Table 42 - Distinctions and similarities between Machadinho d'Oeste and Vale do Anari.

SETTLEMENTS		MACHADINHO D'OESTE	VALE DO ANARI
Distinctions	**Architectural design**	Area of 2,090 km^2	Area of 1,246 km^2
		Topography oriented with patches of forest communal reserves	Fishbone without patches of forest communal reserves
		Property size ~ 44 ha	Property size ~ 50 ha
		Properties with more equitable access to fertile soil, relatively flat terrain, and sources of water	Properties with unequal access to fertile soil, relatively flat terrain, and sources of water
	Institutional design	Private properties (67%) and forest communal reserves (33%)	Private properties (100%)
		Good infrastructure	Fair infrastructure
		Governmental assistance	Lack of governmental assistance
		Incentives for the creation of associations	Lack of incentives for the creation of associations
		Actors: settlers, loggers, and rubber tappers	Actors: settlers and loggers
Similarities		Biophysical features within the settlements' landscapes (e.g., climate, topography, soils, original vegetation)	
		Settlement age (both settlements were implemented in the early 1980s)	
		Assets among colonists (settlers were selected following the same eliminatory and classificatory criteria)	

Table 43 - Selected findings of this dissertation.

SETTLEMENTS		MACHADINHO D'OESTE	VALE DO ANARI
Findings	**Vegetation structure**	3 stages of secondary succession distinguished using vegetation structure data	
		2 stages of secondary succession distinguished using LANDSAT TM data	
	LULC	66% of forest cover in 1998 (51% if excluding reserves)	51% of forest cover in 1998
		44% of forest within the 800-meter buffers along roads in 1998	25% of forest within the 800-meter buffers along roads in 1998
		1.35 ha deforested per year per property	1.35 ha deforested per year per property
		13% of pasture within properties in 1998	16% of pasture within properties in 1998
		Correlation of forest and pasture of –0.434 in 1998 (p<0.01)	Correlation of forest and pasture of –0.626 in 1998 (p<0.01)
	Landscape structure	Lower forest fragmentation	Higher forest fragmentation
		Greater shape complexity	Lower shape complexity
		Higher interspersion between patch types	Lower interspersion between patch types
	Institutions	Importance of associations since implementation	Associations are more recent
		Better interactions among actors	Poor interactions among actors