).

Plot layout

At each site a 75 m x 105 m (0.79 ha) plot was established (Figure 2.3). Two 105 m transects divided the plot into 3 - 25 m x 105 m (0.26 ha) subplots. The diameter for all trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh was recorded in the entire plot (0.79 ha).



Figure 2.2. Partitioning of total aboveground biomass into components.



Figure 2.3 Plot layout for total aboveground biomass sampling. Point A indicates the origin of a 15 m coarse wood debris transect. Plot C1 was a 1 x 1 m plot for seedling quantification. C2 was a 0.5 x 0.5 m plot for destructive litter/rootmat samples.

All trees and palms 10 - 30 cm dbh were measured in the center subplot. Along each 105 m transect, we established a planer intersect transect to measure coarse wood debris (CWD) every 15 m (n=16, 8/transect) (Brown and Rossopoulous 1974; Van Wagoner 1968). At each of the 15 m points along the transect, a 2 x 10 m belt transect was established to measure small trees, vines and palms (>1.37 m in height, but <10 cm dbh) and basal leaf palms. At the same 15 m points along the 105 m transect, the biomass of the forest floor was measured in a 50 x 50 cm microplot and density of dicot seedlings in a 1 x 1 m plot was measured.

Procedures

Equations used for calculating each component of the biomass are listed in Table 2.2 and 2.3. Tree height was estimated from a regression equation with tree diameter as the independent variable. Data for the tree height model were collected from 129 trees in Rondônia. Height measurements were made using a range finder and clinometer and dbh was measured with a forestry caliper or dbh tape. Dbh of the trees ranged from 1.5 to 238 cm. Biomass of trees < 5 cm dbh was calculated from equations based on dbh given by Hughes (1997). Biomass of trees ≥5 cm dbh were calculated from equations based on dbh given by Higuchi (unpublished, 1997) for Amazonian trees, or the general moist tropical forests equations from Brown et al. (1989).

Biomass of CWD was calculated using the methods of Van Wagner (1964). Transects to measure mass of CWD ≥ 7.5 cm diameter were 15 m in length. CWD 2.5 - 7.5 cm in diameter were measured along 5 m of the 15 m transect. CWD was

Table 2.2. Equations used to determine aboveground biomass of tree components and forest structure. Biomass is expressed in Mg of dry weight.

Parameter	Equation	Source
Trees < 5 cm dbh	$[(\exp(1.0583*\ln(D^2)+4.9375))*1.143]/10^6$ $R^2=0.94$ $N=66$	Hughes, 1997
Trees 5 cm to 20 cm dbh	$[(\exp(-1.754+2.665\ln(D))*.604]/10^3$	Higuchi unpublished data, 1997
Trees >20 cm dbh	$[(\exp(-0.151+2.17\ln(D)))*.604]/10^3$	Higuchi unpublished data, 1997
OR:		
Trees >5 cm dbh	$(\exp(-3.1141+0.9719\ln(D^2H)+0.058))/10^3$ $R^2=0.97$ $N=168$	Brown, et. al., 1989
Height trees <20 cm dbh (m)	$[\exp(0.638689+0.798819(\ln(D)))]*1.043785$ $R^2=0.85$ $N=40$	This Study
Height trees >20 cm dbh (m)	$[19.5873+\ln(D)]*.999991$ $R^2=0.64$ $N=89$	This Study
Quadratic Stand Diameter (QSD)	$\sqrt{\sum(D^2)/n}$ or $\sqrt{(BA/n)*(4/\pi)}$	
Standing Dead		
Trees <10 cm dbh	$[\exp((1.1788*\ln(D^2)+4.4189)*1.08191861]/10^6$ $R^2=0.96$ $N=66$	Hughes,1997
Trees > 10 cm dbh	$(\pi r^2*H)*Sg$	
Wood debris 2.45 to 7.6 cm dbh	$Sg*((\pi^2*N*S*Cs*d^2)/8L)*10^2$ $Sg=0.413$ g/cm^3	Van Wagner, 1964
Wood debris >7.6 cm dbh	$Sg*((\pi^2*\Sigma D^2*S*Cs*d^2)/8L)*10^2$ Sg sound = 0.492 Sg rotten = 0.342 Sg palm = 0.327	Van Wagner, 1964

Key:
D=dbh (cm); H = height(m); BA=basal area (cm^2); Sg= specific gravity of wood (g/cm^3); N= number of intercepted wood particles; S= secant of wood particles; Cs= slope correction factor ($\sqrt{1+(\%slope/100)^{2}}$) ;$\Sigma D^2$=Sum of wood particle diameter squared; L= transect length (cm); stem=stem ht. (m); d^2= quadratic mean diameter of wood particles; r = radius (m)

Table 2.3. Equations used to determine aboveground biomass of non-tree forest components. Biomass is expressed in Mg of dry weight.

Parameter	Equation	Source
Attalea sp Palm >1.78 m H	$\{[(46.1*\text{stem H})-82.1]+[0.375*[(46.1*\text{stem H})-82.1]]\}/10^3$ $R^2 = 0.99$ N=7	Anderson, 1983
Palm (not *Attalea*) > 10 cm dbh	$(4.5+(7.7(\text{stem H}))/10^3$ $R^2 = 0.90$ N = 25	Frangi and Lugo, 1985
Palm < 10 cm dbh	$[[(\exp(0.9285*\ln(D^2))+5.7236]*1.0500065]/10^6$ $R^2 = 0.39$ N=15	Hughes, 1997
Stemless palm	$(\text{Leaves} * 296.54)/10^6$	Cummings this study
Lianas	Base10 (0.12+0.91 LOG 10 (BA))/10^3 $R^2 = 0.82$ N = 20	Putz, 1983
Dicot seedlings	Seedling Count * Mean Wt (Determined from subsample)/10^6	This study
Forest floor	Wet wt * % dry wt (Determined from subsample)/10^6	This study
Standing dead palm		
Palm <10 cm dbh	$[(\exp(1.5321*(\ln D^2)+3.2758))*1.09311496]/10^6$ $R^2 = 0.34$ N = 15	Hughes, 1997
Palm > 10 cm dbh	$(\pi r^2*H)*Sg/10^6$ Sg = 0.327 g/cm^3	

Key:
D=dbh (cm); H = height (m); BA=basal area (cm^2); Sg= specific gravity of wood (g/cm^3); N= number of intercepted wood particles; S= secant of wood particles; Cs= slope correction factor ($\sqrt{1+(\%slope/100)^2}$) ;ΣD^2=Sum of wood particle diameter squared; L= transect length (cm); stem=stem ht.. (m); d^2= quadratic mean diamater of wood particles; r = radius (m); Wt = weight in g.

further separated into tree (dicot) wood or palm wood components. The $\geq$7.5 cm diameter class was also separated into sound or rotten classes. One hundred samples for each class were collected in forests near Jamari, Rondonia, to obtain an average wood density. For the 2.5-7.5 cm diameter classes the diameter and angle of 65 individuals along a 100 m transect were measured to calculate the quadratic mean diameter and fuel particle tilt, and to correct for wood particle tilt (Brown and Rousopoulous, 1974). Thereafter, we only counted pieces that intersected the line and used the quadratic mean diameter to calculate biomass.

To calculate forest floor biomass, each sample was initially weighed in the field. Sub-samples were then oven dried to determine the ratio of wet to dry weight. This ratio was then applied to the entire sample to convert from wet to dry weight.

The number of leaves on each basal leaf palm encountered in the 2 x 10 m plot was counted and multiplied by a mean weight per leaf derived from a random sample of 30 basal leaves that were oven dried and weighed. Three equations are necessary to ascertain biomass of palms; biomass of *Attlea* sp. $\geq$ 1.78 m high was calculated using the model by Anderson (1983), that of other palm species $\geq$ 10 cm dbh estimated using the model of Frangi and Lugo (1985), and that of palms < 10 cm dbh calculated using the model of Hughes (1997).

Seedling biomass (< 1.37 m ht.) was based on sub-sample of 50 oven dried plants from which an average weight per seedling was determined. Vine biomass estimates were calculated by the model given by Putz et al., (1983).

Standing dead trees $<$ 10 cm dbh, were calculated from an equation developed by Hughes (1997), while volume of standing dead trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh were first calculated then multiplied by the mean value of specific gravity of dead wood (0.413 g/cm^3, the value for sound CWD). Standing dead palm biomass was estimated from Hughes (1997) for palm $<$ 10 cm dbh or from volume multiplied by specific gravity (0.327 g/cm^3) for palms $\geq$ 10 cm dbh.

Biomass structure as a proportion of tree biomass

To examine the biomass structure of the forest for comparison to other studies both the tree and non-tree components were calculated as a proportion of the aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh.

Forest structure

Tree density (number of trees ha^{-1}) and basal area (BA; m^2 ha^{-1}) was calculated for each diameter class. Quadratic stand diameter (QSD; cm) is the diameter of a tree of average basal area (formula in Table 2.2.). QSD was calculated for each site based on trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh and $\geq$30 cm dbh. Vine and palm density were derived for stems $<$10 cm and $\geq$ 10 cm dbh. Mean TAGB of all vegetative components and TAGB for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh for open, dense and ecotone forest types were compared by ANOVA and a Fishers LSD multiple range test.

Results

Total aboveground biomass

Mean TAGB of open forest (n=8) was 313 Mg ha^{-1} with a range from 288 to 346 Mg ha^{-1}(Table 2.4). Dense forests (n=7) ranged from 298 to 534 Mg ha^{-1} with a mean of 377 Mg ha^{-1}. Ecotone forests (n=4) ranged from 298 to 422 Mg ha^{-1} with an average of 350 Mg ha^{-1}.

The proportion of TAGB composed of trees $\geq$10 cm dbh averaged 77% in open forests, 81% in dense forests, 76% in ecotone forests, and 78% for all plots combined. TAGB (Mg ha^{-1}) for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh differed between open and dense forests at the $p = 0.13$ level.

Biomass structure as a proportion of tree biomass

Notable differences among forest types in the structure of biomass as a proportion of aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$10 cm dbh were found in the large trees and palms (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). In the open forest trees $\geq$ 70 cm dbh composed 17% of the aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh. For dense forests, those large trees composed 31%, and in ecotone forests, 40%. The proportion of palms was highest in ecotone forests composing 18% of the aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh, while palms in the open and dense forest composed 8% and 6%, respectively. CWD proportion ranged from 3.4% in a dense forest plot to 24.4% in a open forest plot. CWD averaged 13.2%, 11.0% and 9.4% for open dense and ecotone forests respectively, with a mean of 11.6%

Table 2.4. Total aboveground biomass mean for each geomorphic - subregion and topographic - formation. Units are Mg ha^{-1}.

Forest type Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Topographic - Formation	Plot	TAGB
Open tropical forest	Amazonian alluvial	Alluvial terraces	225	328.8
			226	288.2
	Sub region and Formation Mean ± SE			308.5±20.3
	Broken surface of the upper Xigu/Tapajos/Madeira	Submontane rolling hills	70	345.7
			74	294.7
			75	311.5
			76	310.8
		Formation Mean ± SE		315.7±10.7
		Submontane broken surface	89	299.4
			113	320.9
		Formation Mean ± SE		310.1±10.7
	Sub region Mean ± SE			313.8±12.9
	Region Mean ± SE			312.8±6.7
Dense tropical forest	Amazonian alluvial	Alluvial plane, periodically flooded	1	407.7
			2	319.1
	Sub region and Formation Mean ± SE			363.4±44.3
	Low plates of Amazonia	Rolling low lands	229	299.5
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	Submontane low hills	24	533.8
			25	441.7
	Sub region and Formation Mean ± SE			487.8±46.1
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	Submontane broken surface	43	298.1
			44	336.4
	Sub region and Formation Mean ± SE			317.3±19.2
	Region Mean ± SE			376.6 ± 33.4
Areas of ecological tension (open forests)	Forest /savanna edge	Low land plates	186	348.3
			188	297.9
			190	422.1
			195	332.6
	Sub region and Formation Mean ± SE			350.2±26.2
	Region Mean ± SE			350.2 ± 26.2
Human Influence	Platform cover above 600 m	Submontane table lands	218	287.3
Grand Mean ± SE				341.2 ± 14.2



Figure 2.4. Proportion of aboveground biomass of trees > 10 cm dbh in each size class of trees in open, dense and ecotone forest types and for 20 combined sites.

for all plots combined. The forest floor component ranged from a low of 1.3% in a dense forest to a high of 7.1% in a open forest. Forest floor averaged 4.3%, 2.9% and 3.6% for open, dense and ecotone forests respectively, with a mean of 3.4%for all plots combined.

Biomass partitioning among forest components.

Trees

Live trees made up the majority of the TAGB averaging 252 Mg ha^{-1}, 320 Mg ha^{-1} , and 281 Mg ha^{-1} in open, dense, and ecotone forest types respectively (Figure 2.5, Appendix A.2). Comparing biomass of the tree size categories, open and dense forests were similar in average biomass in trees <10 cm dbh (14 Mg ha^{-1}) , 10 to 30 cm dbh (76 and 78 Mg ha^{-1}), 30 to 50 cm dbh (71 and 70 Mg ha^{-1}), and 50 to 70 cm dbh (47 Mg ha^{-1}) (Figure 2.6). The ecotone forests had slightly lower values than open or dense forests for biomass in the diameter classes< 50 cm dbh (144 Mg ha^{-1} compared to ≈162 Mg ha^{-1} for all classes < 50 cm dbh in open and dense forests) and about half the average biomass in the 50 to 70 cm dbh diameter class (22 Mg ha^{-1} compared to 47 Mg ha^{-1} in open and dense forests). The open forest diameter classes ≥ 70 cm dbh contained lower biomass than the same diameter classes for dense or ecotone forests, 45 Mg ha compared to 111 and 114 Mg ha^{-1} respectively (Figure 2.6, Appendix A.2).



Figure 2.5. Proportion of total aboveground biomass in each component for open, dense and ecotone forest types and for the 20 combined sites.



Figure 2.6. Distribution of total aboveground biomass in components for open, dense and ecotone forest types

Non-tree components

Biomass of live non-tree components (seedlings, palms, and vines) was ≈ 18 Mg ha^{-1} in both open and dense forest types, and 39 Mg ha^{-1} in ecotone forests (Figure 2.6, Appendix A.3). However, biomass of non-tree components was highly variable within a given forest type, ranging from 4 to 95 Mg ha^{-1} in open forests, 3 to 39 Mg ha^{-1} in dense forests, and 1 to 74 Mg ha^{-1} in ecotone forests. If a single plot (225) in the open forest was excluded the average for open forests would drop to 7 Mg ha^{-1}, or less than half that of the dense forests. Plot 225 had a high biomass value for non-tree live vegetation due to the biomass of large diameter palms. The large non-tree biomass of ecotone forests was also primarily the result of biomass of large palms ($\geq$ 10 cm dbh). Vines and other understory vegetation contributed minimally to the TAGB (a range of 0 to 3 Mg ha^{-1} over all forest types).

In general, CWD, standing dead, and litter along with the rootmat composed an equal or larger proportion of the TAGB than non-tree live vegetation (Figure 2.5 and 2.6). The forest floor component was composed of litter, small wood debris (<2.5 cm diameter), and rootmat. Rootmat contained a large amount of decomposing organic matter as well as live roots and was not as well developed as those reported by Kauffman et al. (1988).

CWD and standing dead (palms, vines and trees), averaged 32 Mg ha^{-1} in open forests, 30 Mg ha^{-1} in dense forests, and 28 Mg ha^{-1} in ecotone forests (Appendix A.4). The largest contributor was CWD with a mean for all plots of 29

Mg ha^{-1}. Mass of the forest floor was 9 Mg ha^{-1}. The remaining components of standing dead palms, trees and vines ranged from of 0 to 1 Mg ha^{-1}.

Differences in forest structure among forest types

Density

The widest range in density of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh within forest type occurred in the open and ecotone forests which ranged from 291 to 527 trees ha^{-1} and 223 to 487 trees ha^{-1} respectively, while the dense forests had a narrow range of 402 to 533 trees ha^{-1} (Figure 2.7, Appendix A.5). Average density of live trees < 10 cm dbh ha^{-1} differed by 25% between the open forest ($\approx$ 7500 ha^{-1}), dense forest ($\approx$ 5800 ha^{-1}) and ecotone forests ($\approx$ 4900 ha^{-1}), but plots within a given forest type varied widely (from $\approx$ 2000 to 9000 ha^{-1} in each forest type; Figure 2.7, Appendix 2.5).

Breaking density into size classes, in the 50 to 70 cm dbh class for live trees, the ecotone forest averaged about half the number of trees ha^{-1} as the open and dense forests (6 ha^{-1} compared to 13 ha^{-1}). Density of large trees ($\geq$ 70 cm dbh) averaged $\approx$4 ha^{-1} in the open forest and $\approx$7 ha^{-1} in the dense and ecotone forest. Open forests averaged fewer trees ha^{-1} in the 70 to 200 cm dbh classes (4 ha^{-1} compared to 6 ha^{-1}) and no trees were found in the largest diameter class ($\geq$ 200 cm dbh).

The density of standing dead trees< 10 cm dbh was similar among forest types ($\approx$80 ha^{-1} ; Appendix A.5). Dead trees 10 to 30 cm dbh varied slightly among



Figure 2.7. Density of trees in each size class for open, dense and ecotone forest types.

the forest types with 27 ha^{-1}, 19 ha^{-1}, and 13 ha^{-1} for open, dense, and ecotone forests respectively. The density of standing dead trees > 30 cm dbh was similar in dense and ecotone forests at 6 ha^{-1} and 5 ha^{-1} while open forest had 10 ha^{-1} .

Density of palms and vines followed a pattern similar to their biomass (Figure 2.8, Appendix 2.6). The most dramatic differences were in the palms $\geq$ 10 cm dbh. Open forest averaged approximately two thirds the number of palms $\geq$ 10 cm dbh ha^{-1} as the dense and ecotone forests (60 ha^{-1} compared to 97 and 107 ha^{-1}, respectively) (Table 2.5). The open and dense forests had about one third of the number of palms < 10 cm dbh ha^{-1} than the ecotone forest (203 and 196 ha^{-1} compared to 633 ha^{-1}). Densities of seedlings and vines < 10 cm dbh were similar among forest types. Vines > 10 cm dbh were similar in dense and ecotone forest but lower in number in the open forests (5 ha^{-1} compared to 1 ha^{-1}). Basal leaf palms were similar in density in open and ecotone forests ($\approx$750 ha^{-1}) but lower in dense forests (443 ha^{-1}).

Basal area and quadratic stand diameter

The total BA ranged from 19 to 26 m^2 ha^{-1} in open, 23 to 37 m^2 ha^{-1} in dense and 15 to 34 m^2 ha^{-1} in ecotone forests. The average total basal area of each forest type did not differ by more than 5 m^2 ha^{-1} (average 24 m^2 ha^{-1}, 28 m^2 ha^{-1} and 24 m^2 ha^{-1} for open dense and ecotone forests respectively; Figure 2.9, Appendix A.7). The difference in average basal area is equivalent to that of one very large tree ha^{-1} ($\geq$ 200 cm dbh). Likewise QSDs were only slightly different between forest types. The mean QSD of open forests was 25 cm; dense forests



Figure 2.8. Density of non-tree components for open, dense and ecotone forest types.

Table 2.5. Palm Structure (> 10 cm dbh) in 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Values are means for each site.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Palm biomass (Mg ha-1)	Hieght (m)	Density (palm ha^{-1})	Diameter at breast hieght (cm)		*Attalea sp.* Dominant (Yes/no)?
						Attalea sp.	Other sp.	
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	92.3	11.2	171	30	24	y
		226	1.9	8.5	15	33	19	n
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	5.6	7.8	107	30	13	y
		74	2.5	16.0	27	nd	nd	n
		75	0.0	nd	11	nd	13	n
		76	7.3	7.9	65	38	14	y
		89	6.8	6.7	23	40	0	y
		113	8.3	8.0	61	37	19	y
	Mean		15.6±11.0	9.4±1.2	60±20	35±6	14±3	
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	10.4	8.9	114	34	27	n
		2	7.3	5.4	160	0	26	n
	Low plates	229	0.4	13.0	4	0	10	n
	Low hills of Southern Amz.	24	22.7	10.6	42	22	0	y
		25	24.5	10.0	130	35	18	n
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	36.4	8.4	202	28	14	n
		44	5.5	15.9	30	28	13	n
	Mean		15.3±4.9	10.3±1.3	97±28	29±5	18±4	
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	281	46.0	9.3	130	31	11	y
		188	71.5	7.9	187	32	29	y
		190	0.8	13.5	8	0	17	n
		195	23.8	7.5	103	31	26	y
	Mean		35.5±15.1	9.5±1.4	107±37	31±7	20±4	
Others	Anth ropogenic	218	21.2	9.0	57	26	16	
Grand mean			19.8±5.6	9.8±0.7	82±14	31±3	18±2	



Figure 2.9. Basal area of each size class of trees and the total for open, dense and ecotone forest types.

was 27 cm, and ecotone forests 27 cm (trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh; Appendix A.8). The mean QSDs of trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh for dense and ecotone forests were higher than that of open forests (48 cm in open forests, 54 cm in dense forests and 55 cm in ecotone forests).

Vertical structure

The dense and ecotone forests had the highest canopy due to the presence of a few very large trees (>200 cm dbh). The tallest trees in the open forest (100 to 200 cm dbh) averaged 44 m in height. In the dense and ecotone forests the tallest trees (200 to 300 cm dbh) were ≈ 52 m in height. The average height for the 70 to 100 cm dbh size class was 39 m over all sites. The presence of emergent trees was noticeable in the dense and ecotone forest types with dominant trees in the 200-300 cm dbh class ranging from 5 to 14 meters taller than the average of the next tallest trees in the plot.

Discussion

Total aboveground biomass differences among forest types in Northern Rondônia, Brazil

Evidence of past harvest did not appear to influence TAGB to a significant degree. Mean TAGB was not significantly different ($p= 0.8$) between plots with and without cut trees. The mean TAGB in open forests without the plots containing harvested trees was 10 Mg ha^{-1} lower than that of the plots containing harvested trees, whereas the mean TAGB in dense forests without the harvested plots was 8 Mg ha^{-1} higher than that of the plots with harvested trees.

As would be expected in areas with abundant precipitation there is no noticeable pattern in biomass associated with a north to south gradient of decreasing rainfall over the area included in this study. Plots were located between 8° and 11° latitude and 62° to 66° longitude, the effects of decreasing rainfall would likely be pronounced in southern Rondônia. Over the area covered in our study other site conditions appear to have a greater influence than precipitation on TAGB.

The range in TAGB of open forests was much smaller than that found in the dense or ecotone forest types (Figure 2.10). All 3 major forest types in this study had similar values for sites at the low end of the TAGB range (≈ 294 Mg ha^{-1}; Table 2.4). The highest biomass values were in the 2 dense forest hill sites and accounted for much of the variability in the dense forest type. In ecotone forest there was no clear relationship of TAGB to geomorphology. Site to site variability within forest types and subregions may be as much or greater than the variability among forest types. This suggest that for the purpose of estimating TAGB in Rondônia, the scale of geomorphology (sub-regions) within forest type (region) may be more appropriate than the coarser scale of forest type alone. To test this hypothesis adequately would require data collection in each sub-region. The problem of deriving better estimations of TAGB based on forest classification systems used in RADAMBRASIL may be overcome by resampling more sites.



Figure 2.10. Total aboveground biomass for open, dense and ecotone forest types.

Brown, S. et al, (1989) and Brown and Lugo (1992) suggested that field estimates resulted in higher TAGB because of a bias by researchers and/or foresters in site selection. In contrast Brown, I.F., et al. (1995) found that biomass from a site selected based on its appearance as a "good" forest yielded a lower biomass than sites selected without regard to forest structure. They attributed the inability to see more than 30 to 40 m into a forest with the failure of subjective selection to result in biased high biomass estimates. We found the same to be true in the forests we resampled. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to determine what the end of a 105 m transect will look like based on the view from one end. Visual distances > 15 m are rare in intact forests.

The mean of biomass estimates in our study agrees with many others. The live aboveground biomass in open forests of our study (Appendix A.2 and A.3) averaged 270 Mg ha^{-1} compared to 285 Mg ha^{-1} given in Brown, I.F., et al. (1995). TAGB for dense forests in our study averaged 376 Mg ha^{-1} and is comparable to 361 Mg ha^{-1} given by Fearnside (1985) and 352 Mg ha^{-1} reported in Brown, I.F., et al. (1995, from C estimates by the Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change, 1992, p 89). Fearnside's (1992b) area weighted mean TAGB estimates derived from modified forest inventory data for forest types in Rondônia are comparable to ours for open forests (316 Mg ha^{-1} or +1%) and ecotone forest (330 Mg ha^{-1} or -6%) but substantially lower for dense forests (310 Mg ha^{-1} or - 18%). Previous direct measurements of TAGB from dense forests in the Legal Amazon have ranged from 206 Mg ha to 437 Mg ha^{-1} (Revilla Cardinas, 1986 and 1987) and average 313 Mg ha^{-1} (calculated from Revilla Cardinas, 1986, 1987 and 1988; Klinge et al.,1975;

Martinelli et al., 1988 as reported in Fearnside, 1992b). This was substantially lower (by 64 Mg ha^{-1} or -17%) than our average for dense forests (average 377 Mg ha^{-1}, range 298 - 533 Mg ha^{-1}). The average for open forests from direct measurement is 258 Mg ha^{-1} (Revilla Cardinas, 1986 and 1987) also lower (by 55 Mg ha^{-1} or -18%) than our average for open forests (313 Mg ha^{-1}, range 288 - 346 Mg ha^{-1}). Kauffman et al. (1995) found TAGB in slashed primary forests to be 292 and 435 Mg ha^{-1} in 2 dense forests and 290 and 361 Mg ha^{-1} in 2 open forests in the Brazilian Amazon. These differences explain some of the variability in TAGB estimates from small studies; examined in isolation they appear to give widely disparate TAGB but considered together they cover the range of biomass present in Amazonian forest types. In this study the average minimum TAGB value for plots in open, closed and ecotone forests was 294 $\pm$ 6 Mg ha^{-1}.

In contrast, in this study the maximum TAGB in the open forest plots was 346 Mg ha^{-1} , while dense and ecotone forest plots have the potential to be as high as 534 and 422 Mg ha^{-1} respectively. Although not measured in this study we observed numerous ecotone forests that were lower in biomass than the RADAMBRASIL sites represented by our sample plots.

Biomass partitioning among forest components

Trees

There were slight differences among forest types in the way biomass was partitioned among components (Figure 2.6), however the site variability within forest types was sometimes greater than among forest types (Appendix A.3). The mean biomass for all trees < 50 cm dbh was similar among the 3 major forest types (Figure 2.6). Size classes 10 to 50 cm dbh contributed the highest proportion of TAGB in all 3 major forest types (47%, 42%, and 38% of TAGB in open, dense, and ecotone forests respectively, Figure 2.5). Combined biomass of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh was ≈ 78% of TAGB for the forest types combined (Figure 2.5).

Gillespie et al., (1992) estimated that trees in the 10 to 35 cm dbh class constitute 23 to 40% of aboveground biomass for trees ≥ 10 cm dbh in Venezuela. Our study showed trees from the 10 to 30 cm dbh class made up 15 to 49% of the aboveground biomass for trees ≥ 10 cm dbh (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). This illustrates the important contribution of small trees to TAGB, a size class the RADAMBRASIL inventory did not measure.

Although among forest types there were differences in total tree biomass, the way the biomass was distributed among trees ≥ 30 cm dbh as compared to aboveground biomass of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh was similar. The aboveground biomass of trees ≥ 30 cm dbh composed 68%, 72%, and 75% of the aboveground biomass of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh in open, dense, and ecotone forests respectively (Figure 2.4). Brown and Lugo (1992) assumed that in open forests the fraction of the total volume of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh represented by trees ≥ 30 cm dbh would be more than 10% lower than that of dense forests. If volume can be assumed to be directly correlated to biomass, then the assumption of Brown and Lugo (1992) doesn't hold for sites in our study where the fractions of the biomass averaged within 5% of each other.

The greatest variation in biomass distribution among forest types was in the dbh classes > 50 cm. The dense forest had the greatest amount of TAGB in the largest size classes (mean 158 Mg ha^{-1}, ranging from 47 to 305 Mg ha^{-1}), followed by the ecotone forests (mean 137 Mg ha^{-1}, ranging from 78 to 208 Mg ha^{-1}), and open forests (mean 92 Mg ha^{-1}, ranging from 58 to 139 Mg ha^{-1}; Appendix 2.2). In terms of proportional distribution of biomass (structure), the greatest difference was in the trees $\geq$ 70 cm dbh, which made up 18%, 31%, and 41% of the aboveground biomass of trees > 10 cm dbh in open, dense and ecotone forests respectively (Figure 2.4). In terms of TAGB large trees ($\geq$ 70 cm dbh) made up an average of 15% in open forests, 29% in dense forests and 33 % in ecotone forests, or 24 % of the combined 20 sites (Figure 2.5). This is consistent with estimates by Brown and Lugo (1992) that large trees compose < 40% of TAGB in Amazon forests.

Five sites out of 20 had no trees in diameter classes $\geq$ 100 cm dbh. It should be noted that the 5 sites without trees $\geq$ 100 cm dbh showed no evidence of tree removal. Of the 5 plots without very large trees, 2 were in the open / alluvial forest type, 2 were in the dense / pre-Cambrian forest type, and the other was in dense / alluvial forest. The lack of very large trees may indicate a limitation for growth at the site or may indicate simply limitations of the plot size. However, the plot size used in our study for trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh (0.79 ha) was well above the minimum plot size (0.25 ha) recommended by Brown, I.F., et al. (1995).

Density of large trees (calculated as the number of trees $\geq$ 70 cm dbh divided by the total area sampled for each of the three forest types) was 3.8, 6.7, and 7.0 trees ha^{-1} in open, dense and ecotone forests respectively. Densities of very large trees ($\geq$ 100 cm dbh) were 2.1, 1.5, and 2.5 trees ha^{-1} while those $\geq$ 200 cm dbh have densities of 0.0, 0.7, and 0.6 trees ha^{-1} for open, dense and ecotone forest types respectively. The greatest difference between the open forest type and the other 2 types was the absence of the largest trees $\geq$ 200 cm dbh in the former (There were none in 8 open forest sites totaling 6.30 ha). Forty five percent of the 11 sites in dense or ecotone forests (7 sites totaling 5.51 ha and 4 sites totaling 3.15 ha respectively) had trees $\geq$ 200 cm dbh. Jordan and Uhl (1978) suggest that the absence of very large trees in the tierra firme forest of the Venezuelan Amazon may be due not only to low soil nutrients but also to mortality of slow growing trees before they can attain larger size. Our study lends some support to the Jordan and Uhl hypothesis, in that open forests had 4 times more biomass in standing dead trees from all size classes than dense forests (that represents a very small biomass difference of 0.11 compared to 0.03 Mg ha^{-1}).

Non-tree components

Non-tree aboveground biomass had a wide range in the open and ecotone forest of 91 and 73 Mg ha^{-1}, respectively, between the lowest and highest values while, dense forest had a narrow range of 36 Mg ha^{-1} between the highest and lowest values. Palms were a major contributor to the non-tree biomass, and there was large variation in their abundance in both open and ecotone forests (Figure 2.5, Table 2.5). The palm contribution to TAGB (≈ 6%) over all 20 sites (Figure 2.5) is higher than the l.3 % calculated from Jordan and Uhl (1978) in "tierre firme" forests in the Amazon basin of Venezuela. Fearnside (1992) used a factor of 3.5% of aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh to account for palm biomass in Amazonian forests. The mean percent that palm biomass comprised of aboveground biomass for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh in our 20 sites was 9.3% (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). We assumed that palms $\geq$ 10 cm dbh would have a greater density and biomass in open and ecotone forest types than in dense forests because RADAMBRASIL (DNPM, 1978) described open forests as having enclaves of palms, however, this turned out not to be prevalent in our sites. Large palm biomass in open forests was highly variable from 0.09 to 92.32 Mg ha^{-1} while, dense forests were less variable from 0.04 to 36.42 Mg ha^{-1} yet both forests averaged approximately the same biomass (15 Mg ha^{-1} in each). Ecotone forests averaged twice the palm biomass of open and dense forests (35 Mg ha^{-1}), but was also highly variable (from 0.80 to 71.47 Mg ha^{-1}). The density of palms was lower in open forests (60 ha^{-1}) compared to dense and ecotone forests (97 and 107 ha^{-1}, Table 2.5). The potential discrepancy between density and biomass of palms among the forest types is explained by individual site characteristics (Table 2.5). In general, the palms in the open forest were larger and had more biomass per individual than those in dense forests. *Attelea spp.*, a robust palm with a thick stem and a high biomass to height ratio, was dominant in 5 of the 8 sampled areas in open forests, 3 of the 4 sampled areas in ecotone forests, and only 1 of the 7 sampled areas in dense forests. Other palm species present in the plots may attain a greater height but tend to have less robust stems than *Attelea spp.*, averaging 18 cm dbh versus 31 cm dbh. A non-specific regression was used in calculating palms $\geq$10 cm dbh other than *Attelea spp*. (for which a specific regression was available; Anderson, 1983. Table 2.3), because of this non-specificity, variations in specific gravity, leaf biomass, or structure (other than height) would not be taken into account thereby reducing the accuracy of the biomass estimate.

Seedlings and vines comprised a minor proportion of the TAGB in our study sites (average < 0.4% of aboveground biomass for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh, with the maximum combined value for any of the forests sites at 1.27% (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). Fearnside (1992a) used a factor of 4.25 % of aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh for vines and a factor of 0.21% for other non-tree components (Fearnside's factor is based on an average from direct measurement studies by Revilla Cardenas, 1986, 1987, and 1988, Klinge et al., 1975, Fearnside et al., 1983, and Martinelli et al., 1988). Klinge (Unpublished ms, reported in Jordan and Uhl, 1978) found vines to be only 0.3% of the biomass in a lowland Amazon forest in Venezuela.

Dead wood debris (from palms, vines and trees both standing and on the forest floor) combined with litter and rootmat in the forest floor composed the largest non-tree component of the TAGB in open and dense forests (Figure 2.5 and 2.6), with a grand mean of 11.3% of TAGB, and a range from $\approx$ 17 Mg ha^{-1} in 2 dense, alluvial forests to 73 Mg ha^{-1} in 1 open, broken surface forest site. The greatest proportion of the combined biomass came from CWD (74%), followed by the combined litter and rootmat (25%) and only a slight contribution from standing dead (0.7%).

In this study, 5 plots were observed to have continuous rootmat, 7 had discontinuous and sparse rootmat , 4 had no rootmat and there was no notation on the remaining 4. Average biomass of the combined litter and rootmat were 13.8, 7.9, 5.3 and 9.2 Mg ha^{-1} for continuous, sparse, no rootmat and those without data respectively. Overall, the combined litter and rootmat averaged 9.6 Mg ha^{-1} for all 20 plots. The forest floor in plots with substantial rootmat were usually observed to also have a substantial litter layer. Although the roots in the rootmat are live they are woven through a layer of decomposing organic matter. The rootmat was included with litter in our study for three reasons: (1) it was biomass above the mineral soil surface; (2) it was impossible to separate in the field and, (3) it would be susceptible to the effects of deforestation. For example, Kauffman et al. (1995) found that biomass burning for conversion to pasture resulted in the consumption of > 99% of the litter and rootmat layers combined.

Large wood (CWD) averaged 29 Mg ha^{-1} or 8.4 % of the TAGB in our study sites and ranged from 3 to 17% (Figure 2.6). Combined CWD and forest floor from our study averaged 38 Mg ha^{-1} ranging from 17 - 72 Mg ha^{-1} . Uhl and Kauffman (1990) found litter and CWD to be 56 Mg ha^{-1} for a dense forest in Para, Brazil. Kauffman et al. (1988) found the mass of forest floor and CWD combined to be 64 and 107 Mg ha^{-1} respectively for species rich and species dominant tierra firme forests in the Venezuelan Amazon. The combined average percentage of litter and rootmat for other Amazonian forests (compiled from references; Revilla Cardenas, 1986, 1987, and 1988 and Martinelli et al., 1988) was 5% of the live aboveground biomass. Litter and rootmat comprised 4% to 8% of the TAGB in 4 slashed forests from Para and Rondonia (Kauffman et al., 1995). Those values from other studies are comparable to the grand mean for this study of 4% (ranging from 1% to 8%) of live TAGB.

Differences in forest structure among forest types

Large tree density

The greatest differences in TAGB are attributable to the density of large trees. The average density for trees 70 - 200 cm dbh was greater in the dense and ecotone forests compared to the open forests (7 , 6 and 4 tree ha^{-1}, respectively,) while the heterogeneity of the forest types was reflected in the range of tree density between sites (1 - 6 tree ha^{-1}, open forests; 3 - 10 tree ha^{-1}, dense forests and 5 - 9 tree ha^{-1}, ecotone forests; Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1).

The largest trees ($\geq$200 cm dbh) were exceptional in the dense and ecotone forest averaging <1 tree ha^{-1} but accounting for a mean of 14% and 13% of the aboveground biomass for all trees $\geq$10 cm dbh (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). The percentage of aboveground biomass for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh composed of the largest trees ranged from 22% to 42% in the dense forest and 18% to 32% in ecotone forests, for sites in which the size class occurred (Figure 2.4, Appendix A.1). The largest trees ($\geq$ 250 cm dbh) occurred in the two hill sites (24 and 25) in dense forests. The dense hill sites also had the highest average TAGB (488 Mg ha^{-1}). Compared to level sites on oxisols or latisols, the high biomass and very large trees found in the hill sites may be due to less weathered soils with a higher nutrient content . Both hill sites had rock outcroppings not evident at other sites, indicating a shorter distance to active mineral weathering.

Trees < 70 cm dbh density

Though the average tree density for trees 10 - 50 cm dbh was similar for open, dense and ecotone forests the heterogeneity within forest types is evident in the range of tree density. The open and ecotone forests had the widest range, a difference of 240 and 262 trees ha^{-1} respectively between the highest and lowest values while, dense forests had the narrowest range , a difference of 150 trees ha^{-1}.

The heterogeneity of the forest is evident again in the 50 - 70 cm dbh class where average tree density was lower in the ecotone forests than in the open or dense forest (7 trees ha^{-1} in ecotone forests compared to 13 trees ha^{-1} in open and dense forests) (Figure 2.8, Appendix A.5). However, the range of tree density between sites was widest in the dense forest (3 to 28 trees ha^{-1}) while in the open and ecotone forest the range was about half that (8 to 18 trees ha^{-1} and 4 to 10 trees ha^{-1}, respectively; Figure 2.8, Appendix 2.5).

Vertical structure and density

We considered trees $\geq$ 70 cm dbh to be emergent from the canopy. These averaged 4 ha^{-1} (range l to 6 trees ha^{-1}) for open forests while in dense and ecotone forest they averaged 7 ha^{-1} (range 3 to 12 trees ha^{-1}, Figure 2.7, Appendix A.6). Trees 30 to 70 cm dbh form a high canopy with an average of 63 trees ha^{-1} (range 34 to 85 trees ha^{-1})in all 3 forest types. Trees 10 to 30 cm dbh form the mid canopy with 350 trees ha^{-1} (range 175 to 464 trees ha^{-1}) for all three forest types. The understory was found to have a variable density of trees and palms< 10 cm dbh ranging from 2406 to 9796 individuals ha^{-1} (Figures 2.7 and 2.8, Appendix 2.5 and 2.6). In the herbaceous layer, basal leaf palms ranged from 0 to 1563 individuals ha^{-1} and seedlings < 1.37 m in height ranged from 109,000 to 307,000 individual ha^{-1}.

Comparative density

The mean density for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh was 419 trees ha^{-1} and ranged from 223 trees ha^{-1} in an ecotone site to 528 trees ha^{-1} in a dense site (Figure 2.4, Appendix 2.5). Klinge et al., (1975) reported 400 trees ha^{-1} for forests near Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. Jordan and Uhl (1978) found 786 trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh in a tierra firme forest of the Venezuelan Amazon. Brown,I.F., et al. (1995) found a density of 475 trees ha^{-1} (trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh) for an open forest near Samuel Hydroelectric Reservoir in Rondonia, Brazil. One site (74), south of the Samuel Hydroelectric Reservoir , which was in the same forest type and area as the site reported by Brown, I.F., et al. (1995), had a similar density of 458 trees ha^{-1}.

Brown and Lugo (1992) using inventory data found trees > 70 cm dbh contributed no more than 3% (or 6 to 10 ha^{-1}) to the total number of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh. In our study we found that the trees $\geq$ 70 cm dbh contributed 3.8%, 7.1%, and 1.8% to the total number of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh in open, dense, and ecotone forests respectively and averaged 4 ha^{-1} (range I to 6 trees ha^{-1}) for open forests while in dense and ecotone forest they averaged 7 ha^{-1} (range 3 to 12 trees ha^{-1})

(Figure 2.7, Appendix 2.5). Part of the explanation for the differences between the estimate of Brown and Lugo (1992) and our field measurements may be due to the limited information on the number of smaller trees (< 30 cm dbh) available from inventory data. Brown and Lugo (1992) assumed that dense forests would have fewer trees ha^{-1} 10 - 30 cm dbh than open forests. Number of trees 10 - 30 cm dbh in open forests for our sites averaged 359 ha^{-1}, and in dense forests 379 ha^{-1}. In open forests trees 10 - 30 cm dbh contributed 84% of the total number of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh, and in dense forests they contributed 80%.

Basal area and QSD

Basal area for all trees combined was highest in the dense forests at 28 m^2 ha^{-1} (range 23 to 37 m^2 ha^{-1}, Figure 2.9, Appendix 2.7), while ecotone forest averaged 25 m^2 ha^{-1} (range 15 to 33 m^2 ha^{-1}), and open forests averaged 24 m^2 ha^{-1} (range 19 to 26 m^2 ha^{-1}). These values are consistent with those measured in other moist tropical forests. Basal area of dense forests in Rorima and Para, Brazil differed by 30 % (32 m^2 ha^{-1} and 24 m^2 ha^{-1} respectively, Higuchi et al., 1994). Lieberman and Lieberman (1987) found a basal area ranging from 27 to 31 m^2 ha^{-1} for stems $\geq$ 10 cm dbh at La Selva in Costa Rica, and Jordan and Uhl (1978) reported an average basal area of 33 m^2 ha^{-1} in tierra firme forests in Venezuela. In the tierra firme forest, basal area of the small size trees (<10 cm dbh) was 11 m^2 ha^{-1}. Forest structure in our study gave a basal area of trees < 10 cm dbh ranged from 1 to 5 m^2 ha^{-1}. An open forest site at Samuel Hydroelectric reservoir in Rondonia had a basal area of 25 m^2 ha^{-1} for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh and a mean basal area per tree of .052 m^2 (Brown et al., 1995). The basal area for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh for open forests for our study was 20 m^2 ha^{-1} with .047 m^2 per tree.

The QSD is used as a factor in some models to determine a volume expansion factor (VEF) to convert reported forest inventory values to biomass (Brown, 1997, Brown and Lugo, 1992, Gillespie et al., 1989). QSD is directly related to basal area (Table 2.2) and in our study ranged from 22 to 33 cm for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh both values occured in dense forest plots (Appendix A.8). QSD for trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh ranged from 41 to 54 cm in open forests, 42 to 64 cm in dense forests and 47 to 62 cm in ecotone forests. In their biomass estimates Brown and Lugo (1992) assumed a QSD of > 35 cm for dense forests leading to a VEF of 1.25 and a smaller QSD of 25 cm for open forests, leading to a VEF of 1.5 . In our study we found the QSD's for open and dense forest types to be very similar (average for trees > 10 cm dbh was 25 cm in open forest and 27 cm for dense forests.

Conclusions

Our study provided a unique opportunity to compare the biomass of 20 tropical forest sites using a uniform method to quantify TAGB. The RADAMBRASIL sites provided a framework of forest classification for comparing the samples. The TAGB from the 20 sites indicated the variability within and among forest types in northern Rondônia, Brazil. Data collected on basal area, QSD, and non-tree components explained some of the difference between estimates derived from direct and indirect methods by quantifying components of TAGB not often measured.

The open and ecotone forests were more variable in the contribution to TAGB of both trees < 50 cm dbh and non-tree components within forest types than were dense forests. All three forest types from this study were highly variable in the contribution to TAGB of trees > 50 cm dbh. The narrower range of TAGB in open forests appears to be the result of the absence of trees > 200 cm dbh in the open forest. The average contribution of live non tree components to TAGB for all plots was 6.6%; for wood debris and standing dead, 8.9%; for litter/rootmat, 2.8%; for trees< 10 cm dbh, 3.6%; and trees > 10 cm dbh make up the remaining 79.1%. The results of this study decrease the uncertainty of biomass in the Amazonian rainforests, while pointing out that due to forest heterogeneity there are limits to the usefulness of forest delineations from RADAMBRASIL to predict biomass.

Chapter 3

Analysis of Projeto RADAMBRASIL as a Data Set Useful to Predict Total Aboveground Biomass of Forests in Rondônia, Brazil.

Dian Lyn Cummings, J. Boone Kauffman and David A. Perry

Keywords: Tropical forest biomass, Biomass models, Brazil, Rondônia, Amazon forests.

Abstract

It is recognized that tropical forest ecosystems are significant global carbon pools and potential sources of atmospheric C, therefore accurate assessment of total aboveground biomass (TAGB) is necessary. It has been suggested that forest inventory data may be a good means of accurately calculating these pools. One such forest inventory is Projeto RADAMBRASIL. We tested the hypothesis that models based on the commercial volume reported in the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory could be used to estimate TAGB. In order to test the models we located 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites in Northern Rondônia and quantified the TAGB. TAGB for the resampled sites ranged from 288 to 345 Mg ha^{-1} (mean 313 Mg ha^{-1}); 298 to 534 Mg ha^{-1} (mean 377 Mg ha^{-1}); and 297 to 422 Mg ha^{-1} (350 Mg ha^{-1}) in open, dense and ecotone forest types respectively. The grand mean for all 20 sites was 341 Mg ha^{-1}. Area weighted mean (mean based on the total area represented by each forest type) was 334 Mg ha^{-1}. The results from this study were then compared to 2 models which use commercial tree volume (trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh) from Projeto RADAMBRASIL to estimates TAGB. One model (Fearnside's model, 1992a) accounts for all biomass while the second model (Brown and Lugo's model, 1992) only estimates aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh. The models were not good predictors of the forest biomass for specific sites or forest type means. The model for TAGB (Fearnside, 1992a) over-estimated the field measured TAGB from this study, while the model for TAGB of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh (Brown and Lugo, 1992) under-estimated TAGB. In open forests the Fearnside model over-estimated biomass by > 100 Mg ha^{-1} while in dense forests the Brown

and Lugo model under-estimated biomass by > 100 Mg ha $^{-1}$. Commercial tree volume and density reported in RADAMBRASIL for the sample sites had no relationship to TAGB, tree biomass, or density quantified in this study ($R^2 < 0.10$). Therefore, it was not possible to model TAGB from commercial volume reported in RADAMBRASIL. Results indicate that RADAMBRASIL data is not reliable to estimate TAGB. Estimates of C pools and loss from deforestation are dependent on the models used to derive TAGB and the use of forest classification as well as accurate determinations of the area deforested. This study identifies some of the error associated with modeled TAGB based on commercial volume reported in Projeto RADAMBRASIL.

Introduction

Tropical forests have been at the center of discussion about emissions of green house gases from land use change (Fearnside, 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1997: Hall and Uhlig, 1991; Houghton, 1991a, 1995; Houghton et al., 1991). Some of the uncertainty in the carbon cycling and global climate change models stem from estimates of total aboveground biomass (TAGB) for tropical forest.

Estimates for TAGB in the Brazilian Amazon have ranged from 155 to 394 Mg ha^{-1} (Brown and Lugo, 1984, 1992; Brown et al.,1989; Fearnside, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Kauffman et al.,1995). Differences in TAGB estimates arise, in part from the methods used to formulate the data base. The Fearnside (1985) and Kauffman (1995) estimates were based on field enumerated measurements whereas the Brown and Lugo (1992), and Fearnside (1992a, 1992b) estimates are based on an expansion factor for forest commercial volume reported in forest inventory data.

The costly nature and scarcity of destructive sampling or field enumerated biomass measurements makes commercial volume from forest inventories, with large data sets, desirable for calculating TAGB of Amazonian forests. Forest inventory data has an advantage in that there are many data points available but the disadvantage that the methods used are not specific to measure biomass and do not account for many of the components that make up TAGB such as litter, vines, palms, and small diameter trees (< 30 cm diameter at breast height (dbh)). Moreover, forest inventories generally have a focus on commercially valuable species of trees. Direct measurements or enumerated field biomass measurements specifically for TAGB are scarce for the Amazon but include more (or all) elements of the TAGB.

A major program of Projeto RADAMBRASIL (DNPM, 1978) included a forest inventory of commercial volume with the objective of describing the potential economic value of forest resources of Brazil. RADAMBRASIL focused primarily on merchantable timber with a diameter at breast height (dbh) $\geq$ 30 cm. Most of the study plots were one hectare in size (10 x 1000 m). The data from RADAMBRASIL are reported in a 50 volume series covering the forested areas of Brazil (DNPM, 1978). Projeto RADAMBRASIL(Vol.16, Folha SC.20 Porto Velho, DNPM, 1978) identified a hierarchy of 57 forest types and sub types in the state of Rondônia, Brazil. Forest delineation varied from volume to volume. Based upon communication with scientists who interviewed RADAMBRASIL personnel, there are inconsistencies among sites and between volumes due to differences in the field crews and methods of analysis (Lucarelli, H, and Nepstad, D, personal communication; reported in Brown, I.F. et al., 1995, Fearnside, 1992a).

Information from the RADAMBRASIL inventory has been used in global models of carbon pools and flux (Dixon et al., 1994; Houghton et al., 1995; Fearnside, 1992a, 1993, 1997). However, due to the low estimates of biomass derived from models using the RADAMBRASIL data set compared to data collected in ecological studies, it's use is controversial (Brown and Lugo, 1992 and Fearnside, 1992a). Adding to the controversy, no study has examined the relationship between the data in the forest inventory and the quantification of TAGB by enumerated field measurements. This is necessary in order to ascertain if forest inventory information can reliably predict TAGB and hence C pools. It was hypothesized that the more detailed information from our study could be scaled up to the larger data base of RADAMBRASIL increasing the accuracy of global carbon models essential to predicting climate change.

The objectives of this study were: (1) Determine if a quantifiable correlation exists between the TAGB estimates from this study and modeled estimates based on the RADAMBRASIL data set and (2) Develop a model based on the TAGB results from this study and the commercial volume reported in RADAMBRASIL.

Study Sites

Study sites were located in the northwestern portion of the state of Rondônia and the southern extreme of Amazonas state, Brazil (Chapter 2, Figure 2.1). Forests in this part of Amazonia are representative of forests within the "crescent" of deforestation occurring along the southern and eastern fringe of the Amazon (Skole et. al., 1994). Forests were classified by Projeto RADAMBRASIL as seasonal tropical evergreen forests transitional between evergreen tropical forests and semi deciduous tropical forests (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). Under the Holdridge system, they would be classified as tropical moist forests (Holdridge, 1971). Based on climatological data from Porto Velho (the closest station to the sites) the average annual rainfall is ≈ 2300 mm with the majority falling between November and April (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). Mean temperature is 25.2° C (average maximum of 31.1° C, and average minimum of 20.9° C), and average relative humidity is 85% (Departimento Nacional de Meterologia, Brasil, 1992). Soils at the individual sites range from upland red-yellow and yellow oxisols, red-yellow ultisols, to alluvial soils with hydromorphic lateritic, and gley characteristics (DNPM, BRAZIL, 1978). The elevation at the sites ranged from 61 to 310 m.

We sampled 20 sites across 9 forest classifications from Projeto RADAMBRASIL (Vol.16; Folia SC. 20 Porto Velho; Geologia, Geomorfologia, Pedologia, Vegetaçao e Uso Potencial da Terra (RADAMBRASIL); DNPM, Brazil, 1978) (Chapter 2, Table 2.1). Each of the 20 sites were forest inventory sites sampled as part of RADAMBRASIL in the early 1970's. Study plots were labeled using the original numbers of the forest inventory plots of the RADAMBRASIL study. The RADAMBRASIL classification system was based on a hierarchy of ecological regions (i.e., forest types), subregions (i.e., ecological/geomorphology sub-groupings) and formations (i.e., topographic differences). The most coarse resolution classifies our study sites into 3 forest types: (1) "open" (characterized by well spaced individual trees, numerous palms and the presence of vines); (2) "dense" (normally having 3 strata; one of large trees, one of small regenerating trees and one of shrubs and herbaceous material); and (3) "ecotone" (edge forests in contact with savanna and different classes of forest formations) tropical forest. A fourth forest type (represented by 1 plot) classified as anthropogenic disturbance also was identified as open forest. Open forests are the most abundant forest type in Rondônia (DNPM, Brazil, 1978). The 8 subregions (based on the geomorphology of the area) represented in this study ranged from open, Amazonian alluvial terraces to dense southern Amazonian submontane low hills (Chapter 2, Table 2.1).

Many of the plots had minor levels of human impact. However the level of disturbance in sample plots did not appear to be greater than that reported at the time of the RADAMBRASIL inventory. For example, subsistence palm and tree harvest for local use and trails used for rubber tapping were reported in the original inventory. Some sites (i.e.;1 ,2, 225, 226 and 218) were located near areas of long term (> 100 yrs.), low density (euro American) settlement and therefore we can assume that there has been ongoing low level impacts on forest structure and composition. Five of the 20 sites had at least 1 stump indicating past selective tree harvest; site 75 and 229 each contained 3 stumps, site 76 had 2, site 25 had 1, and site 113 had 6 stumps. All the stumps originated > 20 years prior to our study.

Methods

Plot site selection

There were a total of 229 forest inventory sites in Volume 16, Porto Velho, which covered the area of northern Rondônia and Southern Amazonas for Projeto RADAMBRASIL (DNPM, 1978), but we limited ourselves to the northern part of the region due to logistics. Selection of RADAMBRASIL plots for resampling in this study was based on continued existence of the forested plot site (many sites had been deforested) and accessibility. Plots were accessible by a combination of automobile, boat, and hiking. The aforementioned criteria eliminated all but 59 possible sites. The 20 plots selected to be used in this study were assumed to be representative of undisturbed Rondônian forests; there was no a priori knowledge of either biomass or structure (other than the RADAMBRASIL classification) of these study sites. Geographical locations of the sites were determined from maps and coordinates provided by D. Skole, University of New Hampshire, and located in the field using a Global Positioning System (GPS) (Chapter 2, Table 2.1). We also used a RADAMBRASIL map and satellite photos of the area to assist in plot location. In cases where the area containing the original RADAMBRASIL sites had likely been deforested (i.e. adjacent to a road), we moved our plots to the closest intact forest still within the same forest type, usually a short distance (≈ 200 m) from the road. Our assumption was that if the data from the inventory RADAMBRASIL are relevant to estimate TAGB, then the slight differences in relocation should not be an important influence on results.

Total aboveground biomass components

TAGB was estimated by measuring all organic materials above mineral soil. Partitioning of TAGB was based on structural and ecologically significant components and practicality of measurement (Chapter 2, Figure 2.2). Trees were separated into 6 diameter classes based on dbh (0-10, 10-30 ,30-50, 50-70, 70-100, 100-200 and 200-300 cm dbh). Tree diameter was measured at 1.37 m above the ground (dbh) or immediately above the tree buttress or stilt roots when present. Palms were divided into three categories (basal palms with no trunks, $<$10 cm dbh, and $\geq$10 cm dbh) and vines or lianas into two size classes ($<$10 cm dbh and $\geq$10 cm dbh). Other components included small dicots (plants $<$1.37 m in height), litter/rootmat (forest floor), standing dead trees and palms, and dead and downed coarse wood debris (CWD), the latter divided into two categories 2.5 - 7.5 cm diameter and $\geq$7.5 cm diameter (diameter of CWD measured at the point of intersection with the transects).

Plot layout

At each site a 75 m x 105 m (0.79 ha) plot was established (Chapter 2, Figure 2.3). Two 105 m transects divided the plot into 3 - 25 m x 105 m (0.26 ha) subplots. The diameter for all trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh was recorded in the entire plot (0.79 ha). All trees and palms 10 - 30 cm dbh were measured in the center subplot. Along each 105 m transect, we established a planer intersect transect to measure coarse wood debris (CWD) every 15 m (n=16, 8/transect) (Brown and Rossopoulous 1974; Van Wagoner 1968). At each of the 15 m points along the transect, a 2 x 10 m belt transect was established to measure small trees, vines and palms (>1.37 m in height, but <10 cm dbh) and basal leaf palms. At the same 15 m points along the 105 m transect, the biomass of the forest floor was measured in a 50 x 50 cm microplot and density of dicot seedlings in a 1 x 1 m plot was measured.

Procedures

Equations used for calculating each component of the biomass are listed in Chapter 2, Table 2.2 and 2.3.. Diameter of trees was measured with a forestry caliper or dbh tape. Biomass of trees < 5 cm dbh was calculated from equations based on dbh given by Hughes (1997). The biomass of trees $\geq$ 5 cm dbh were calculated from equations based on dbh given by Higuchi (1997) for Amazonian trees, or the general moist tropical forests equations from Brown et al. (1989). The two different individual tree models were used to test the difference in biomass that resulted from the use of each model on the same tree data.

Biomass of CWD was calculated using the methods of Van Wagner (1964). Transects to measure mass of CWD > 7.5 cm diameter were 15 m in length. CWD 2.5 - 7.5 cm in diameter were measured along 5 m of the 15 m transect. The CWD was further separated into tree (dicot) wood or palm wood components. The ≥7.5 cm diameter class was also separated into sound or rotten classes. One hundred samples for each diameter class were collected in forests near Jamari, Rondonia, to obtain an average wood density. For the 2.5-7.5 cm diameter classes the diameter and angle of 65 individuals along a 100 m transect were measured to calculate the quadratic mean diameter and fuel particle tilt, and to correct for wood particle tilt (Brown and Roussopoulous, 1974). Thereafter, we only counted pieces that intersected the line and used the quadratic mean diameter to calculate biomass.

To calculate forest floor biomass, each sample was initially weighed in the field. Sub-samples were then oven dried to determine the ratio of wet to dry weight. This ratio was then applied to the entire sample to convert from wet to dry weight.

The number of leaves on each basal leaf palm encountered in the 2 x 10 m plot was counted and multiplied by a mean weight per leaf derived from a random sample of 30 basal leaves that were oven dried and weighed. Three equations are necessary to ascertain biomass of palms; biomass of *Attlea* sp. ≥ 1.78 m high was calculated using the model by Anderson (1983), that of other palm species $\geq$ 10 cm dbh estimated using the model of Frangi and Lugo (1985), and that of palms < 10 cm dbh calculated using the model of Hughes (1997).

Seedling biomass (< 1.37 m ht.) was based on sub-sample of 50 oven dried plants from which an average weight per seedling was determined, the number of seedlings were then multiplied by the average to determine biomass. Vine biomass estimates were calculated by the model given by Putz et al., (1983).

Standing dead tree aboveground biomass < 10 cm dbh, were calculated from an equation developed by Hughes (1997), while for standing dead trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh volumes were first calculated then multiplied by the mean value of specific gravity of dead wood (0.413 g/cm^3, the value for sound CWD). Standing dead palm biomass was estimated from Hughes (1997) for palm < 10 cm dbh or from volume multiplied by specific gravity (0.327 g/cm^3) for palms $\geq$ 10 cm dbh.

Comparison of modeled TAGB based on RADAMBRASIL and TAGB calculated in this field study.

Individual tree biomass from our field data were calculated first with the model for moist tropical forest presented by Brown et al. (1989) and then with an Amazon forest specific model suggested by Higuchi (personal communication, 1997). The Brown individual tree model was derived from data collected on 168 trees ranging from 5 to 130 cm dbh in moist tropical forest globally. The Higuchi individual tree model was based on 307 tees ranging from 5 cm dbh to 120 cm dbh in the Brazilian Amazon. The TAGB estimates resulting from the two individual tree models were compared using a paired t-test.

TAGB for the RADAMBRASIL sites of our study were also estimated from expansion factors and models developed by Fearnside (1992) and Brown and Lugo (1992). Those are referred to as the "Fearnside" and "Brown / Lugo" models in this study. Biomass calculation of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh with the Brown / Lugo model involves first expanding the commercial volume for trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh from RADAMBRASIL to the volume at 10 cm dbh. Then converting the volume, by multiplying it by average wood density (specific gravity), to stemwood biomass, and expanding the stemwood biomass to total aboveground biomass (TAGB). The equation was:

TAGB (trees $\geq$ *10 cm dbh) = VEF * WD * BEF*

Volume expansion factor (VEF) = 1.25 for dense forests and 1.50 for open forests

Wood density (WD) = 0.69 Mg/m^3

Biomass expansion factor (BEF) = $\exp\{3.213 - 0.506 * Ln(SB)\}$ *for* $SB < 190$ $Mg\ ha^{-1}$

or *1.74 for* $SB \geq 190$ $Mg\ ha^{-1}$

*Stemwood biomass (SB) = Commercial volume (RADAMBRASIL) * VEF * WD*

The Fearnside model uses adjustments to the Brown / Lugo model to account for factors affecting aboveground biomass (Table 3.1). In our calculations using the Fearnside model we omitted factors for belowground biomass, as it was not measured in our field study.

Table 3.1. Adjustments to TAGB from the Brown / Lugo model used by Fearnside (1992a).

Factor	Correction multiplier	Percent adjust-ment
Adjustment to aboveground live biomass:		
Hollow trees	0.9077	-9.23
Vines	1.0425	4.25
Other non tree components	1.0021	0.21
Palms	1.0350	3.50
Trees < 10 cm dbh	1.1200	12.00
Trees 30 - 31.8 cm dbh	1.0360	3.60
Bark (volume and density)	0.9856	-1.44
Sapwood (volume and density)	0.9938	-0.62
Form factor	1.1560	15.60
Net adjustment to live aboveground:	1.2787	27.87
Adjust ment for other components (with respect to values for aboveground live biomass after correction):		
Dead aboveground biomass:	1.0903	9.03
Bellow ground	1.3428	34.28
Net adjustment for other components:	1.4331	43.31
Total adjust ment:	1.8325	83.25

The Brown / Lugo and Fearnside model estimates were tested against the results of the field data estimates (based on the means at the forest type - regions, geomorphic - subregion, topographic - formation and individual plot levels of vegetation organization) by a paired t-test. We used regression analysis to determine if there was a relationship between our field measured biomass estimates and those modeled from commercial volume in the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory.

Comparison of TAGB area weighted means from the Fearnside model, Brown / Lugo model and TAGB estimates from this study

Commercial volumes reported in RADAMBRASIL were compiled into statistical analysis based on the forest classification level of geomorphic subregion this is comparable to TAGB from our study at the same level (Projeto RADAMBRASIL Vol. 16. Folha SC 20 Porto Velho IV-Vegetacao, Analise Estatistica de dados. DNPM, 1978) . Land area delineated in each geomorphic subregion that comprises the total area surveyed by Projeto RADAMBRASIL in Folha SC 20 Porto Velho (DNPM, 1978) extending from longitude 66^0 to 60^0 and latitude 8^0 to 12^0 totals 262,110 km^2 (Table 3.2). The sites sampled in this study represent 8 of the 12 geomorphic subregions identified by RADAMBRASIL (Table 3.3). The most resampled sites (6) for an individual geomorphic region were located in the open tropical forest type, in the broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madiera river formations. These 6 sites represent 48% of the land area. The areas of ecological tension, savanna/forest edge subregion represent 14% of the land area and 4 of the resampled sites are located in that vegetation type. Representative sites were resampled for geomorphic subregions covering 80% of the land area. At the forest type - regional level all 4 of the regions have representative sites (8, 7, 4 and 1 sites for open, dense, ecotone and human influenced respectively).

Forest biomass at state-wide scale was estimated using mean TAGB for forest types and geomorphic subregions from each method of estimation (Brown / Lugo, Fearnside and this study). The area of land covered by the subregion multiplied by the mean TAGB for that subregion gave an area weighted biomass for the forest

Table 3.2. Forested land area (km^2) of Rondonia, Brazil (60° - 66° Longitude and 8° - 12° Latitude) by region and sub-region as delineated in RADAMBRASIL Vol. 16 Porto Velho Vegetaçao (DNPM, 1978: pg 101).

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Area (Km^2)	Percent of total area
Open tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	1,472.03	0.6
	Flat surface of accumulation	12,024.32	4.6
	Low plates of Amazonia	12,475.56	4.8
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	126,492.56	48.2
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	12,010.38	4.6
Dense tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	2,887.68	1.1
	Low plates of Amazonia	12,616.68	4.8
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	11,940.05	4.5
	Low hills of the southern Amazonia mountains	15,688.77	6.0
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	2,790.77	1.1
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / Forest edge	36,482.38	13.9
Others		3,073.25	1.2
		12,155.57	4.6
TOTAL		262,110.00	100.0

Table 3.3. The mean and range (Mg ha^{-1}) of total above ground biomass (TAGB). RADAMBRASIL sites grouped by region and subregion. Groupings were from RADAMBRASIL Vol. 16 Porto Velho Vegetaçao (DNPM, 1978

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Mean ± SE This study	Range, This Study	Number of sites
Open tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	308.50±20.27	288.22 - 328.77	2
	Flat surface of accumulation	-	-	-
	Low plates of Amazonia	-	-	-
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	313.82±7.42	294.65 -345.67	6
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	-	-	-
Dense tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	363.40±44.27	319.13 - 407.67	2
	Low plates of Amazonia	299.52	299.52	1
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	-	-	-
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	487.76±46.08	441.68 - 533.83	2
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	317.27±19.15	298.11 - 336.42	2
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / Forest edge	350.23±26.18	297.91 - 422.14	4
Human influence		287.34	287.34	1

- indicates no data for this geomorphic subregion.

type and/or subregion. The sum of the weighted biomass for each subregion gives an area weighted biomass for the state of Rondônia. The weighted biomass of Rondônia divided by the total area yields an area weighted mean biomass (Mg ha^{-1}) for the forests in Rondônia and the southern edge of Amazonas covered in RADAMBRASIL vol.16 (DNPM, 1978). TAGB for the same area based on the mean for the coarser level of classification by forest type (open, dense, ecotone and areas of human influence) was calculated in the same way, thus giving a weighted mean (Mg ha^{-1}) based on the total forest area classified into type.

Correlation of RADAMBRASIL tree density and commercial volume to TAGB and tree density derived from this study.

To test the replicability of the RADAMBRASIL study, the density of trees > 30 cm dbh quantified in our study compared to density of trees >30 cm dbh reported in RADAMBRASIL by a paired t-test, to determine if the sample was unusual. Linear regression was used to asses the relationship of our density and aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh by geomorphic subregion mean and individual site to the RADAMBRASIL reported tree density and commercial volume respectively. In the same manner TAGB from the means by geographic subregions and individual sites from our data were regressed on the RADAMBRASIL commercial volumes to determine the feasibility of creating a model for TAGB based on commercial volume. The data were analyzed with a log transformation were necessary to improve the fit.

Results

Comparison of modeled TAGB based on RADAMBRASIL and TAGB calculated in this field study.

The Higuchi individual tree biomass model was used to calculate tree biomass in this study. There was no significant difference ($p = 0.41$) between mean TAGB using the model for individual tree biomass presented by Brown, et. al, (1989) for tropical moist forests and that of Higuchi (personal communication 1997). For example the TAGB of all sites was calculated to be 341 Mg ha^{-1} using the Higuchi individual tree model and 344 Mg ha-1 using Brown, et. al,(1989) individual tree model (TABLE 3.4). The Higuchi individual tree model was based on a destructive sample of trees in the Amazon Basin and therefore may be more appropriate for trees in the region of this study.

TAGB estimates from the Brown / Lugo model and Fearnside model were tested against the TAGB estimates from our study at the geomorphic and topographic mean levels of community type partitioning. The tests at those levels were inconclusive due to the small irregular sample sizes. A t-test of means at the level of forest type yielded no differences in TAGB for open forest between the Brown / Lugo model and estimates from this study ($p = 0.74$), but differences from the Fearnside model (mean 35% higher) estimate ($p = 0.01$). Open forest TAGB estimates from our study, Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models were 313, 306 and 408 Mg ha^{-1}, respectively (Table 3.4). In the dense forest type there was a difference between the Brown / Lugo model and our TAGB estimates (mean 28%

Table 3.4. Comparison of total above ground biomass (TAGB, Mg ha^{-1}) for RADAMBRASIL sites using 4 models for calculations. Models based on forest inventory data (Brown and Lugo, 1992; Fearnside, 1992a) and TAGB from data from this study and models for individual tree biomass (Brown, 1989 and Higuchi,1997, unpublished data).

Forest type -Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Site	RADAMBRASIL inventory		Individual tree data	
			Brown and Lugo 1992 (Trees > 10)	Fearnside 1992a	Brown et.al., 1989	Higuchi, 1997
Open tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	225	316.10	440.69	326.79	328.77
		226	377.36	526.10	276.75	288.22
		Mean	346.73±30.63	483.39±42.73	301.77±25.02	308.50±20.27
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	70	335.06	462.13	345.26	345.67
		74	254.80	355.23	293.40	295.65
		75	307.76	429.07	311.49	311.50
		76	335.29	467.45	315.94	310.84
		Topo Mean	308.23±18.95	433.79±28.56	316.52±10.75	315.66±10.73
		89	302.62	421.90	296.54	299.41
		113	218.91	305.20	318.10	320.86
		Topo Mean	260.77±41.86	363.55±58.35	307.32±10.78	310.14±10.72
		S.Reg Mean	292.41±18.99	407.65±27.79	313.45±7.60	313.99±7.42
	Mean Open forests		305.99±17.48	425.97±24.23	310.53±7.55	312.75±6.66
Dense tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	1	250.98	349.91	433.09	407.67
		2	221.79	309.21	320.30	319.13
		Mean	236.38±14.60	329.56±20.35	376.69±56.39	363.40±44.27
	Low plates of Amazonia	229	323.45	450.94	288.46	299.52
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	24	259.57	361.88	563.63	533.83
		25	254.28	354.51	464.74	441.68
		Mean	256.92±2.64	358.20±3.69	514.18±49.45	487.76±46.08
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	43	432.31	602.71	293.21	298.11
		44	159.16	221.89	324.63	336.42
		Mean	295.73± 136.58	412.30± 190.41	308.92±15.71	317.27±19.15
	Mean Dense forests		271.65±32.55	378.72±45.39	384.01±39.69	376.62±33.43
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / Forest edge	186	287.28	400.52	365.42	348.34
		188	195.08	271.97	300.85	297.91
		190	296.51	413.38	435.97	422.14
		195	260.63	363.36	330.60	332.55
	Mean Ecotone forests		259.87±22.90	362.31±31.93	358.21±29.08	350.23±26.18
Human Influence		218	167.32	233.27	286.74	287.34
Grand Mean			277.81±15.22	388.13±21.40	344.60±22.73	341.23±14.17

less) but no difference between the Fearnside model and our TAGB estimates ($p=0.09$ and $p=0.64$, respectively). Dense forests TAGB from our study, Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models were 377, 272, and 378 Mg ha $^{-1}$, respectively. The ecotone forest type revealed a difference between the Brown / Lugo model and our TAGB estimate (mean26% less) ($p<0.00$) and no difference between our TAGB estimates and Fearnside's estimates ($p=0.16$). Ecotone forest TAGB from our estimates, Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models were 350, 259, and 362 Mg ha $^{-1}$, respectively. Comparing the grand means resulting from the Brown / Lugo model, Fearnside model and our TAGB estimates shows a difference between the Brown / Lugo model and our estimates ($p=$ 0.00, t-test) as well as the Fearnside model and our estimates ($p=0.08$). The Brown / Lugo model grand mean estimate averaged 18% lower and Fearnside model grand mean estimate 14% higher than our estimate.

If forest inventories are useful to estimate TAGB, there should be a strong correlation between modeled TAGB based on inventories and TAGB from our field measured estimates. Both the Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models are based on the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory commercial volume and expansion factors or ratios (as described in the introduction and methods) consequently, they have the same basis at each site and are parallel in relationship to the RADAMBRASIL commercial volume values. However there was no correlation between either the Brown / Lugo or Fearnside models and the field quantified estimates of TAGB at the level of either individual plot or topographic formation ($R^2= <0.05$) (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5. Results of linear regression relating our estimates of total aboveground biomass (TAGB) to modeled estimates based on commercial volume in the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory.

TAGB field estimate (*TAGB for trees >10 cm dbh) vs:		R^2 value	p - value
Individual sites (n=20)	Brown/Lugo model TAGB	0.0073	0.72
	Brown/Lugo model TAGB *	0.0031	0.82
	Fearnside model TAGB	0.0152	0.60
Means from geomorphic and topographic types (n=9)	Brown/Lugo model TAGB	0.0076	0.82
	Brown/Lugo model TAGB*	0.0418	0.60
	Fearnside model TAGB	0.0147	0.76

For example in dense forest, low hills of S. Amazonia site the Fearnside model predicted mean TAGB was 358 Mg ha^{-1} and the Brown / Lugo model predicted 257 Mg ha^{-1} while our estimate was 488 Mg ha^{-1} (sites 24 and 25). In open, broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madiera, submontain hills Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models estimated mean TAGB to be 308 and 434 Mg ha^{-1} respectively, while our field quantified estimate was 316 Mg ha^{-1}. Log transformations did not improve the fit of the regressions.

Comparison of TAGB area weighted means from the Fearnside model, Brown / Lugo model and TAGB estimates from this study

Estimated weighted mean TAGB for the 80% of the land area represented by resampled sites shows the magnitude of differences among the models (Table 3.6). The weighted mean from our estimate was 331.5 Mg ha-1, for the Bown / Lugo

Table 3.6. Regional total above ground biomass (TAGB) pools and weighted means based on estimates from 2 commercial volume models and estimates from this study. Means are in units of Mg ha^{-1} . TAGB of areas are in Pg. Resampled Regions represent 80.3% of the total area.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Mean (mg ha^{-1})	RADAMBRASIL based models:		% of total area	TAGB of regions and subregions (Pg)		
		this study	Brown	Fearnside		This study	Brown	Fearnside
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	308.5	346.7	483.4	0.6	0.0454	0.0510	0.0712
	Flat surface of accumulation	-			4.6			
	Low plates of Amazon	-			4.8			
	Broken surface of the upper X/T/M	313.8	292.4	410.4	48.2	3.9717	3.6988	5.1571
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	-			4.6			
	Mean for Open forests	312.8	306.0	426.6	62.8	5.1440	5.0328	7.0163
	Weighted mean for open forests	313.9	293.0	408.52				
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	363.4	236.4	329.6	1.1	0.1049	0.0683	0.0952
	Low plates of Amazon	299.5	323.5	450.9	4.8	0.3779	0.4081	0.5689
	Broken surface of the upper X/T/M	-			4.5			
	Low hills of southern Amazon	487.8	256.9	358.2	6.0	0.7652	0.4031	0.5620
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	317.3	295.7	412.3	1.1	0.0885	0.0825	0.1151
	Mean for Dense forests	376.6	271.7	378.7	17.5	1.7296	1.2475	1.7392
	Weighted mean for dense forests	393.3	283.1	394.6				
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / Forest edge	350.2	259.8	362.3	13.9	1.2778	0.9481	1.3217
Others		-			1.2			
		287.3	167.3	233.3	4.6	0.3493	0.2034	0.2836
TAGB for area represented by re-sampled sites (80.3%) using subregional means.						6.9808	5.8632	8.1741
TAGB for total area (100%) using forest type means (open, dense and ecotone forests)						8.5889	7.4832	10.4326
TAGB (Mg/ha) weighted for 80% area represented by each subregion.		333.9	278.4	388.2				
TAGB (Mg/ha) weighted for 100% area represented by each forest type.		327.7	285.5	398.0				

model it was 278.4 Mg ha^{-1}, and for the Fearnside model it was 388.2 Mg ha^{-1}. The total regional biomass (80 % of the area) was about 1 Pg difference between each of the three estimates. The Brown estimate was the lowest (5.86 Pg) followed by the our field estimate (6.98 Pg) and the Fearnside estimate (8.17 Pg; Table 3.6).

If the means by the forest type are used in the calculation of the weighted biomass we can assume that the mean extends to include all the subregions and yields a total weighted biomass for 100% of the area. The weighted mean calculated from the mean by forest type yield slightly different results than that weighted by subregion. The weighted mean for our estimate was reduced by ≈ 4 Mg ha^{-1}, the Brown / Lugo estimate increased ≈ 1 Mg ha^{-1} and the Fearnside estimate increased by ≈ 10 Mg ha^{-1}. Calculating the biomass for 100% of the area using the forest type mean resulted in a difference of ≈ 1 Pg between our estimate (8.59 Pg) and the Brown estimate (7.48 Pg) , but a ≈ 1.5 Pg difference between our estimate and the Fearnside estimate (10.43 Pg; Table 3.6).

Correlation of RADAMBRASIL tree density and commercial volume to TAGB and tree density derived from this study.

There was no difference between the mean tree density (trees > 30 cm dbh) from RADAMBRASIL data and that enumerated in this study (paired t-test, $p = 0.37$). According to data reported in RADAMBRASIL the individual sites chosen for resampling in this study were similar in commercial volume and density of trees >30 cm dbh to the mean for other RADAMBRASIL sites in the each subregion (DNPM, 1978; Table 3.7).

Table 3.7. Summary of means for subregions and individual resampled sites commercial volume (m^3 ha^{-1}) and tree density for trees≥30 cm dbh (Trees ha^{-1}) reported in RADAMBRASIL Vol. 16 Porto Velho Vegetaçao (DNPM, 1978) and tree density from this study.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	Plot	Page No.	Trees≥30 cm dbh (numbers ha^{-1})			Commercial volume with bark (m^3 ha^{-1})	
				This study	RADAM inventory	No. of Species	All sites in the subregion	Resampled sites.
Open tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	225	467	70	81	**31**		**166.25**
		226		83	87	**50**		**209.54**
	Mean for this subregion			77±7	84±3		**187.90±27**	**187.89±22**
	Broken surface of the upper Xingu/Tapajos/Madeira	70	436	69	93	**53**		**186.05**
		74		58	48	**27**		**107.46**
		75		67	68	**41**		**157.49**
		76		61	64	**37**		**186.18**
		89		62	82	**47**		**152.21**
		113		84	45	**29**		**79.03**
	Mean for this subregion			67±4	54±2	**33**	**144.84±18**	**114.82±16**
Dense tropical forest	Amazonia alluvial	1	138	46	51	**30**		**125.07**
		2		93	58	**35**		**97.38**
	Mean for this subregion			69±23	61±13	**34**	**135.91±30**	**111.22±14**
	Low plates of Amazonia	229	494	63	82	**44**		**209.34**
	Mean for this subregion				66±16		**154.09±55**	
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	24	220	91	75	**41**		**133.88**
		25		64	63	**34**		**128.41**
	Mean for this subregion			77±14	63±5	**37**	**127.37±15**	**131.15±3**
	Pre - Cambrian platform cover	43	333	75	88	**40**		**288.07**
		44		69	29	**22**		**49.74**
	Mean for this subregion			72±3	52±19	**30**	**129.36±76**	**168.90±119**
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / Forest edge	186	695	50	67	**48**		**137.00**
		188		48	48	**25**		**62.58**
		190		74	64	**38**		**146.05**
		195		76	55	**40**		**112.49**
	Mean for this subregion			62±8	57±5	**32**	**99.42±13**	**114.23±19**
Human Influence		218	801	65	30	**18**		**45.87**
	Mean for this subregion				43±8	**26**	**79.20±17**	

There was no correlation between the tree density quantified in this study and that reported by RADAMBRASIL ($R^2 = 0.095$ $p=0.42$). Similarly, no relationship existed between the aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$30 cm dbh from this study and the commercial volume reported in RADAMBRASIL ($R^2 = 0.107$, $p=0.39$) or TAGB from this study and RADAMBRASIL commercial volume ($R^2=0.008$, $p = 0.82$). Log transformations did not improve the relationship.

Discussion

Comparison of modeled TAGB based on RADAMBRASIL and TAGB calculated in this field study

This field experiment was the first comparison of independently collected field data to test RADAMBRASIL commercial volume based models. The lack of a relationship between our estimates of TAGB and the estimates using the Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models indicates that the RADAMBRASIL data set can not be used to predict TAGB. There are several possible factors to explain the differences in the TAGB estimates from models using commercial volume compared to our enumerated TAGB. Among those factors are the inconsistencies between inventories designed to assess commercial value put into use to determine biomass, variation in the contribution of biomass components other than trees, and errors in the terms used in the models. The factors that can be addressed by this study are, the contribution of the non-tree components, contribution of the trees to the biomass, and how the tree and non tree components relate to terms used in the Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models.

To determine the TAGB, the Brown / Lugo model used expansion factors and wood density of the commercial volume of trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh to extrapolate the biomass of trees 10 to 30 cm dbh (Brown and Lugo, 1992). Quadratic stand diameter (QSD, i.e., diameter of a tree with mean basal area; Husch et al., 1972) is one of the variables for determining the volume expansion factor (VEF) used (Brown and Lugo, 1992; Brown et al., 1989). The VEF is related to the size of trees that make up the forest with higher expansion factors in forests with smaller trees (low QSD) (Brown et al., 1989). In applying the Brown / Lugo model to the RADAMBRASIL data set, it was assumed that the open forest type would have a lower QSD ($\approx$ 25 cm) than the dense forest type (> 30 cm). Therefore a VEF of 1.25 was used for forests classified as dense while a VEF of 1.5 was applied to open forests (Brown and Lugo, 1992). In our study we found the QSD was approximately equal among the forest types (Chapter 2, Appendix A.8). The calculated mean QSD for trees $\geq$10 cm dbh was 24.8 ± 2.7, 26.6 ± 1.5, and 27.2 ± 5.9 for open, dense, and ecotone forest types respectively. Calculating the mean QSD for trees $\geq$30 cm dbh (comparable to the RADAMBRASIL inventory) values where 48.0 ± 1.3, 54.4 ± 4.6, and 54.6 ± 3.4 for open , dense, and ecotone forest types respectively. The difference in the VEF used in Brown / Lugos model could account for the result of open forest with higher biomass than that of closed forests. This was quite the opposite of the field measurements (Figure 3.1). Given that the Brown / Lugo model grossly underestimates dense forest, a higher VEF would improve this model (Figure 3.1). Due to the Fearnside models reliance on the Brown / Lugo model results, the error is carried over from one estimate to the



Figure 3.1. Comparison of total above ground biomass (TAGB) estimates from this study to 2 model estimates based on commercial volume from RADAMBRASIL forest inventory .

other. The results from the Fearnside model substantially overestimate the open forest TAGB but is reasonably close in estimating the dense forest TAGB through a combination of errors.

There are several assumptions made on the contribution to TAGB of vegetative components other than trees. The Brown / Lugo model did not include the contribution of components other than trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh to TAGB. To correct for that omission, Fearnside (1992b) used a correction multiplier based on direct measures from the literature (Revilla Cardenas, 1986, 1987, 1988; Klinge et al., 1975; Jordan and Uhl, 1978; N. Higuchi, reported in Fearnside, 1992b; D. A. Da Silva reported in Fearnside, 1992b) on the values derived from the Brown / Lugo model (Table 3.1). Fearnside (1992a) sums up adjustments he uses in his model as a 27.87% net adjustment for live above ground components and an additional 9.03% for dead aboveground components applied to the adjusted live TAGB. Among the live aboveground adjustments to aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh by Fearnside (1992a) are 4.25% for vines, 0.21% for "other" non-tree components, 3.50% for palms, and 12.00% for trees≤10 cm dbh for a total of 19.96%. In our study the total mean percentage of aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh for the aforementioned components were; 0.2% vines, 0.2% "other", 8.1% palms, and 5.2% trees < 10 cm dbh in open forests; 0.2% vines, 0.2% "other", 5.6% palms, and 4.8% trees < 10 cm dbh for dense forests; 0.2% vines, 0.1% "other", 18.0% palms, and 3.9% trees < 10 cm dbh in ecotone forest respectively(Chapter 2, Appendix A.1). In our data proportions of contributions from vegetative components other than trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh are different from those of Fearnside (1992a) giving an overall contribution of 13.67%, 10.74 % and 22.20% for open, dense and ecotone forests respectively. This contribution is lower in open (-6.29%) and dense (-9.22%) forests but higher in ecotone forests (+2.24%) compared to the 19.96 % Fearnside adjustment. The mean for coarse wood debris, standing dead and litter/rootmat combined from our study had contributions of 15.86%, 12.35%, and 10.10% of the live TAGB for open, dense, and ecotone forests respectively (Chapter 2, Figure 2.5). The means for coarse wood debris, standing dead and litter/rootmat combined in our field measurements are slightly higher than the Fearnside correction factor (9.03% of adjusted live TAGB) for the ecotone forest but are almost 6% and 2% higher in open and dense forest. The additional adjustment factors for bark, sapwood, and form factor totals 7.9%of aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh (Fearnside 1992a). These adjustments were unnecessary for our data because we used an individual tree model taken from direct measurements which encompassed all the aforementioned factors.

Considering the discrepancies between factors used in the 2 models and the information from our study it is surprising that the grand means are not more disparate. This is probably reflective of the heterogeneity of the Amazonian tropical forests and more importantly the way the model estimates over-estimate and under-estimate biomass depending on forest type effectively canceling out the error in each.

Comparison of TAGB area weighted means from the Fearnside model, Brown / Lugo model and TAGB estimates from this study

Each site identified in RADAMBRASIL may be generally composed of 2 or more forest types but they are lumped into a dominant forest type for the purpose of statistical analysis (DNPM, vol 16, 1978). Forests that are classified as open on maps at a scale of 1:1,000,000 may contain large areas classified as dense at a scale of 1:250,000 (Brown, I.F., et al., 1995). It has been suggested that biomass estimates could be improved by linking maps of forest types with data on biomass for each type based on geographic information systems (GIS) (I.F. Brown et al., 1995, Fearnside 1992b). The weighted mean uses land area in each forest classification to determine a more accurate biomass estimate for a given area.

The differences in mean biomass by forest type between the RADAMBRASIL based model estimates and field data becomes more critical at the larger scale. The weighted mean for the Brown / Lugo model, 278.4 Mg ha^{-1}, was similar to that reported in Brown and Lugo (1992) of 252 $\pm$32 Mg ha^{-1} for dense forests. The weighted mean for the Fearnside estimate of 388.2 Mg ha^{-1} was higher than the value of 334.9 Mg ha^{-1} (394 Mg ha^{-1} less 15% for below ground biomass) reported by Fearnside as the mean for all Amazonian forests (1992b). The predicted biomass pools of the area covered in RADAMBRASIL vol. 16 Porto Velho dramatically varied depending upon model selection (Table 3.6). The Fearnside estimate was 1.2 Pg (17%) larger than the estimate from this study and the Brown / Lugo model estimate was 1.1 Pg (16%) less than the field data.

There can also be a difference dependent on how the land area is broken up into classification units. The area weighted estimate based on subregion means is limited by our sample to 80% of the forested area by using the coarser resolution of forest type - regional mean we can extend our area weighted estimate to 100% of the forested area. The difference in the results from the weighted mean by the subregion and the weighted mean by forest type is mostly due to the larger land area represented by the forest type mean. The remainder of the difference is due to the fact that the open forest make up 62.8 % of the land cover for the region and therefore contribute more influence on the weighted mean. The Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models both yielded higher biomass estimates for open forests than dense forests which results in a weighted mean that is higher than if the same models were used on dense forests alone.

The 3,000 km arc of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon runs along the southern edge of the Legal Amazon and northward through the eastern Amazon (Fearnside 1990). The state of Rondônia falls within the path of the deforestation arc. The estimate of deforestation in Rondônia ranges from 11.5% (Skole et al, 1994) to 20% (Fearnside, 1992b) of the original forested area. Open forests make up 62.8 % of Rondônian forests, dense forests account for 17.5% and ecotone types are 13.9% (Table 3.4, from the DNPM, 1978). If deforestation estimates for Rondônia are accurate then 30,142 to 52,422 km^2 of the original forests have been cut and burned. This would represent a total of 1.00 to 1.75 Pg of forest biomass effected by deforestation (calculated using the weighted mean from our data). A majority of the deforestation in Rondonia is occurring in non-dense forests (open and ecotone). Depending on the model utilized as well as how the forest types are classified and how biomass is apportioned among the forest area the estimation of biomass lost in deforestation and consequently carbon flux can dramatically vary from 0.76 Pg to 2.07 Pg (using the Brown and Lugo, (1992) biomass estimate and the Fearnside (1992a) estimate respectively, with the given deforestation estimates).

If the rate of deforestation in the entire Amazon Basin is 20×10^3 km^2 yr^{-1} (up to 1988; Skole, 1994) and we assume that deforestation occurs in the individual forest types in proportion to the area covered by those forest types in the arc of deforestation (36% open forest, 38% dense forests and 25% ecotone forests (calculated from Table 5; Fearnside (1992b) for the states of Acre, Marranhao, Mato Grasso, Para, Rondonia, and Tocantins). Then we estimate that deforestation influenced 0.7000 Pg of biomass yr^{-1} (7.000 Pg over 10 years) effecting 0.350 Pg C yr^{-1} (3.500 Pg C over 10 years) (based upon weighted mean TAGB by forest type estimates from this study, Table 3.6). Calculating the C effected over the same area using the weighted mean from the Brown / Lugo and Fearnside models gives 2.780 and 3.877 Pg respectively, over 10 years, a difference of 20% and 11% respectively from our projection.

Total C flux from low latitude forests in the neotropical Americas is estimated to range between 0.5 to 0.7 Pg yr^{-1} (Dixon et al, 1994), (i.e.; the Amazonian deforestation was 50% to 70% of the C). If the Brown / Lugo model grand mean is used the C content of the biomass is 0.2778 Pg yr^{-1} (or 40% to 56 % of the total C). Calculations using the Fearnside model grand mean the value is 0.3860 Pg C yr^{-1} (or 55% to 78% of the total C). The method and model used for biomass calculations has an increasing magnitude of effect as the scale and time period is increased.

<u>Correlation of RADAMBRASIL tree density and commercial volume to TAGB and tree density derived from this study.</u>

Use of the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory to accurately estimate TAGB is questionable. Lack of a relationship between our field data (i.e., tree density $\geq$ 30 cm dbh, aboveground biomass of trees $\geq$30 cm dbh or TAGB) to RADAMBRASIL tree density or commercial volume estimates indicates that we cannot quantify a relationship of aboveground biomass to data presented in RADAMBRASIL. Therefore, no model based on the RADAMBRASIL commercial volume data was possible. Reasons for the lack of correlation in results may partially lie in the purpose of, and the conditions under, which the RADAMBRASIL project was carried out. The primary purpose of RADAMBRASIL was to inventory commercially valuable timber resources. Less attention was given to trees and vegetation components that were without commercial value. Brown, I. F. (et al.,1995) reports a personal communication from N. Rosa (1993), revealing that bole and tree height in many RADAMBRASIL inventories were estimated by eye. Field conditions for the teams carrying out the inventory were difficult, dangerous, and sometimes fatal. Although there was some air support to get to remote locations, for the most part the teams (as were we) were restricted to areas that could be accessed by river, road, or trail. Lumping of sites that contained several forest types into one classification for summary data loses a level of resolution in the data, but indicates the high degree of heterogeneity in the tropical moist forest. Commercial volume reported only for trees $\geq$30 cm dbh leaves room for error in estimation of biomass for size classes < 30 cm dbh for which there is no data.

Commercial volume also failed to give information on a portion of the TAGB in other vegetation components, (trees $\leq$ 30 cm dbh, palm, dead wood and forest floor that can be as high as 40 to 47%) of the TAGB (Chapter 2, Appendix A.1). The vast amount of information reported in RADAMBRASIL is impressive and valuable for many purposes (soil classification; delineation of vegetation cover types, species distribution, geology and geomorphology) but the tree commercial volume can not reliably translate to TAGB. It is, however, possible that the use of the RADAMBRASIL mapping of forest classification and area could be useful in improving TAGB estimates throughout the Legal Amazon (as the IBDF (Brazilian Institute for Forest Development)and IBGE (Brazilian Institute for geography and Statistics) maps were used by Fearnside for his calculations of TAGB for the Amazon (1992b, Table 12).

Chapter 4

Conclusions

Results of this study to quantify total above ground biomass (TAGB) and structure of Amazonian tropical forests delineated by RADAMBRASIL in northern Rondônia, Brazil led to the following conclusions:

- Mean TAGB by forest type was; open forests - 314 Mg ha^{-1} , dense forest - 377 Mg ha^{-1} and ecotone forests - 350 Mg ha^{-1} . Area weighted mean for 80% of the state of Rondônia by forest type and geomorphic subregion was 332 Mg ha^{-1}.
- Range of TAGB in open forest was less than that of dense or ecotone forests (288 to 345 Mg ha^{-1} vs. 298 to 534 Mg ha^{-1} and 298 to 422 Mg ha^{-1} , respectively). The only subregion that was significantly different from the others was the dense, lowhills of southern Amazonia which accounts for 6% of the vegetation cover in the study area.
- Contribution of non-tree components to TAGB varied from 7% to 40%. Major non-tree components were palm and the combined dead wood and forest floor. Non-tree component comprised a slightly higher proportion of TAGB in open and ecotone forests compared to dense forests (Averaging 19%, 21% and 16% respectively.
- Trees 10 to 50 cm dbh contributed slightly more proportionally to the TAGB in open forest than in dense or ecotone forests. The 10 to 50 cm dbh classes

contributed 47%, 42% and 38 % to the TAGB in open, dense, and ecotone forest respectively.

- Greatest variation in tree biomass among forest types was in the ≥ 50 cm dbh size classes. In open forests trees ≥ 50 cm dbh averaged 92 Mg ha^{-1}; in dense forests 158 Mg ha^{-1}; and in ecotone forests 137 Mg ha^{-1}.
- There were no trees ≥ 200 cm dbh in any of the open forest sites, dense forest had trees ≥ 200 cm dbh in 43% of the sites and ecotone forests in 50%.
- Major differences in the structure of tree biomass was in trees ≥ 70 cm dbh which made up 18% of the biomass in trees ≥ 10 cm dbh in open forests, 31% in dense forests and 41% in ecotone forests.
- Density of trees 10 - 30 cm dbh was similar among open and dense forests (358 and 379 ha^{-1}, respectively, within 6%of each other). This is contrary to an assumption of fewer trees 10 - 30 cm dbh in dense forest that is used in formulating the Brown and Lugo (1992) model to estimate biomass using the RADAMBRASIL forest inventory.
- The proportion of biomass in trees ≥30 cm dbh as compared to biomass of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh was similar among forest types (68%,in open forests; 72%, in dense forests; and 75%, in ecotone forests). The fraction of the total volume of trees ≥ 10 cm dbh represented by trees ≥ 30 cm dbh was assumed to be lower in open forests as compared to dense forests (Brown and Lugo, 1992). If the proportion of biomass can be assumed to be directly

correlated to volume than the assumption of a lower proportion of biomass represented in trees $\geq$ 30 cm dbh was exaggerated for open forests.

- Quadratic stand diameters (QSD) for trees $\geq$ 10 cm dbh were similar among forest types (25 cm, in open forests; 27 cm, in dense forests; and 27 cm in ecotone forests). The Brown and Lugo (1992) model for estimating biomass from the RADAMBRASIL inventory data assumes that the dense forests will have a higher QSD (>30 cm) than open forest. Therefore the volume expansion factor (VEF) for open forests is over-estimated. The error in the VEF resulted in an over-estimate of open forest biomass compared to dense forest biomass.
- The Fearnside (1992b) estimates are based on the Brown and Lugo (1992) estimates of biomass and so carry over the errors from that model.
- There was no correlation between our TAGB or tree density and RADAMBRASIL forest inventory commercial volume or tree density. Therefore, no model was possible.
- Despite errors in model assumptions and the lack of correlation between field measurements and RADAMBRASIL data the weighted mean TAGB estimates from the 2 models were close to that derived in our study. This was probably due to the over-estimation of open forests biomass balancing out the under-estimation of dense forests biomass in each commercial volume model.

A valid prediction of carbon flux for the vast forest areas of the Legal Amazon will require more detailed descriptions of deforestation delineated by forest type as Fearnside (1992b) has done. Estimates used for TAGB effect estimates of carbon pools in tropical forest. Vegetative sources of carbon are effected differently by deforestation and release carbon at different rates. Therefore, components of biomass included or excluded from estimates are important factors when determining the fate of C from deforestation projected over large scales of time and space.

Bibliography

Anderson, A.B. 1983. The biology of *Orbignya martiana* (Palmae), A tropical dry forest dominante in Brazil. PhD Dissetation, University of Florida

Bacastow, R., and C.D Keeling. 1973. Atmospheric carbon dioxide and radio-carbon in the natural carbon cycle. II. Changes from A.D. 1700-2070 as deduced from geochemical model. In: *Carbon and the Biosphere* (eds. Woodwell, G.M. and Pecan, E.V.), 86-135. US Atomic Energy Commission, Symposium Series 30, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia.

Broecher, W.S., Takahasi, T., Simpson, H.H., and T.H. Peng. 1979. Fate of fossil fuel carbon dioxide and the global carbon budget. Science, 206: 409-418.

Brown, I.F., Martinelli, L.A., Thomas, W.W. , Moreira, M.Z., Ferreira, C.A.C., and R. A. Victoria. 1995. Uncertainty in the biomass of Amazonian forests: An example from Rondonia, Brazil. Forest Ecology and Managment, 75:175-189

Brown, J. K. and P. J. Roussopoulous. 1974. Eliminating biases in the planar intersect method for estimating volumes of small fuels. Forest Science, 20:350-356.

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

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

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1992. Aboveground biomass estimates for tropical moist forests of the Brazilian Amazon. Interciencia, 17:8-18.

Brown, S. 1997. *Estimating biomass and biomass change of tropical forest : A primer.* A Forest Resources Assessment publication. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations. Rome, Italy, pp55

Crutzen, P.J., and M.D. Andreae. 1990. Biomass burning in the tropics: Impact on atmospheric chemistry and biogeochemical cycles. Science, 250:1669-1678.

Departamento Nacional de Meterologia - Brazil. 1992. Normais climatalogicas (1961 - 1990). Minesterio da Agricultura e Reforma Agrario, Brasilia, D.F. Brazil.

Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral. 1978. Projecto RADAMBRASIL. Folha SC. 20 Porto Velho; geologia, geomorfologia, pedologia, vegetação e uso potencial da terra. Rio de Jeniro, Brazil, pp. 668 Anexo: Analise estistitica de dados (Vegetacao). pp. 850.

Ditwiller, R.P., and C.A. Hall. 1988. Tropical forests and the global carbon cycle. Science, 239:42-47.

Dixon, R.K., Brown, S., Houghton, R.A., Solomon, A.M., Trexler, M.C. and J. Wisniewski. 1994. Carbon pools and flux of global forest ecosystems. Science, 263:185-190

Dunnette, D. And R. J. O'Brien (eds). (1992). *The Science of Global Change: The Impact of Human Activities on the Environment.* ACS Symposium Series 483. American Chemical Society Washington, D. C., pp 483.

Fearnside, P.M. 1985. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem. Interciencea, 10(4):179-186

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

Fearnside, P.M. 1987. Summary of progress in quantifying the potential contribution of Amazonian deforestation to the global carbon problem. In: *Proceedings of the workshop on biogeochemistry of tropical rain forests: Problems for research.* (eds. Athie, D., Lovejoy, T.E., and P. De M. Oyens). Universidade de Sao Paulo, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura (CENA). Paricicaba, Sao Paulo, pp.75-87

Fearnside, P.M. 1989. Contribution to the greenhouse effect from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Soils and the Greenhouse Effect, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 14-18 August 1988, pp 465-468 (Copy). In: *Tropical forestry response options to global climate change. Conference Proceedings*, Sao Paulo, January 1990. Report 20D-2003, Office of Policy Analysis, USEPA, Washington D.C. 1990.

Fearnside, P.M. 1990. The rate and extent of deforestation in Brazilian Amazônia. Environmental Conservation, 17(3):213-226

Fearnside, P.M. 1991. Greenhouse gas contributions from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia. In: *Global biomass burning: Atmospheric, Climatic, and Biospheric Implications*. (ed. J.S. Levine). MIT press, Cambridge, MA., pp 92-105.

Fearnside, P.M. 1992a. Forest biomass in Brazillian Amazônia: Comments in the estimates by Brown and Lugo. Interciencia, 17(1):19-27

Fearnside, P.M. 1992b. *Carbon emissions and sequestration in forests:* Case *studies from seven developing* countries, *Volume 2 Brazil* (eds. Makundi, W. and J. Sathge) EPA Climate Change Division Environmental Protection Agency Washington, D.C. and Environment division Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA.

Fearnside, P.M., Leal, N. Jr., and F.M. Fernandes. 1993. Rainforest burning and the global carbon budget: Biomass, combustion efficiency, and charcoal formation in the Brazilian Amazon. Journal of Geophysical Research, 98(9):16733-16743

Fearnside, P.M. 1997. Greenhouse gases from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia: Net committed emissions. Climate Change, 35:321-360.

Frangi, J.L. and A.E. Lugo. 1985. Ecosystem dynamics of a subtropical floodplain forest. Ecological Monographs, 55:351-369

Gillespie, A.J.R., Brown, S., and A.E.Lugo. 1992. Tropical forest biomass estimation from truncated stand tables. Forest Ecology and Managment, 48:69-87

Grace, J., Loyd, J., McIntyre, J., Miranda, A.C., Meir, P., Miranda, H.S., Nobre, C., Moncrieff, J., Massheder, J., Malhi, Y., Wright, I., and J. Gash. 1995. Carbon dioxide uptake by an undisturbed tropical rain forest in Southwest Amazonia, 1992 to 1993. Science, 270:5237, 778-780

Hall, C.A.S., and J. Uhlig. 1991. Refining estimates of the carbon released from tropical land use change. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 21:118-131.

Higuchi, N., Marden dos Santos, J., Imanaga, M., and S. Yoshida. 1994. Aboveground biomass estimate for Amazonian dense tropical moist forests. The Memoirs of the Faculty of Agriculture, Kagoshima University, Vol. XXX (consecutive number 39). Kagoshima, Japan.

Holdridge, L. 1967. Life zone ecology. Tropical Science Center, San Jose, Costa Rica, pp. 206

Holdridge, L.R., Grenke, W.C., Hathaway, W.H., Liang, T. and J.A. Tosi Jr. 1971. Forest environment in tropical life zones. A pilot Study. Pergamon Press, New York.

Houghton, R. A., and D.L. Skole. 1990. Carbon . In: *The earth as transformed by human action*. (eds. Turner B.L., Clark, W.C. Kates, R.W., Ruckards, J.T., Mathews, J.T., and Meyer, W.B.) , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., pp 325

Houghton, R.A., Skole, D.L. and D.S. Lefkowitz. 1991. Changes in the landscape of Latin America between 1850 and 1985. II Net release of CO_2 to the atmosphere. Forest Ecology and Managment, 38:173-199

Houghton, R.A. 1991. Troppical deforestation and atmospheric carbon dioxide. Climate Change, 19(1-2):99-118

Houghton, R.A. 1995. Land - use change and the carbon cycle: A commissioned review. Global Change Biology, 1:275-287.

Hughes, R. F. 1997. Effects of deforestation and land use on biomass, carbon, and nutrient pools in the Los Tuxtlas Region, Mexico. PhD. Dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

Husch, B., Miller, C.I. and T.W. Beers. 1972. *Forest mensuration. Second edition*. Ronald Press Co., New York, pp 410

Jordan, C.F. and C. Uhl. 1978. Biomass of a "tierra firme" Forest of the Amazon basin. Oecolgia Plantarium, 13(4):387-400.

Jordan, C.F. and R. Herrera. 1981. Tropical rainforests. Are nutrients really critical? American Naturalist, 117:167-180

Kauffman, J.B., Cummings, D.L., Ward, D.E., and R.F. Hughes. 1995. Fire in the Brazilian Amazon: 1. Biomass, nutrient pools, and losses in slashed primary forests. Oecologia. 104:397-408.

Kauffman, J.B., Uhl, C. and D.L. Cummings. 1988. Fire and the Venezuelan Amazon: 1. Fuel biomass and fire chemistry in the evergreen rain forest of Venezuela. Oikos, 53:167-175

Keeling, C.D., Bacastow, R.B., Carter, A.F., Piper, S.C., Whorf, T.P., Heimann, M., Mook, W.G., and H. Rodoffzen. 1989. A three dimensional model of atmospheric CO_2 transport based on observed winds: 1. Analysis of observational data. In: *Aspects of Climate Variability in the Pacific and the*

*Western Americas. pp*165-236 *(ed.* D.H. Peterson),. Geophysical Monograph 55. American Geophysical Union, Washington , D.C.

Kling, H. and W.A. Rodrigues. 1973. Biomass estimation in a central Amazonian rain forest. Acta Cientifica Venezolona, 24:225-237

Kling, H., Rodrigues, W.A., Bruning, E. and E.J. Fittkau. 1975. Biomass and structure in a central Amazonian rain forest. pp 115-122. In: *Tropical Ecological Systems: Trends in Terrestrial and aquatic research.* (eds. Golly, F. and E. Medina) Springer Verlog, New York, pp 398

Kling, H. and R. Herrera. 1978. Biomass studies in Amazon caatinga forest in southern Venezuela: 1. Standing crop of composite root mass in selected stands. Tropical Ecology, 19:93-110

Lieberman, D. and M. Lieberman. 1987. Forest tree growth and Dynamics at La Selva, Costa Rica (9169-1982). Journal of Tropical Ecology, 3:347-358

Lugo, A.E. and S. Brown. 1992. Tropical forests as sinks of atmospheric carbon. Forest Ecology and Management, 54:239-255.

Martinelli, L.A., Victoria, R. L., Moreira, M.Z., Arruda, G.Jr., Brown, I.F., Ferreira, C.A.C., Coelho, L.I., Lima, R.P. and W.W. Thomas. 1988. Implantação de parcelas para monetoreamento de dinâmica florestal na área de proteção ambiental, UHE Samuel, Rondônia: Relatório preliminar. Unpublished report, Centro de Energia Nuclear na Agricultura (CENA), Paracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil, pp72.

Martins, P.F.S., Cerri, C.C., Volkoff, B., Andreux, F. and A.Chauvel. 1991. Consequences of clearing and tillage of a natural amazonian ecosystem. Forest Ecology and Management, 38:273-282.

Neftel, A., Moor, E., Oescher, H., and B. Stauffer. 1985. Evidence from Polar ice cores for the increase in atmospheric CO2 in the past two centuries. Nature, 315:45-47.

Putz, F.E. 1983. Liana biomass and leaf area of a "tierra firme" forest in the Rio Negro Basin, Venezuela. Biotropica, 15(3):185-189.

Reiners, W.A., A.F. Bouwman, W.F.J. Parsons, and M. Keller. 1994. Tropical rainforest conversion to pasture: changes in vegetation and soil properties. Ecological Applications, 4:363-377

Revilla Cardinas, J.D., Kahn, F.L., and J.L. Guillaumont. 1982. Estimativa da Fitomassa do Reservatório do UHE de Tucuruí. pp1-11. In: *Projeto*

Tucuruí, Relatório Semestral Jan.- Jun. 1982, Vol. 2: Limnologia, macrófitas, fitomassa, degradação de fitomassa, doenças endêmicas, solos. Brazil, Prsidência da República, Ministério das Minas e Energia, Centrais Electricas do Norte S.A. (ELECTRONORTE) and Brazil , Secrataria do Plaejamento, Conselho National de Desenvolvimento Científico e Technológico, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas do Amazônia (SEPLAN-CNPq-INPA). INPA, Manaus, Brazil, pp32.

Revilla Cardinas, J.D. 1986. Estudios de ecologia e controle ambiental na região do reservatório de UHE de Samuel. Convênio: ELN/MCT/CNPq/INPA. De 01.07.82. Relatório Setorial, Segmento: Estimativa da fitomassa. Período julho-dezembro 1986. Instatuto National de Pesquisas do Amazônia (INPA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil, pp 194

Revilla Cardinas, J.D. 1987. Relatória: Levantamenta e Análise da fitomassa de UHE de Kararaô, Rio Xingú. Instituto National de Pasquisas da Amazônia (INPA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil, pp 181.

Revilla Cardinas, J.D. 1988. Relatória: Levantamenta e Análise da fitomassa de UHE deBabaquara, Rio Xingú. Instituto National de Pasquisas da Amazônia (INPA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil, pp 277.

Russell, C.E. 1983. Nutrient cycling and productivity of native and plantation forests at Jari Florestal, Para, Brazil. PhD. Dissertation , University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Samiento, S. L., Orr, J.C., and V. Sugenthuler. 1992. A perturbation simulation of CO_2 uptake in an ocean general circulation model. Journal of Geophysical Research, 97:3621-3645.

SCEP (Study of Critical Environmental Problems). 1970. *Mans Impact on the Global Environment*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Schlesinger, W.H. 1997. *Biogeochemistry: An analysis of global change. Second edition.* Academic press. San Diego, CA., pp 588.

Skole, D.L., Chomentowski, W.H., Salas, W.A. and A.D. Nobre. 1994. Physical and Human Dimensions of Deforestation in Amazonia. Bio Science, 44:314-322

Tans, P.P., Fung, I.Y., and T. Takahashi. 1990. Observational constraints on the global atmospheric CO_2 budget. Science, 247:1431-1438.

Uhl, C. and J.B. Kauffman. 1990. Deforestation, fire susceptibility and potential tree response to fire in the eastern Amazon. Ecology, 71:437-449.

Van Wagner, C.E. 1968. The line intersect method in forest fuel sampling. Forest Science, 14:20-26

Ward, D.E., Sousott, R.A., Kauffman, J.B., Babitt, R. E., Cummings, D.L., Dias, B., Holben, B.N., Kaufman, Y.J., Rasmussen, R.A. and A.W. Setzer. 1992. Smoke and fire characteristics for cerrado and deforestation burns in Brazil: BASE-B experiment. Journal of geophysical Research, 97:14601-1468.

World Resources 1990-91: A report by the World Resources Institute in collaboration with the United Nations Environmental Program, Oxford University Press, New York, 1990

Appendix

Appendix A.1. Proportion of the biomass of trees > 10 cm dbh in selected biomass components from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	The percentage of above ground biomass for trees > 10 cm dbh in each component of TAGB.										
			Seedlings & vines	Palms	Forest floor	Coarse wood debris	Trees < 10 cm dbh	Trees 10 - 30 cm dbh	Trees 30 - 50 cm dbh	Trees 50 - 70 cm dbh	Trees 70 - 100 cm dbh	Trees 100-200 cm dbh	Trees 200 - 300 cm dbh
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	0.28	46.3	4.0	7.0	3.1	26.1	34.2	35.1	4.6	0.0	0.0
		226	0.20	1.6	7.1	12.9	7.7	38.1	40.4	18.3	3.1	0.0	0.0
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	0.66	2.8	4.3	24.4	4.7	30.4	31.1	10.7	6.7	21.0	0.0
		74	0.26	3.3	4.8	18.5	8.1	34.9	27.4	12.5	9.8	15.4	0.0
		75	1.08	0.6	3.1	11.5	6.3	31.1	25.9	23.5	2.7	16.8	0.0
		76	0.12	3.5	3.1	14.7	3.8	25.5	18.6	25.9	2.7	27.4	0.0
		89	0.12	2.9	4.0	7.0	5.8	36.5	26.3	14.1	12.1	11.1	0.0
		113	0.15	3.7	3.7	9.8	2.9	31.3	35.9	19.1	0.0	13.6	0.0
	Mean		0.36±0.14	8.1±5.5	4.3±0.5	13.2±2.1	5.2±.7	31.7±1.6	30.0±2.4	19.9±2.8	5.2±1.4	13.2±3.4	0.0
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	0.21	3.0	1.3	3.4	6.8	17.3	11.7	3.4	21.0	5.0	41.6 0
		2	0.31	3.0	1.9	4.3	3.1	22.6	30.0	29.2	18.2	0.0	0.0
	Low plates Amz.	229	0.43	1.0	6.9	23.0	6.6	49.1	29.3	9.4	4.5	7.7	0.0
	Low hills of Southern Amz.	24	1.27	5.2	2.8	5.6	2.1	15.3	18.4	21.7	6.1	16.8	21.7
		25	0.16	7.4	2.5	11.5	1.8	17.8	14.6	17.0	19.6	0.0	31.0
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	0.45	16.8	2.5	6.9	5.0	33.5	39.3	13.4	13.9	0.0	0.0
		44	0.76	2.8	2.4	22.5	8.1	43.1	30.5	9.6	16.7	0.0	0.0
	Mean		0.37±0.10	5.6±2.0	2.9±0.7	11.0±3.2	4.8±.9	28.4±3.8	24.8±3.8	14.8±3.3	14.3±2.5	4.2±2.4	13.5±6.7
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	186	0.28	18.7	2.2	4.5	5.0	17.8	20.3	4.5	5.4	19.9	32.1
		188	0.25	73.3	5.1	23.5	2.4	24.5	29.6	10.3	21.7	14.0	0.0
		190	0.13	0.2	4.3	4.8	4.8	24.8	18.9	9.8	12.1	16.5	18.0
		195	0.82	9.9	2.7	4.8	3.3	34.2	30.8	8.8	10.8	15.4	0.0
	Mean		0.37±0.20	18.0±9.2	3.6±0.7	9.4±4.7	3.9±.6	25.3±6.4	24.9±3.1	8.3±1.3	12.5±3.4	16.4±1.3	12.5±7.8
Others	Anthropogenic	218	0.27	10.5	6.9	10.6	4.5	28.9	29.1	19.9	9.1	13.0	0.0
Grand mean			0.36±.073	9.32±2.9	3.8±.4	11.6±1.6	4.8±.4	29.2±1.9	27.1±1.7	15.8±1.8	10.0±1.5	10.7±1.9	7.2±3.0

Appendix A.2. Biomass of live trees from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are in Mg ha^{-1}.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Trees < 10 cm dbh	Trees 10 to 30 cm dbh	Trees 30 to 50 cm dbh	Trees 50 to 70 cm dbh	Trees 70 to100 cm dbh	Trees 100 to 200 cm dbh	Trees 200 to 300 cm dbh	Tree TAGB
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	6.4±2.2	53.2	70.0	71.7	9.4	0.0	0.0	210.7
		226	15.8±2.1	84.9	90.1	40.8	7.0	0.0	0.0	238.5
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	12.0±2.9	76.8	78.6	27.1	16.9	53.0	0.0	264.3
		74	17.7±3.3	75.8	59.6	27.1	21.4	33.5	0.0	235.0
		75	16.0±3.2	79.1	65.8	59.7	6.9	42.8	0.0	270.2
		76	9.4±2.6	63.3	46.1	64.1	6.7	67.9	0.0	257.4
		89	14.5±4.1	91.1	65.7	35.2	30.2	27.7	0.0	264.4
		113	7.6±1.8	83.4	95.7	50.9	0.0	36.3	0.0	273.8
	Mean		13.7±1.5	76.0±4.3	71.4±5.7	47.1±6.1	12.3±3.5	32.6±8.4	0.0±0	251.8±7.7
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	24.1±3.7	61.6	41.6	11.9	74.5	17.7	148.0	379.5
		2	8.8±3.0	64.1	85.0	82.9	51.5	0.0	0.0	292.3
	Low plates of Amaz.	229	14.2±2.6	106.6	63.7	20.4	9.7	16.7	0.0	231.3
	Low hills of Southern Amazonia	24	9.8±1.81	70.6	84.4	99.7	28.1	77.3	100.0	469.9
		25	6.6±2.1	63.8	52.2	60.8	70.2	0.0	110.9	364.5
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	11.3±2.2	75.8	88.9	30.4	31.4	0.0	0.0	237.9
		44	20.0±2.7	106.3	75.3	23.7	41.2	0.0	0.0	266.4
	Mean		13.5±2.4	78.4±7.5	70.2±6.9	47.1±12.9	43.8±8.8	16.0±6.0	51.3±24.8	320.2±33.2
Areas of ecological tension (Ecotone)	Savanna / forest edge	186	13.3±3.1	47.5	54.0	12.0	14.4	53.0	85.5	279.7
		188	4.1±1.2	41.8	50.5	17.5	36.9	23.8	0.0	174.6
		190	17.6±2.7	91.7	69.7	36.2	44.7	60.8	66.4	387.1
		195	9.2±4.3	93.6	84.3	24.1	29.5	42.2	0.0	282.8
	Mean		11.0±2.9	68.6±13.9	64.6±7.8	22.5±5.2	31.4±6.5	45.0±8.0	38.0±22.3	281.1±43.4
Others	Anthropogenic	218	9.8±2.7	62.6	63.0	43.2	19.7	28.1	0.0	226.3
Grand mean			12.4±1.1	74.7±4.0	69.2±3.5	42.0±5.5	27.5±4.7	29.0±5.6	25.5±10.6	280.3±19.7

Appendix A.3. Biomass of live non-tree vegetation from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are Mg ha^{-1}.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Seedlings	Basal leaf palms	Palms < 10 cm dbh	Palms > 10 cm dbh	Vines < 10 cm dbh	Vines > 10 cm dbh	Living non-tree Vegetation
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	0.6±0.1	2.2±0.4	0.1±0.1	92.3	0.0±0.0	0.0	95.2
		226	0.4±0.1	0.7±0.2	0.9±0.4	1.9	0.0±0.0	0.0	3.9
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	0.7±0.1	1.2±0.3	0.3±0.2	5.6	0.1±0.0	0.9	8.7
		74	0.3±0.0	3.0±0.4	1.6±0.4	2.5	0.2±0.1	0.0	7.7
		75	0.3±0.0	0.5±0.2	0.9±0.5	0.1	2.4±2.4	0.0	4.2
		76	0.3±0.1	0.9±0.2	0.4±0.3	7.3	0.0±0.0	0.0	8.9
		89	0.3±0.0	0.5±0.2	0.0±0.0	6.8	0.1±0.0	0.0	7.7
		113	0.4±0.0	1.5±0.3	0.1±0.1	8.3	0.1±0.0	0.0	10.3
	Mean		0.4±0.1	1.3±0.3	0.6±0.2	15.6±11.0	0.4±0.3	0.1±0.1	18.3±11.0
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	0.7±0.1	0.0±0	0.2±0.1	10.4	0.1±0.0	0.0	11.4
		2	0.5±0.1	1.1±0.4	0.0±0	7.3	0.1±0.0	0.3	9.3
	Low plates of Amazonia	229	0.3±0.0	0.8±0.2	1.1±0.4	0.4	0.1±0.0	0.6	3.3
	Low hills of Southern Amazonia	24	0.4±0.1	0.6±0.2	0.6±0.3	22.7	0.0±0.0	0.8	25.1
		25	0.5±0.1	1.1±0.3	0.9±0.6	24.6	0.1±0.1	0.0	27.2
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	0.6±0.1	1.5±0.3	0.1±0.0	36.4	0.1±0.1	0.3	39.0
		44	0.3±0.1	0.9±0.3	0.5±0.2	5.5	0.1±0.0	1.5	8.7
	Mean		0.5±0.1	0.8±0.2	0.5±0.2	15.3±4.9	0.1±1.1	0.5±0.2	17.7±4.9
Areas of ecological tension (Ecotone)	Savanna / forest edge	186	0.3±0.	0.8±0.3	3.1±1.0	46.0	0.0±0.0	0.4	50.6
		188	0.4±0.1	2.1±0.2	0.3±0.2	71.5	0.0±0.0	0.0	74.3
		190	0.5±0.0	0.0±0	0.0±0	0.8	0.0±0.0	0.0	1.3
		195	0.3±0.0	2.2±0.3	1.01±0.4	23.8	0.1±0.0	1.9	29.3
	Mean		0.4±0.0	1.3±0.5	1.1±0.7	35.5±15.1	0.0±0.0	0.6±0.5	38.9±15.5
Others	Anthropogenic	218	0.4±0.1	0.7±0.2	0.8±0.5	21.2	0.1	0.0	23.3
Grand mean			0.41±0.0	1.1±0.2	0.7±0.2	19.8±5.6	0.2±0.1	0.3±0.1	22.5±5.6

Appendix A.4. Coarse wood debris (CWD), standing dead and forest floor (litter and rootmat) from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are in Mg ha^{-1}.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Forest floor	Coarse wood debris	Dead palm	Dead vine < 10 cm dbh	Dead Trees < 10 cm dbh	Dead trees 10-30 cm dbh	Dead Trees > 30 cm dbh	Aboveground biomass of CWD and standing dead
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	8.1±2.3	14.4±7.4	0.29	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.00	0.03	14.7
		226	15.8±1.6	28.7±9.3	0.11	0.00±0	1.0±.6	0.02	0.06	30.7
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	11.0±0.9	61.5±23.8	0.02	0.00±0	0.1±.0	0.00	0.07	61.7
		74	10.5±1.5	40.2±19.7	0.00	0.00±0	1.1±.8	0.13	0.04	41.5
		75	7.8±2.0	29.2±15.6	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.01	0.11	29.3
		76	7.6±0.7	36.5±15.9	0.00	0.00±0	0.1±.1	0.07	0.25	36.9
		89	9.9±1.0	17.4±6.1	0.00	0.01±.01	0.1±.1	0.01	0.02	17.5
		113	9.8±1.3	26.2±11.5	0.00	0.00±0	0.8±.7	0.00	0.06	27.1
	Mean		10.1±0.9	31.8±5.2	0.05±.04	0.00±.00	0.3±.1	0.03±0.0	0.08±0.03	32.4±5.2
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	4.6±0.6	12.2±5.9	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.00	0.00	12.3
		2	5.3±0.7	12.2±5.7	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.00	0.02	12.3
	Low plates of Amazonia	229	15.1±2.3	49.9±16.9	0.00	0.00±0	0.1±.0	0.01	0.05	50.0
	Low hills of southern Amazonia	24	12.8±0.7	25.7±14.5	0.00	0.00±0	0.4±.4	0.02	0.02	26.1
		25	8.8±1.0	41.3±19.2	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.02	0.03	41.3
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	5.5±0.5	15.7±6.9	0.02	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.00	0.00	15.7
		44	5.9±0.6	55.4±30.7	0.00	0.00±0	0.1±.1	0.01	0.04	55.5
	Mean		8.3±1.6	30.3±6.9	0.00±.00	0.00±0	0.1±.0	0.01±0.0	0.02±0.01	30.5±6.9
Areas of ecological tension (Ecotone)	Savanna / forest edge	186	5.9±0.7	12.1±4.7	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±.0	0.01	0.00	12.1
		188	8.8±1.4	40.0±15.2	0.12	0.00±0	0.0±.0	0.00	0.02	40.2
		190	16.1±4.9	17.6±9.5	0.00	0.00±0	0.2±.1	0.00	0.01	17.7
		195	7.3±1.1	13.1±5.9	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.00	0.03	13.2
	Mean		9.5±2.3	20.7±6.6	0.03±.03	0.00±0	0.1±.1	0.01±0.0	0.02±0.01	20.8±6.6
Others	Anthropogenic	218	14.8±2.2	22.9±12.2	0.00	0.00±0	0.0±0	0.02	0.01	22.9
Grand mean			9.6±0.8	28.6±3.4	0.03±.02	0.00±.00	0.2±.1	0.02±.00	0.04±0.01	28.9±3.4

Appendix A.5. Density of trees by diameter classes, live and standing dead from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are individuals ha^{-1}.

Forest Type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Trees < 10 cm dbh (*100)	Trees 10 - 30 cm dbh	Trees 30 - 50 cm dbh	Trees 50- 70 cm dbh	Trees 70 - 100 cm dbh	Trees 100 -200 cm dbh	Trees 200 - 300 cm dbh	Dead trees < 10 cm dbh	Dead trees 10 - 30 cm dbh	Dead trees > 30 cm dbh
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	23±5	221.0	50.79	17.78	1.27	0.00	0.00	0±0	0	8
		226	95±7	392.4	68.57	12.70	1.27	0.00	0.00	1±91	38	20
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	83±1	339.1	54.60	7.62	2.54	3.81	0.00	188±101	30	8
		74	94±8	400.0	44.44	8.89	2.54	2.54	0.00	94±56	57	5
		75	92±8	392.4	46.98	17.78	1.27	1.27	0.00	31±31	11	10
		76	75±1	304.8	36.83	17.78	1.27	5.08	0.00	31±31	30	8
		89	61±7	464.8	46.98	10.16	3.81	1.27	0.00	125±72	27	5
		113	75±8	361.9	66.03	15.24	0.00	2.54	0.00	188±126	23	15
	Mean		75±8	359.5±25.8	51.90±3.82	13.49±1.50	1.75±.41	2.06±.63	0.00±.00	82±27	27±6	10±2
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	48±5	384.8	30.48	2.54	8.89	1.27	2.54	0±0	15	1
		2	26±5	308.6	60.95	24.13	7.62	0.00	0.00	31±31	8	4
	Low plates of	229	88±9	464.8	54.60	6.35	1.27	1.27	0.00	125±43	34	15
	Low hills of Southern Amaz.	24	52±5	316.2	55.87	27.94	3.81	2.54	1.27	94±68	8	3
		25	41±6	323.8	36.83	16.51	8.89	0.00	1.27	94±50	23	6
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	60±4	388.6	62.22	8.89	3.81	0.00	0.00	125±62	27	1
		44	91±8	464.8	55.87	7.62	5.08	0.00	0.00	63±62	19	8
	Mean		58±9	378.8±25.2	50.98±4.65	13.42±3.64	5.62±1.10	0.73±.38	0.73±.38	76±21	19±4	5±2
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	186	56±8	270.5	39.37	3.81	2.54	2.54	1.27	125±72	23	10
		188	20±3	175.2	36.83	5.08	5.08	1.27	0.00	31±31	15	3
		190	94±1	403.8	53.33	10.16	6.35	2.54	1.27	156±88	8	3
		195	28±3	411.4	63.49	7.62	3.81	1.27	0.00	0±0	8	9
	Mean		49±1	315.2±56.8	48.25±6.24	6.67±1.41	4.44±.82	1.90±.36	0.63±.36	78±37	13±3	6±2
Others	Anthropogenic	218	61±5	224.8	49.52	11.43	2.54	1.27	0.00	63±43	11	3
Grand mean			63±6	350.7±18.5	50.73±2.42	12.00±1.50	3.68±.58	1.52±.31	0.38±.16	78±14	21±3	7±1

Appendix A.6. Density for each non-tree vegetation component from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are individuals ha^{-1}.

Forest Type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot #	Seedling (times 1000)	Basal leaf palms	Palm < 10 cm dbh	Palm > 10 cm dbh	Vine < 10 cm dbh	Vines > 10 cm dbh	Dead Palms < 10 cm dbh	Dead vine < 10 cm dbh
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	249±42	1406±242	31±31	171	250±91	0.00	63±62	0±0
		226	188±26	469±96	250±91	15	1625±407	0.00	31±31	0±0
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	287±42	688±176	344±134	107	1844±471	11.43	0±0	0±0
		74	151±19	1563±232	531±148	27	5594±1273	0.00	0±0	0±0
		75	138±17	313±100	219±111	11	3125±937	0.00	0±0	0±0
		76	113±14	500±120	94±68	65	3000±309	0.00	0±0	0±0
		89	109±15	313±136	63±62	23	1875±615	0.00	0±2	31±31
		113	153±18	781±170	94±68	61	1719±420	0.00	0±0	0±0
	Mean		174±23	754±170	203±60	60±19	2379±557	1±1.4	12±8.3	4±3.9
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	307±37	0±0	156±88	114	2125±466	0.00	0±0	0±0
		2	210±29	563±198	0±0	160	3156±744	3.81	0±0	63±63
	Low plates of	229	107±16	438±110	406±152	4	3594±445	7.62	0±0	31±31
	Low hills of Southern Amaz.	24	174±36	313±111	125±72	42	1188±285	7.62	0±0	0±0
		25	219±30	594±146	188±77	130	1750±449	0.00	0±0	0±0
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	278±36	781±151	94±68	202	2250±413	3.81	0±0	0±0
		44	139±25	406±123	406±166	30	3438±476	8.89	0±0	0±0
	Mean		205±27	442±93	196±58	97±28	2500±345	5±1.5	0±0	13±9.4
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	186	131±14	531±185	1875±462	130	1031±675	3.81	0±0	0±0
		188	169±30	1281±151	219±101	187	813±258	0.00	0±0	0±0
		190	195±19	0±0	0±0	8	1656±508	0.00	0±0	0±0
		195	109±17	1219±164	438±135	103	1281±341	15.24	0±0	0±0
	Mean		151±19	758±304	633±423	107±37	1195±181	5±3.5	0±0	0±0
Others	Anthropogenic	218	171±25	438±143	188±110	57	3531±633	0.00	0±0	31±31
Grand mean			180±14	630±97	286±90	82±14	2242±278	3±1.1	5±1.1	8±3.8

Appendix A.7. Basal Area of trees from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are in m^2 ha^{-1}.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Trees < 10 cm dbh	Trees 10 to 30 cm dbh	Trees 30 to 50 cm dbh	Trees 50 to 70 cm dbh	Trees 70 to 100 cm dbh	Trees 100 to 200 cm dbh	Trees 200 to 300 cm dbh	Total Tree Basal Area
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	1.60±.45	5.42	5.69	5.37	0.67	0.00	0.00	18.75
		226	4.31±.38	8.77	7.35	3.11	0.51	0.00	0.00	24.05
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	3.36±.68	7.88	6.36	2.05	1.22	3.60	0.00	24.47
		74	4.52±.68	8.08	4.86	2.07	1.51	2.29	0.00	23.33
		75	4.42±.69	8.36	5.34	4.54	0.50	2.72	0.00	25.88
		76	2.65±.55	6.62	3.77	4.84	0.49	4.63	0.00	23.00
		89	3.83±.79	9.62	5.33	2.67	2.15	1.82	0.00	25.42
		113	2.35±.39	8.56	7.74	3.87	0.00	2.46	0.00	24.98
	Mean		3.38±0.38	7.92±.46	5.81±.46	3.56±.45	0.88±.24	2.09±.57	0.00	23.74±.79
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	5.53±.73	6.95	3.39	0.88	5.27	1.21	8.97	32.20
		2	2.04±.58	6.77	6.90	6.28	3.70	0.00	0.00	25.69
	Low plates of Amaz.	229	3.85±.96	10.94	5.24	1.55	0.69	1.14	0.00	23.41
	Low hills of Southern Amazonia	24	2.71±.43	7.24	6.81	7.53	2.01	4.90	5.94	37.14
		25	1.64±.41	6.75	4.23	4.58	4.98	0.00	6.54	28.72
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	2.94±.42	8.10	7.21	2.31	2.23	0.00	0.00	22.79
		44	4.88±.56	10.85	6.13	1.81	2.92	0.00	0.00	26.59
	Mean		3.37±0.55	8.32±.71	5.70±.55	3.56±.97	3.11±.62	1.40±.68	3.06±1.49	28.08±1.90
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	186	3.31±.63	5.23	4.39	0.92	1.05	3.49	5.14	23.53
		188	1.12±.27	4.26	4.10	1.33	2.64	1.58	0.00	15.03
		190	4.68±.50	9.46	5.69	2.74	3.20	3.97	4.07	33.81
		195	2.14±.77	9.58	6.87	1.84	2.09	2.68	0.00	25.20
	Mean		2.81±0.66	7.13±1.39	5.26±.63	1.71±.39	2.25±.46	2.93±.52	2.30±1.34	24.39±3.85
Others	Anthropogenic	218	2.40±.54	6.15	5.15	3.25	1.40	1.84	0.00	20.19
Grand mean			3.22±.27	7.78±.40	5.63±.28	3.18±.41	1.96±.33	1.92±.36	1.53±.51	25.21±1.12

Appendix A.8. Quadratic Stand Diameter by diameter class for trees from 20 RADAMBRASIL forest inventory sites. Units are in cm dbh.

Forest type - Region	Geomorphic - Subregion	plot	Quadratic Stand Diameter (QSD)	
			Trees > 10 cm dbh	Trees > 30 cm dbh
Open tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	225	27.40	46.24
		226	23.01	41.16
	Broken surface of the Upper Xingu / Tapajos / Madeira	70	25.68	49.56
		74	22.86	48.38
		75	24.32	49.59
		76	26.62	53.55
		89	22.84	49.49
		113	25.43	46.23
	Mean		24.77 ± 2.67	48.03 ± 1.28
Dense tropical forest	Amazon alluvial	1	28.08	74.11
		2	27.39	48.15
	Low plates of Amaz.	229	21.71	41.58
	Low hills of Southern Amazonia	24	32.79	61.53
		25	29.84	63.85
	Pre-Cambrian platform cover	43	23.35	44.69
		44	22.89	47.01
	Mean		26.57 ± 1.54	54.42 ± 4.58
Areas of ecological tension	Savanna / forest edge	186	28.36	62.08
		188	28.15	50.46
		190	27.87	58.31
		195	24.54	47.46
	Mean		27.23 ± 5.94	54.58 ± 3.39
Others	Anthropogenic	218	27.97	47.84
Grand mean			26.06 ± 0.65	51.56 ± 1.86