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Abstract

Understory fires in Amazon forests alter forest structure, species composition, and the likelihood of future disturbance. The annual extent of fire-damaged forest in Amazonia remains uncertain due to difficulties in separating burning from other types of forest damage in satellite data. We developed a new approach, the Burn Damage and Recovery (BDR) algorithm, to identify fire-related canopy damages using spatial and spectral information from multi-year time series of satellite data. The BDR approach identifies understory fires in intact and logged Amazon forests based on the reduction and recovery of live canopy cover in the years following fire damages and the size and shape of individual understory burn scars. The BDR algorithm was applied to time series of Landsat (1997-2004) and MODIS (2000-2005) data covering one Landsat scene (path/row 226/068) in southern Amazonia and the results were compared to field observations, image-derived burn scars, and independent data on selective logging and deforestation. Landsat resolution was essential for detection of burn scars <50 ha, yet these small burns contributed only 12% of all burned forest detected during 1997-2002. MODIS data were suitable for mapping medium (50-500 ha) and large (>500 ha) burn scars that accounted for the majority of all fire-damaged forest in this study. Therefore, moderate resolution satellite data may be suitable to provide estimates of the extent of fire-damaged Amazon forest at a regional scale. In the study region, Landsat-based understory fire damages in 1999 (1508 km²) were an order of magnitude higher than during the 1997-1998 El Niño event (124 km² and 39 km², respectively), suggesting a different link between climate and understory fires than previously reported for other Amazon regions. The results in this study illustrate the potential to address critical questions concerning climate and fire risk in Amazon forests by applying the BDR algorithm over larger areas and longer image time series.
1. Introduction

Fire is an important cause of tropical forest degradation with myriad impacts on forest structure, biodiversity, and nutrient cycling (Goldammer 1990; Cochrane 2003). In Amazonia, forest fires occur when human ignitions for deforestation or land management escape their intended boundaries and burn into neighboring forest areas (e.g., Uhl and Buschbacher 1985; Cochrane et al. 1999). Understory forest fires are surface fires that burn leaf litter and coarse woody debris in both logged and intact Amazon forests (Holdsworth and Uhl 1997; Souza et al. 2005a; Balch et al. 2008; Matricardi et al. 2010). Damages from understory fires in tropical forests can be severe, reducing species richness by 30% and above-ground live biomass by up to 50% (Cochrane and Schulze 1999). Even moderate-intensity understory fires can result in high canopy mortality, as few Amazon forest species have fire-adapted traits (Uhl and Kauffman 1990). Widespread forest fires in Amazonia were reported during drought conditions associated with the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) in 1997-1998 (Barbosa and Fearnside 1999; Elvidge et al. 2001; Phulpin et al. 2002; Alencar et al. 2006), yet the interannual variation in burned forest extent remains uncertain due to difficulties in separating fires from other forest damages using satellite data.

Fire, selective logging, and deforestation are related and often sequential forest disturbances in dynamic Amazon frontier landscapes (Uhl and Buschbacher 1985; Nepstad et al. 1999; Alencar et al. 2004; Souza et al. 2005a; Asner et al. 2006; Matricardi et al. 2010). Thus, isolating the unique contribution from fire to forest degradation requires reconciling the spatial and spectral similarities among disturbance types in satellite imagery (Figure 1). Detecting understory forest fires is further complicated by the partial or complete obscuration of actively burning fires and burn damages by intact forest canopies. Previous methods to map understory
forest fires in Amazonia have combined field data with high-resolution imagery from a single date to identify canopy damage from fire in near-real time (Elvidge et al. 2001; Phulpin et al. 2002; Brown et al. 2006) or during the subsequent dry season (Pereira and Setzer 1993; Cochrane and Souza 1998; Alencar et al. 2004; Souza et al. 2005a; Matricardi et al. 2010). However, single-date methods are ill-equipped to separate fire-related canopy damage from conventional logging and deforestation that may be spectrally similar in any given year (e.g., Cochrane et al. 1999; Souza et al. 2005a; Souza et al. 2005b). Changes in forest structure remain visible for several years following fire exposure (Cochrane and Souza 1998; Souza et al. 2005b), whereas canopy closure removes evidence of most logging within one year (Asner et al. 2004; Souza et al. 2005b) and deforestation for pasture or cropland remains cleared following forest conversion (Morton et al. 2006), introducing the possibility that a method based on satellite image time series over three or more years may aid the separation of disturbance types in Amazonia.

Time series of satellite imagery have been used to map burned forest at a range of spatial and temporal scales (e.g., Lopez Garcia and Caselles 1991; Kasischke and French 1995; Viedma et al. 1997; Barbosa et al. 1999; Roy et al. 2002; Anderson et al. 2005; Giglio et al. 2009). In most biomes, multiple images within a single season can accurately track the timing and extent of vegetation fires, but approaches based on frequent observations have lower performance in tropical forest regions due to persistent cloud cover and subtle changes in surface reflectance associated with sub-canopy burning (Eva and Lambin 1998; Roy et al. 2008; Giglio et al. 2009), except during drought conditions (Shimabukuro et al. 2009). Evidence of forest disturbance and recovery in time series of annual or biannual Landsat imagery has been used to identify forest fires in northern Spain (Viedma et al. 1997) and logging activity in North America (Kennedy et
Souza et al. (2005b) documented a similar trajectory of loss and recovery of green vegetation fraction over four years following fire in an Amazon forest. Building on these efforts, we designed a multi-year, time-series approach to differentiate canopy damage related to understory fires from other forest damages. Throughout the manuscript, we refer to the reduction in live canopy cover from understory forest fires in intact or logged forests as fire-damaged forest. The extent of fire-damage forest may differ from the actual burned area in regions with little or no canopy damage following an understory fire. However, one advantage of our method is that reductions in live canopy cover over large, contiguous areas can be more easily identified using optical remote sensing data than the spectral characteristics of ash or charred vegetation that may be obscured by remaining live canopy trees and understory vegetation following fire in Amazon forests.

This paper describes the development of the Burn Damage and Recovery algorithm (BDR) to map the annual extent of canopy damage from understory fires in Amazonia based on the unique trajectory of disturbance and recovery for fire-damaged forests in time series of dry-season imagery. We applied the BDR algorithm to time series of Landsat and MODIS data to compare the ability to detect forest fire damages in imagery with different spatial resolution. Landsat data (30 m) are an important intermediary between field information and MODIS data because higher-resolution data allow detection of small forest disturbances and visual confirmation of field locations. Advantages of 250 m MODIS data for time series processing and burn detection include reduced data volumes, consistent data quality (e.g., atmospheric correction, accurate geolocation, and data compositing to reduce cloud cover), and more homogenous depiction of canopy damage that may facilitate automated detection approaches and regional-scale studies. The goals of this study were three-fold: 1) to evaluate the accuracy of the
BDR approach for mapping fire-damaged forest using field validation data and independent, satellite-based estimates of selective logging and deforestation, 2) to determine what size burned scars are appropriate for detection with moderate and high-resolution data, and 3) to estimate the interannual variability in fire-damaged forest area in ENSO and non-ENSO years during 1997-2002 for a study region in southern Amazonia.
2. Methods

2.1 Study Area

We mapped the annual extent of canopy damage from forest fires for a study area (Landsat scene 226/068) in central Mato Grosso state, Brazil (Figure 2). In the past decade, the region experienced high rates of deforestation for cattle ranching and soybean cultivation (Morton et al. 2005; Morton et al. 2006) and forest degradation from selective logging (Asner et al. 2005; Matricardi et al. 2005; Souza et al. 2005b; Matricardi et al. 2007), but the unique contribution from fire to forest degradation has received less attention (Matricardi et al. 2010). The 29,275 km² study area was 77% forested in 1997 (>70% shade-normalized green vegetation fraction, following Souza et al., 2005a) and lies predominantly within the Xingu River basin near the southern extent of Amazon forests. Rainfall in the study area is highly seasonal, averaging 1890 mm per year during 1998-2005 with <100 mm per month during May-September based on data from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM 3B343, Huffman et al. 2007). Prior to analysis, topographic data (SEPLAN-MT 2004) were used to exclude 1,450 km² of water and seasonally-inundated vegetation for three main tributaries of the Xingu River (Rio Manissuiá-Miçu, Rio Arraias, and Rio Ferro) in order to avoid spurious errors associated with interannual changes in river levels or unreliable vegetation index values over water (Figure 2).

2.2 Satellite-Based Measures of Fire Effects in Amazon Forests

Canopy damage from understory fires in Amazon forests is highly variable. Field studies suggest that understory fires may kill 6-44% of trees >10 cm diameter at breast height, and canopy mortality is typically higher in logged forests than in undisturbed forests (Holdsworth and Uhl 1997; Barbosa and Fearnside 1999; Pinard et al. 1999; Barlow et al. 2003; Haugaasen et
Canopy mortality from understory fire also exhibits fine-scale spatial heterogeneity (see Figure 1). Edaphic conditions and differential mortality among tree species may partially explain these patterns (Ivanauskas et al. 2003), although the distribution of leaf litter and fine fuels may also be important for patterns of understory burning and related canopy mortality in more seasonal Amazon forests (Balch et al. 2008).

In the months following fire, the patchy distribution of high and low canopy damage areas from understory fires can be detected with high-resolution optical remote sensing data (e.g., Figure 1, Cochrane and Souza 1998; Souza and Roberts 2005). Optical remote sensing data are sensitive to changes in live canopy cover, consistent with field measurements of canopy damages from understory fires. In the first year following fire, Haugaasen et al. (2003) reported an increase in canopy gap fraction from 5% to 19%, and Balch et al. (2008) measured a 16% decline in LAI. Over longer time scales, delayed mortality of large trees three or more years following fire has important consequences for net carbon storage in Amazon forests (Barlow et al. 2003). However, changes in surface reflectance from delayed mortality of large trees are likely to be offset by a reduction in canopy gap fraction from growth of remaining trees and recruitment of new individuals in the years following fire damages (Barlow and Peres 2008).

We derived two parameters of canopy damage from fire using high and moderate resolution satellite data. Because the BDR algorithm uses imagery from the early dry season to detect evidence of burning from the previous year, this study mapped post-fire effects on canopy trees and not burned area, per se (Lentile et al. 2006). Therefore, we refer to canopy damage from understory fires as fire-damaged forest area rather than burned area. The total fire-damaged forest area was calculated as the sum of all pixels within the study area with canopy
damage from fire. Individual burn scars of different sizes were delineated from the map of fire-
damaged forest area based on contiguous patches of canopy damage. Given the fine-scale spatial
heterogeneity in canopy damage from fire observed in field and satellite-based studies, burn
scars derived from both high and moderate resolution satellite data may include some fraction of
unburned forest within individual burn scars, while burned forest areas that do not exhibit
canopy damage may be excluded.

2.3 Data

We used a variety of data sources to build and test the BDR algorithm for mapping the
extent of canopy damage from fire. Below, we describe the pre-processing steps to generate dry-
season time series of Landsat and MODIS data and the satellite and field data used to calibrate
the BDR algorithm. Section 2.4 provides a detailed description of the BDR algorithm. Finally,
Section 2.5 presents the approach for validation of the satellite-based maps of canopy damage
from fire using field observations of burned forest, image-derived validation data, and
independent data products on selective logging and deforestation.

2.3.1 Landsat TM 1997-2004

We used a time series of annual Landsat TM/ETM+ data (Table 1) for the Mato Grosso
study area to characterize patterns of disturbance and recovery from fire at high resolution (30
m). Image preprocessing, including georegistration and atmospheric correction, was described in
detail by Souza et al. (2005a). Briefly, reflectance values in annual dry-season Landsat images
from June-August of each year (1997-2004) were normalized to one atmospherically-corrected
scene (1999), and a linear spectral mixture model with common endmembers for green
vegetation (GV), non-photosynthetic vegetation (NPV), shade, and soil was used to derive
annual fraction images and normalized difference fraction index (NDFI) data layers (Souza et al. 2005a; Souza et al. 2005b). Images were co-registered to the 1999 ETM+ reference scene, with root mean square (RMS) error <1 pixel in all years (Souza et al. 2005a; Souza et al. 2005b). In this study, we analyzed annual shade-normalized green vegetation fraction (GVs) data layers from 1997-2004 following the calculation presented by Souza et al., (2005a):

\[ GVs = \frac{GV}{100 - Shade} \]  

Souza et al. (2005a) showed that the GVs fraction was best for separating logged and burned forests, while the composite NDFI was best for separating logged and intact forest classes:

\[ NDFI = \frac{GV_s - (NPV + Soil)}{GV_s + (NPV + Soil)} \]  

2.3.2 MODIS 250 m Dry-season Mean NDVI 2000-2005

We constructed an annual time series of MODIS dry-season mean normalized difference vegetation index (mNDVI) to detect evidence of forest disturbance and recovery from fire at moderate resolution (250 m). mNDVI data layers were produced by averaging dry-season NDVI values from the Collection 4 MOD13 Q1 Vegetation Indices (Huete et al. 2002). The MOD13 product is based on atmospherically-corrected surface reflectance data (Vermote et al. 2002), and MODIS has sub-pixel geolocation accuracy (Wolfe et al. 2002). Annual mNDVI data values for each 250 m pixel were derived from seven 16-day composite periods (day of year 129, 145, 161, 177, 193, 209, and 225) in order to 1) limit interference from clouds or biomass burning aerosols typical of wet-season and late dry-season months, respectively, 2) eliminate artifacts from new forest burning that occurs during the late dry season, and 3) maintain consistent solar illumination conditions relative to the June solstice to minimize the impacts of seasonal changes.
in solar illumination on canopy reflectance. Remaining cloudy or other low-quality data values identified in the Quality Assurance data layer were replaced using a local spline function based on remaining high-quality data values in each pixel’s time series (Morton et al. 2006) prior to averaging for each annual mNDVI data layer for 2000-2005. Finally, in order to evaluate evidence of fire damage in 2000 MODIS data from fires in 1999, all regions were assigned a forested mNDVI value in 1999 (mNDVI = 0.85). Landsat-based results for fire-damaged forest during 1998 and 1999 were used to quantify the fraction of historic burning from these years that was visible in 2000 MODIS imagery.

### 2.3.3 Calibration Data

We used existing satellite-based data products and field observations to assess the spatial and temporal patterns of forest disturbances in time series of Landsat and MODIS data (Table 2). Forest damages that occurred between 2002 and 2003 were selected for algorithm calibration based on overlap with the MODIS era. Calibration data for both logged forest and logged forests that subsequently burned were identified using results from Souza et al. (2005a) and were visually inspected to eliminate areas that were later deforested using data from the PRODES (Monitoramento da Floresta Amazônica Brasileira por Satélite) annual Landsat-based deforestation assessments (INPE 2007). Field observations of intact forest in July 2005 were used to identify forest areas that were not logged, burned, or cleared during the combined Landsat and MODIS time series (1997-2005). Finally, deforestation events >25 ha with post-clearing land use of either pasture or cropland were selected to compare time series trajectories among major classes of forest cover change within the study area (Morton et al. 2006; INPE 2007). Calibration data totaled approximately 100 km² for each class (Table 2).
Calibration data were used to assess the separability of fire damages from other unburned cover types based on the trajectory of GVs and mNDVI over time (Figure 3, Table 3). Similar vegetation greenness among forest disturbance classes in individual years highlights the value of a time series approach for isolating canopy damages from fire in Amazonia (Figure 3). For example, in 2003, the range of mNDVI and GVs for burned forest was similar to logged forest and deforestation for pasture. However, the multi-year trajectory of burn damage and recovery is unique (Figure 3). Calibration data on burned forest were used to set the transition rules for the trajectory of burn damage and recovery in the BDR algorithm (Table 3). In a per-pixel analysis, the BDR trajectory excluded >99.8% of calibration data for intact forest, logged forest, and deforestation for cropland in time series of Landsat and MODIS data (Table 4). A small fraction of calibration data for pasture deforestation exhibited the BDR trajectory at Landsat (1.8%) or MODIS resolution (4.2%). The BDR algorithm also uses spatial attributes (size, shape) and spectral characteristics (mean greenness) of fire-damaged forest areas to isolate understory forest fires from other cover types, based on calibration data at Landsat and MODIS resolutions.

2.4 Burn Damage and Recovery (BDR) Algorithm

The BDR algorithm is a time-series approach to distinguish fire-related canopy damage from selective logging and deforestation (Figure 4). The BDR algorithm is comprised of three main processing components: Trajectory Analysis, Contextual Analysis, and Attribute Analysis. During Trajectory Analysis, a moving 4-year window is used to compare each pixel’s time series of Landsat or MODIS observations to the BDR trajectory to identify core areas of canopy damage from fire each year. The BDR time series trajectory for fire-damaged forest (Figure 3,
Table 3) is comprised of: 1) forested conditions in the year prior to burning, 2) intermediate change in post-burn vegetation greenness, relative to either logging or deforestation (0.75 years post-fire), and 3) recovery of mNDVI or GVs values during subsequent years (1.75 and 2.75 years post-fire). Clusters of neighboring pixels that satisfy all criteria for pre-burn, post-burn, and recovery elements of the BDR trajectory and exceed the minimum size criteria are considered core areas (Figure 4). To minimize confusion between canopy damage from fire and selective logging, the BDR algorithm only identifies core areas at Landsat resolution that are four times larger (1.5 ha) than previously reported for log landing areas in selective logging operations (0.4 ha) (Souza et al. 2005a). At MODIS resolution, the minimum core area is 10 ha. Compared to single image classification or image differencing techniques, the BDR approach provides 3+ observations to confirm the trajectory of burn damage and forest recovery. We note that the BDR algorithm identifies fire-damaged forests on a one year delay because at least one year of forest recovery is required to confirm understory fire damages rather than deforestation for agricultural use (see Figure 3).

The second component of the BDR algorithm is Contextual Analysis. During Contextual Analysis, core burned areas are grown into larger regions using a neighborhood search for adjacent pixels that meet BDR trajectory criteria for growth regions (Table 4, Figure 4). Compared to core areas of canopy damage from fire, pixels that fit the growth region BDR trajectory have a wider range of pre-burn, post-burn, and recovery values, consistent with mixed pixels of burned forest with other cover types (Figure 4). Growth regions must be adjacent to core areas to be included in the BDR algorithm. A similar, two-phase classification approach was used previously to map burned forest in Alaska with AVHRR data (Kasischke and French 1995).
The final component of the BDR algorithm, Attribute Analysis, analyzes the spatial and spectral characteristics of each burn scar (Figure 4). Spatial and spectral statistics include the size, perimeter-area ratio, average greenness in the year of burn detection, and interior fraction. Interior fraction was selected as a better measure of burn scar shape for MODIS results than perimeter-area ratio, calculated based on the reduction in burn scar size after applying a majority filter to the initial results using a 3 x 3 pixel window. These spatial and spectral statistics form the basis of a burn scar confidence classification, developed based on algorithm calibration data (see Table 2), in which large, non-linear burn scars with low average post-burn greenness are considered most confident. Low confidence burn scars at Landsat resolution have high perimeter-area ratio typical of the linear or dendritic pattern of selective logging operations; MODIS low-confidence detections are small or linear features common along class boundaries at moderate resolution (Figure 5). Figure 5 also shows how Landsat and MODIS data provide complimentary information. Low-confidence burn scars at 30 m and 250 m resolutions rarely overlap, whereas high confidence burn scars at Landsat and MODIS resolutions are largely coincident. The final outputs of the BDR algorithm are annual maps of fire-damaged forest in which each burn scar is classified as high or low confidence according to spatial and spectral metrics.

In summary, the BDR algorithm uses the temporal and spatial patterns of canopy damage from fire to isolate burn damages from undisturbed forest, logged forest, and deforested areas. The BDR algorithm applied to time series of Landsat GVs data searches for core areas of contiguous canopy damage from fire that are at least four times larger than previously documented for log landings in selective logging operations, uses recovery in years 1-2 after damage to differentiate forest burning from deforestation, and analyzes the resulting burn scars...
to eliminate overlap with selectively logged forests based on the shape (perimeter-area ratio) and
degree of canopy damage within each burn scar (mean GVs). The minimum burn scar size in
Landsat-based results is 1.5 ha, equivalent to the smallest core area considered by the algorithm.

The BDR algorithm applied to time series of MODIS mNDVI also begins with large core
areas to search for canopy damage from fire (≥10.7 ha). The algorithm excludes single pixel
clusters to eliminate potential classification errors from small deforestation or fire events that
cannot be well-characterized using moderate resolution data (Morton et al. 2005). MODIS
results are then classified according to confidence levels by size, shape, and mean mNDVI in the
year of burn detection. High confidence burn scars are large (>50 ha), non-linear (interior
fraction >0.6), with intermediate post-burn mNDVI values between logged (>0.8) and deforested
areas (<0.71), and recovery of mNDVI in years 1-2 after canopy damages.

2.5 Validation

We evaluated the accuracies of burn scars from the BDR algorithm using four
independent validation datasets and an inter-comparison of high-confidence Landsat and MODIS
results (Table 2). Figure 6 summarizes the overall approach for analysis and validation of results
from the BDR algorithm. Omission and commission were calculated on a per-pixel and per-
polygon basis. Per-pixel comparisons quantified the total overlap between validation data and
fire-damaged forest. Per-polygon analyses quantified the overlap between BDR results and
validation data for individual validation polygons (perimeters) of different sizes. We stratified
omission and commission errors by polygon size to quantify the advantages and disadvantages of
the BDR algorithm applied to high and moderate resolution time series. The accuracies of both
low and high-confidence detections were evaluated in order to 1) test whether spatial and
spectral metrics derived from calibration data reduced the overlap with independent estimates of logging and deforestation, and 2) evaluate the potential for MODIS to identify small burn scars. Each validation dataset is briefly described below.

Field observations of forests that burned in 1999-2002 were collected during June-September of 2001 and 2003 (DCM, RSD). In each year, field transects along existing roads targeted fire scars visible in coincident high-resolution imagery. The location and perimeter of each forest burn scar was recorded using a hand-held Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. The date and ignition source for each fire was determined using a combination of satellite data and information from landowners. Immediately following field campaigns, field-mapped burn perimeters were identified in coincident high-resolution data (ASTER or Landsat TM/ETM+) to complete portions of the burn perimeter that were not accessible during fieldwork. The total fire-damaged forest area mapped during fieldwork was 145 km² in 18 forest burn scars that ranged in size from 27-5,086 ha (Table 5).

We generated an additional validation dataset of burned forest perimeters from 1999 through visual inspection of Landsat imagery from 1999-2001. Spatial and spectral characteristics of field-mapped forest burn scars were used to identify similar features within the study area. A total of 145 forest burn scars from 1999 (1767.9 km²), ranging in size from 13-14,462 ha, were digitized within the study area to test omission of canopy damage from fire in the BDR results (Figure 7). For per-polygon analyses, we used linear regression to determine whether the area of fire-damaged forest identified in Landsat and MODIS results within individual validation burn scars was similar for burn scars of different sizes. We ran separate regression analyses for large (>500 ha) and small/medium (<500 ha) burn scars.
Agreement between fire-damaged forest results from Landsat and MODIS time series was used as an additional validation test since canopy damages are captured differently in high and moderate resolution data (see Figure 5). Subtle damages from selective logging are less likely to be detected with moderate resolution data than with data from Landsat-like sensors (Asner et al. 2004), while mixed pixel effects at class boundaries typical at MODIS resolution are less likely to occur with higher resolution data (Morton et al. 2005). Therefore, detection by both MODIS and Landsat BDR results increases the confidence of an individual burn scar. To compare the burn scar results from moderate and high resolution data, linear regression was used to determine whether the area identified in Landsat results (y) was similar to the area identified in MODIS results (x). Separate regression analyses were run for large (>500 ha) and small/medium (<500 ha) burn scars. We also calculated the fraction of the total fire-damaged forest in high-confidence burn scars that was detected at both Landsat and MODIS resolutions each year.

Independent datasets on selective logging (Asner et al. 2005) and deforestation (INPE 2007) were used to characterize potential commission errors in the Landsat and MODIS-based results of fire-damaged forest. These comparisons did not provide a rigorous test of commission errors in results from the BDR algorithm because neither logging nor deforestation data products were specifically designed to exclude burned forest. Instead, evaluation of overlap between canopy damage from fire, selective logging, and deforestation was useful to characterize the nature and extent of classification confusion among disturbance types in southern Amazonia. Overlap between deforestation events >25 ha and fire-damaged forests was further evaluated according to post-clearing land use based on results from Morton et al. (2006). Finally, accounting methods differ between the BDR algorithm and datasets of selective logging and
deforestation. For fire-damaged forest, images from the early dry season capture evidence of forest burning during the previous dry season. Selective logging and deforestation damages were assigned to the year in which they were mapped, representing the sum of all damages between annual images. For validation, this study compared fire-damaged forests, selective logging, and deforestation identified in the same year (e.g., burn damages from 1999 were compared with selective logging from 2000 since both were derived from 2000 Landsat data, burn damages from 2002 were compared with 2003 deforestation, etc.). For consistency, this study described validation comparisons using the year of burn damages.
3. Results

3.1 Validation: Omission

Field and image-derived forest burn scars were used to quantify omission in results from the BDR algorithm applied to Landsat and MODIS time series. Overall, the BDR algorithm accurately identified forest burn scars mapped during fieldwork (Table 5). Landsat results identified some canopy damage from fire in all 18 field-mapped burn scars, and MODIS results detected fire damages in all but one field-mapped burn scar in 2000 (size = 103 ha). MODIS results more closely matched burn perimeters mapped during fieldwork than Landsat results due to heterogeneity of canopy damage within the burn scar that truncated the Contextual Analysis component of the BDR algorithm at Landsat resolution. All of the field-mapped burn scars were identified as high-confidence results at Landsat and MODIS resolutions (Table 5).

Landsat and MODIS-based results for fire-damaged forest in 1999 identified burn damages in 99% and 94% of image-derived burn scars, respectively (Table 5). Landsat results detected 61% of the total fire-damaged forest area (pixels within the burn perimeter), with some canopy damage from fire detected in 143/145 burn scars. The fraction of digitized burn scars detected by Landsat was consistent for large (>500 ha, \( y = 0.63x, R^2 = 0.96, n = 65 \)) and small validation burn scars (<500ha, \( y = 0.68x, R^2 = 0.97, n = 81 \), Figure 8a). MODIS results detected a higher percentage of the total fire-damaged forest area (76%) but fewer individual burn scars than Landsat (136/145). Four of the 9 digitized forest burn scars without a corresponding MODIS detection were <50 ha. Results from MODIS underestimated the area within the perimeter of individual burn scars by approximately 25% for digitized burn scars of all sizes (>500 ha, \( y = 0.75x, R^2 = 0.97, n = 65 \); <500 ha, \( y = 0.74x, R^2 = 0.89, n = 81 \), Figure 7b). Nearly all 1999 burn scars were characterized as high-confidence results at both Landsat and MODIS.
resolutions; large burn scars (>500 ha) accounted for 93% of the total digitized area (see Figure 7).

3.2 Validation: Commission

3.2.1 Selective Logging

Independent maps of annual selective logging damages (Asner et al. 2005) were used to characterize potential commission errors in results from the BDR algorithm. Overlap between selective logging and canopy damage from fire was high in 1999 but very low in 2000 and 2001 (Table 6). Coincident burning and logging classifications in 1999 were predominantly in high-confidence results (Table 6). Forest areas classified as logged and burned in 1999 also overlapped with 52% of field-mapped burn scars and 48% of digitized forest burn scars in that year. In 2000 and 2001, there was little overlap between fire-damaged forest and selective logging, and most coincident detections occurred in the low-confidence burn scars. In all years, forest burning extended beyond the area identified as both logged and burned. For example, burn scars in Landsat and MODIS results from 1999 that were also classified as logging averaged only 49% and 33% logged, respectively.

3.2.2 Deforestation

Landsat-based maps of annual deforestation from the PRODES program (INPE 2007) were also used to quantify potential commission errors in results from the BDR algorithm. Overlap between fire-damaged forest and PRODES deforestation occurred primarily in high-confidence burn scars (Table 7). The area of overlap between fire-damaged forest and deforestation was similar for Landsat and MODIS results in all years (Table 7).
Coincident detection of burn damages and deforestation varied according to clearing size and post-clearing land use (Table 7). In 2000 and 2001, confusion between deforestation and fire-damaged forest was mostly confined to large (>25 ha) forest clearings for pasture. Burn scars only overlapped with a small fraction of the individual areas cleared for pasture in those years; the average fraction of forest clearings for pasture mapped as canopy damage from fire was 28% in 2000 and 25% in 2001. In 2002, a small number of individual clearings for pasture (37/192) that were mapped as >50% fire-damaged forest accounted for 75% of the area of overlap between deforestation for pasture and fire-damaged forest in that year. Forest burn scars overlapped less frequently with deforestation classified as not in agricultural production (NIP), and did not overlap with cropland deforestation and clearings <25 ha except in 2002 (Table 7).

3.3 Interannual Variation in Fire-Damaged Forest, 1997-2002

The majority of fire-damaged forest mapped with Landsat and MODIS time series was not associated with the 1997-1998 ENSO. Fire-damaged forest area in 1999 was 10 and 15 times greater than the amount of canopy damage from fire identified during 1997 and 1998, respectively (Table 8). Similarly, nearly all of the burning attributed to 1999 in the analysis of MODIS data from 2000 was unrelated to the ENSO event; less than 1% of MODIS fire-damaged forest area in 1999 was classified as burned during 1998 in Landsat-based results (12 km²). Due to rapid recovery of canopy greenness following fire, imagery from the first year following understory fire damages is critical to identify and follow the fate of burned Amazon forests.

Interannual variation in fire-damaged forest area was similar between results from the BDR algorithm applied to Landsat and MODIS time series (Table 8). The location of individual burn scars during 1999-2002 was also similar between moderate and high-resolution results.
MODIS burn scars with corresponding Landsat detections accounted for over 91% of all MODIS high confidence fire-damaged forest area (Table 8).

In the southern Amazon study area, the total Landsat high confidence fire-damaged forest area during 1997-2002 was 2136 km² (Table 6), equivalent to 10% of all forest in the study area in 1997 (Figure 9). The total area in high confidence burn scars during 1999-2002 at MODIS resolution was 2832 km² (13% of 1997 forested area).

3.4 Burn Scar Sizes

The contribution of large and small burn scars to total fire-damaged forest area varied interannually (Figure 10). Large burn scars (>500 ha) were only identified in years with highest fire damages (1999, 2002). However, these largest burn scars contributed the majority of canopy damage from fire during 1997-2002. Burn scars >500 ha accounted for 56% of the Landsat fire-damaged forest area during 1997-2002 and 78% of the MODIS fire-damaged forest area during 1999-2002.

Small burn scars (<50 ha) in Landsat results were common in all years but contributed only 12% of the total fire-damaged forest area over the study period. Small burn scars contributed 46% of total fire-damaged forest area in years with lowest canopy damage from fire (1998, 2001).

The estimated size of individual burn scars was larger from MODIS than from Landsat, but the exact relationship between MODIS and Landsat-based area was strongly dependent on burn scar size. For large burn scars (>500 ha), MODIS-based burn scar size (x) was consistently twice that derived from Landsat data (y): 1999 (y = 0.52x, R² = 0.92, n = 79) and 2002 (y = 0.49x, R² = 0.94, n = 19) (Figure 11). The correlation between MODIS and Landsat-based burn scar size was lower for smaller burn scars (<500 ha), and the slope of the linear fit was more
variable (1999: $y = 0.23x$, $R^2 = 0.47$, $n = 200$; 2000: $y = 0.40x$, $R^2 = 0.82$, $n = 38$; 2001: $y = 0.23x$, $R^2 = 0.56$, $n = 30$; and 2002: $y = 0.37x$, $R^2 = 0.68$, $n = 105$. Data not shown).
4. Discussion

The BDR algorithm is a novel approach to estimate the annual extent of canopy damage from understory fires in Amazon forests. The use of satellite image time series and spatial attributes of burn scars enabled accurate identification of fire-damaged forest areas and improved separability of burning from logging and deforestation compared to single-date methods. Results from the BDR algorithm applied to time series of Landsat and MODIS data demonstrate the high degree of interannual variability in the extent of fire-damaged forest. Unexpectedly, fire-damaged forest in 1999 was an order of magnitude higher than during the 1997-1998 El Niño. Large burn scars (>500 ha) were also detected in 2002, highlighting potential differences in the relationship between climate and fire in this study area compared to Amazon regions with highest fire damages reported during ENSO-related drought events (e.g., Barbosa and Fearnside 1999; Nepstad et al. 2004; Alencar et al. 2006). Our results illustrate the potential to address critical questions concerning climate and fire risk in Amazon forests when the BDR algorithm is applied over larger areas.

4.1 Fire-damaged forest in southern Amazonia

Interannual variation in fire-damaged forest area was high within the study area in southern Amazonia. Fires damaged 10% of all forest in the study area during 1997-2002, and three quarters of all canopy damage from fire occurred during 1999. Findings in this study were similar to results from Matricardi et al. (2010) for burn damages in 1999. In contrast, Alencar et al. (2006) reported extensive fire damages in 1998 for a neighboring study area in northern Mato Grosso state, Brazil. At least three factors could contribute to regional differences in understory fire damages in southern Amazonia. First, high rates of selective logging in our study area
(Asner et al. 2005; Souza et al. 2005a; Matricardi et al. 2007; Matricardi et al. 2010) may have increased the risk of understory forest fires (Uhl and Buschbacher 1985; Holdsworth and Uhl 1997; Nepstad et al. 1999). Second, differences in climate and soils may contribute to the observed interannual differences in understory forest fire damages in the region. Although the network of meteorological stations in Amazonia is sparse, merged precipitation products from gauge measurements and satellite sensors (Huffman et al. 2007) offer the possibility to evaluate regional climate patterns preceding and during widespread understory fire activity identified using the BDR approach. Third, drought conditions in Amazonia are associated with increased rates of tree mortality (Brando et al. 2007). It is therefore possible that drought-induced tree mortality from the 1997-1998 ENSO event increased understory fire risk in later years. The potential for these differences in land use, climate, or forest structure to generate spatial heterogeneity in understory forest fire damages in Amazonia merits further study.

Very large burn scars were only identified during years with extensive forest burning, consistent with previous findings of greater penetration of understory fires in periodic high-fire years (Cochrane and Laurence 2002; Alencar et al. 2004; Alencar et al. 2006). Based on understory fire spread rates of 0.1 – 0.5 m/min (Cochrane et al. 1999; Balch et al. 2008), the largest fires in 1999 may have burned continuously for approximately two weeks. Whether high fire damages in these years were linked with climate (Ray et al. 2005) or an increase in fuel availability (Holdsworth and Uhl 1997; Alvarado et al. 2004; Balch et al. 2008), prolonged rainless periods once understory fires begin appear necessary for individual fires to damage large areas.

Once burned, Amazon forests may be more susceptible to future fires based on the influence of canopy damage on forest microclimate and fuels (Cochrane et al. 1999). By
extending the length of the satellite data time series, the BDR approach could also be used to characterize the frequency of fires in previously-burned forest to evaluate long-term changes in the structure of tropical forest ecosystems from frequent fire exposure (Cochrane and Schulze 1999; Barlow and Peres 2008).

4.2 BDR Approach

MODIS and Landsat data time series have complementary characteristics for mapping canopy damage from fire in tropical forests. Lower data volumes and a more homogenous disturbance signature in 250 m MODIS data facilitated BDR processing; some canopy damage was not detected at Landsat resolution because damaged pixels were not contiguous, interrupting the neighborhood search in the Contextual Analysis component of the BDR algorithm. Therefore, MODIS results more closely matched validation burn perimeters than Landsat results. Landsat data were essential for detecting small burn scars (<50 ha) and fire damages prior to the MODIS era. Landsat-based results also suggested that only half of the forest area within large burn perimeters exhibited canopy damage, similar to field studies of canopy mortality from fire in Amazonia. Advantages of Landsat resolution for evaluating the patterns and severity of canopy mortality within the burn perimeter, as identified in previous field studies (e.g., Cochrane and Schulze 1999; Haugaasen et al. 2003; Balch et al. 2008), are an important area for future study. Given the tradeoffs in spatial resolution between MODIS and Landsat, a multi-satellite approach may be most efficient for targeting high-resolution analyses of fire damages based on initial burn perimeters mapped with moderate resolution data.

The BDR approach successfully isolated fire-damaged forest from areas of selective logging in years with low fire activity such as 2001, when <0.4% of logging was classified as
burning and <9% of burning was also classified as logging. Given previous reports of low sensitivity to fine-scale canopy damages from selective logging in moderate resolution data (e.g., Asner et al. 2004), the high degree of confusion between MODIS-based burn scars and logging in 1999 was unexpected (821 km² represented 31% of logging and 33% of canopy damage from fire). Overlap between validation burn scars and selective logging suggests that logging and burning may have occurred in the same year (1999) or that burning re-exposed evidence of selective logging prior to 1999. Clarifying the role of logging for generating both fuels and ignition sources for forest fires in Amazonia during years with extensive forest fire damages is an important subject for future study.

Overlap between deforestation and fire-damaged forest in both Landsat and MODIS results suggests that PRODES may have overestimated the amount of deforestation in the study area in 2002. In 2000 and 2001, overlap between deforestation and burning classifications represented <5% of total deforested area, whereas coincident deforestation and burning detection in 2002 (108-115 km²) was approximately 17% of total deforestation that year. Because the BDR algorithm identifies areas of fire-damaged forest based on forest recovery over time, it is likely that the areas of overlap between burn scars and deforestation were never fully cleared for agricultural use. Our results further suggest that cropland expansion may be a more important driver of recent deforestation than previously reported (Morton et al. 2006) because most overlap between forest burning and PRODES deforestation was associated with clearing for pasture. Lower overlap between mechanized forest clearing for cropland and fire-damaged forest may be a result of seasonal differences in the timing of fires for deforestation; fires for cropland deforestation occur earlier in the dry season than fires for pasture deforestation when surrounding forests may be less flammable (Morton et al. 2008). However, confusion between
forest fires and deforestation cannot be completely resolved by combining independent data products derived from different methods (image differencing and time-series approaches).

Development of an integrated time-series approach to separately account for the contributions from understory fires, selective logging, and deforestation to annual forest damage would satisfy information needs for both policy and science applications. All three types of forest disturbance could be identified in time series of data from Landsat-like sensors by combining methods demonstrated in this study to follow fire damages and deforestation over time with techniques to detect spatial attributes of forestry infrastructure (Asner et al. 2005; Matricardi et al. 2005; Souza et al. 2005a). Time series of MODIS data could be used to estimate fire-damaged forest and deforestation in an internally-consistent manner, given that MODIS-based results in this study were largely insensitive to subtle canopy damages from selective logging. Any integrated approach that requires several years of satellite imagery will not replace the need for operational deforestation monitoring (INPE, 2006) or global burn scar mapping (e.g., Roy et al. 2008; Giglio et al. 2009). As presented here, the BDR algorithm can only map canopy damages from fire with high confidence on a two-year delay in order to track both canopy damage and recovery. However, longer time horizons under discussion for policy and market mechanisms for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and sustainable forest management (REDD+) may permit this type of retrospective approach (Gullison et al. 2007), given the substantial differences in forest carbon losses from understory fires (e.g., Barlow et al. 2003; Alencar et al. 2006; Balch et al. 2008), selective logging (e.g., Keller et al. 2004; Huang et al. 2008), and deforestation (Houghton et al. 2000; van der Werf et al. 2009).
4.3 Uncertainties

Validation efforts in this study provide a rigorous test of the BDR algorithm based on the best available data. Omission of fire-damaged forest was tested using field and image-derived validation burn scars, and commission errors were evaluated using independent data on selective logging and deforestation in the region. However, no “gold standard” reference information on understory fire extent was available to resolve uncertainties when independent data products on forest disturbance overlapped or to test omission and commission errors at a regional scale. The time series approach presented here, in combination with field observations or very high resolution (<5m) remote sensing data, can help resolve whether overlap among existing products represents misclassification or sequential forest disturbances. Reducing uncertainties in the rates of deforestation and forest degradation remains a priority in Amazonia and other tropical forest regions, especially given burgeoning international efforts for REDD+.

Several limitations of the BDR algorithm may lead to an underestimate of fire-damaged forest in this study. The BDR algorithm may not detect understory fires that do not generate any canopy damage or forests that burn every year. Similarly, fires that generate very low or very high canopy damage may be considered low confidence detections to minimize potential classification errors with selective logging and deforestation, respectively. Good correspondence between field observations of burned forest and BDR results suggests that canopy recovery following fire is characteristic of burning events in the study region. However, burned forests that do not recover in years following fire damages will be underestimated by the BDR algorithm. Future work in this area is needed to characterize the levels of canopy damage from fire identified by the BDR approach, including the impacts of repeated fires on burn detection. During sequential forest disturbance events, such as fire following selective logging (Souza et al.
2005a), fire damages that follow the network of skid roads and log decks installed during forestry operations may not be considered high confidence burn scars in the BDR approach. Finally, immediate abandonment of partially-cleared areas or installation of plantation forests could generate a recovery trajectory similar to burned forest, leading to commission errors with the BDR approach. Data on land abandonment and plantation forests were not available, but based on field knowledge of the study region these practices are rare relative to widespread damages from understory fires, selective logging, and deforestation for agricultural use.
5. Conclusions

The BDR algorithm is a novel method to identify spatial and temporal characteristics of burned forest in time series of satellite data. Time series of annual dry season data from a minimum of three consecutive years permits detection of two changes—a reduction in green vegetation following fire and immediate recovery of canopy material in subsequent years. The results from this study demonstrate that both Landsat and MODIS time series are suitable for isolating understory forest fire damages from selective logging and deforestation in Amazonia using the BDR algorithm. Although MODIS-based results more closely matched validation burn perimeters, complementary information from MODIS and Landsat resolution time series suggest that a combined approach may be useful to characterize the extent and severity of canopy damage from understory fires in Amazonia, respectively.

Mapping the annual extent of canopy damage from understory fires in Amazonia is critical to improve estimates of carbon emissions from forest degradation to meet both scientific and policy objectives. This study confirmed that periodic high fire years contribute substantially to forest degradation in southern Amazonia. However, the two years with most extensive burning in the study area (1999, 2002) did not coincide with the 1997-1998 ENSO as reported in previous studies. Large fires (>500 ha) were only detected in 1999 and 2002, indicating that climatic conditions in these years may have allowed slow-moving understory fires to burn continuously for several weeks. Applying the BDR algorithm to longer time series and larger study areas will improve understanding of relationships among climate, land use, and forest fire activity in Amazonia. In particular, the BDR approach offers the possibility to assess interannual variability in understory forest fire damages for tropical forest regions that experience a range of seasonal and interannual precipitation patterns.
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Table 1. Day of year for annual Landsat (scene 226/068) and MODIS 16-day composite data (tile H12V10) in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Landsat</th>
<th>MODIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>TM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>TM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>ETM+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>TM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>ETM+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>ETM+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>TM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>TM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Data sources for calibration and validation of fire-damaged forest area derived from the BDR algorithm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Calibration</th>
<th>Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>Field Observations</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Logging</td>
<td>Souza et al. 2005a</td>
<td>Asner et al., 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Forest**</td>
<td>Souza et al. 2005a</td>
<td>Field Observations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image-derived burn scars;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landsat/MODIS Inter-comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deforestation****</td>
<td>INPE, 2007; Morton et al., 2006</td>
<td>INPE, 2007; Morton et al., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002 Pasture: 89.6;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cropland: 91.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deforestation and selective logging between annual images are assigned to the end image date by INPE (2007) and Asner et al. (2005), respectively. Fire-damaged forest areas are assigned to the beginning date, since early dry-season imagery (May-June) captures evidence of burning from the previous dry season (August-September). For consistency, we report all comparisons according to the year of forest burning from the BDR approach (e.g., Year 1999 = 1999 fire damages and 2000 selective logging).

** Souza et al. (2005a) identified forest areas that were logged and subsequently burned. Field and image-derived forest burn scars used for validation were not necessarily logged prior to burning.

*** Inter-comparison of annual high confidence fire-damaged forest area, total: Landsat (1879.8 km$^2$), MODIS (3040.1 km$^2$).

**** A subset of INPE PRODES deforestation for 2002, classified according to post-clearing land use as pasture or cropland, was used for BDR calibration. Validation efforts considered all deforestation during 2000-2002 (excluding the calibration subset), classified as cropland, pasture, or not in production (Morton et al., 2006).
Table 3. BDR trajectory parameters for core and growth areas in dry-season imagery for pre and post-burn periods. Limits for the BDR burn trajectories are depicted in Figure 3, with years 1-4 corresponding to the annual intervals described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Pre-Burn minimum</th>
<th>Drop (2-1) minimum</th>
<th>2. Post-burn range</th>
<th>3. Recovery (1) minimum</th>
<th>4. Recovery (2) minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODIS mNDVI (0-1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.7-0.8</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.65-0.83</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landsat GVs (0-100)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>35-75</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Fraction of calibration data for the BDR algorithm classified as a core burned area at MODIS and Landsat resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Landsat Core Burned Area (%)</th>
<th>MODIS Core Burned Area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Forest</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Forest</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture Deforestation</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland Deforestation</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Detection of field and image-derived validation forest burn scars with results from the BDR algorithm applied to time series of Landsat and MODIS data. Results are presented by area (km²) and percent of total validation area detected. The number of observations (obs.) and validation burn scar sizes are also shown for each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Validation Burn Scars (ha)</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MODIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landsat</td>
<td>MODIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>km²</td>
<td>km²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34, 205, 237, 496, 505, 820, 1148, 1479, 5086</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49, 103</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27, 272, 300, 632, 873, 1672</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year**</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Validation Burn Scars (ha)</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999**</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>(see Fig. 6)</td>
<td>1767.9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only year in which results for high-confidence burn scars differed from total (low + high confidence) fire-damaged forest area (Landsat 0.6 km², MODIS = 0).
** Overlap of high confidence burn scars with image-derived validation data differed by <1% from total results (Landsat 1063 km², MODIS 1331 km²).

Table 6. Overlap between Landsat-based selective logging from Asner et al. (2005) and fire-damaged forest for all BDR results (Total) and high-confidence burn scars (HC) from Landsat and MODIS time series. Total high confidence fire-damaged forest area (HC Area) and the percentage of HC Area that overlapped with selective logging are also shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Logged Area (km²)</th>
<th>Landsat HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>Landsat Total HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>Landsat Overlap (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2587.6</td>
<td>1508.1</td>
<td>653.8</td>
<td>633.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1466.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1878.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MODIS HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>MODIS Total HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>MODIS Overlap (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2526.3</td>
<td>848.2</td>
<td>821.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asner et al. (2005) assigned logging between annual Landsat images to the end image date, whereas burn damages from the BDR algorithm are attributed to previous year. As shown, year 1999 corresponds to logging in 2000, etc.
Table 7. Overlap between fire-damaged forest (2000-2002) and PRODES deforestation (2001-2003) (INPE, 2007) for all BDR results (Total) and high-confidence burn scars (HC). Total overlap with PRODES deforestation is further divided by size and post-clearing land use (Morton et al., 2006). Total high confidence fire-damaged forest area (HC Area) and the percentage of HC Area that overlapped with deforestation are also shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Deforested Area (km²)**</th>
<th>Landsat HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>Landsat Overlap Total (km²)</th>
<th>HC (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MODIS HC Area (km²)</th>
<th>MODIS Overlap Total (km²)</th>
<th>HC (km²)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;25 ha</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;25 ha</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>649.3</td>
<td>281.4</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>402.7</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>235.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td>275.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;25 ha</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Burn year 2000 corresponds to 2001 deforestation due to differences in annual accounting between BDR and PRODES.

**Landsat-based annual deforestation from PRODES (INPE, 2007). Clearings >25 ha classified according to post-clearing land use (Morton et al., 2006).
Table 8. Fire-damaged forest area detected by the BDR algorithm using Landsat and MODIS time series for all forest burn scars (Total) and high-confidence burn scars (HC). Coincident detections at both high and moderate resolution (overlap) were derived from high-confidence burn scars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Fire-damaged Forest Area (km²)</th>
<th>HC Fire-damaged Forest Area (km²)</th>
<th>Overlap (km²)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landsat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1549.9</td>
<td>1508.1</td>
<td>1435.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>290.5</td>
<td>281.4</td>
<td>185.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2788.7</td>
<td>2526.3</td>
<td>2317.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>507.8</td>
<td>402.7</td>
<td>359.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Forest burn scars with high-confidence detections in Landsat and MODIS results during 1999-2002.
Figure 1. Aerial photographs from the Mato Grosso study region depicting canopy damage from roads and log landing areas (patios) for selective logging (top), understory forest fires (middle), and deforestation for agricultural use (bottom) in 2007. Photo credit: Alberto Setzer, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil.
Figure 2: Landsat 1997 shade-normalized green vegetation (GVs) for the study region. Forested regions appear dark gray and deforested regions appear black in this early dry season image. Tributaries of the Xingu River that were excluded from the analysis are outlined in white. Inset: the Landsat study area (black) in central Mato Grosso state (white) lies near the eastern extent of the Amazon Basin (gray outline).
Figure 3: Time series of annual mean ± 1 S.D. MODIS mean dry-season NDVI (mNDVI, top left) and Landsat shade-normalized green vegetation fraction (GVs, bottom left) for calibration data on intact, logged, and burned forest and deforestation for pasture and cropland during 2002. Line plots show the mean trajectory for each class from MODIS (top right) and Landsat (bottom right). Table 1 lists the area and data source for each class. Table 2 provides the percent of each calibration data set that was classified as a core area by the BDR.
Figure 4. The BDR algorithm has three main processing steps: 1) Trajectory Analysis: MODIS and Landsat time series trajectories are used to identify candidate core areas of canopy damage from fire (black) and growth regions (gray). Dashed lines show the range of values for 2-year recovery in growth regions. See Table 2 for pre-burn (1), drop, post-burn (2), and recovery (3,4) parameter ranges for each BDR trajectory. 2) Contextual Analysis: Large core areas (black) are joined to adjacent growth areas (gray) to generate forest burn scars. 3) Attribute Analysis: Individual burn scars are classified as low confidence (LC) or high confidence (HC) based on spatial and spectral metrics.
Figure 5. Landsat (solid colors) and MODIS (outlines) 1999 forest burn scar results classified according to high and low confidence based on spatial and spectral metrics for a subset of the study area (inset). The background image shows the shade-normalized green vegetation fraction (GVs) for 2000.
Figure 6. Flow diagram of data processing and analysis for annual maps of fire-damaged forest area from the BDR algorithm applied to time series of MODIS and Landsat data. The BDR algorithm identifies burned forest areas using a three-step process. All results from the BDR algorithm were compared to validation data on burned forest, selective logging, and deforestation, but only high-confidence burn scars were used to estimate interannual variability in burn scar size and total fire-damaged forest area.

Figure 7. Number of burn scars (bars) and cumulative contribution to total validation fire-damaged forest area (◊) by size class for 145 image-derived validation burn scars from 1999.
Figure 8. Validation of results from the BDR algorithm applied to time series of Landsat (a) and MODIS (b) data using 145 image-derived burn scars from 1999. The relationship between validation data and BDR results for burn scars <500 ha is shown in the upper left corner of each panel (inset). In each panel, a dashed 1:1 line is shown for reference.
Figure 9. Total fire-damaged forest area during 1997-2002 (white) from the BDR algorithm applied to the time series of Landsat shade-normalized green vegetation fraction (GVs). Forested regions appear gray and deforested areas appear black in the background image of the study area from 2003.
Figure 10. Percent contribution from burn scars of different sizes to annual high-confidence fire-damaged forest area for the BDR algorithm applied to time series of Landsat (top) and MODIS (bottom).
Figure 11. Estimated size of individual burn scars >500 ha in 1999 (a) and 2002 (b) from the BDR algorithm applied to time series of MODIS and Landsat data. For 1999, the relationship between MODIS and Landsat estimates of burn scar size for individual scars >4000 ha is shown in the upper left corner (inset). In each panel, a dashed 1:1 line is shown for reference.