RMS® CCRA® Training Program

Severe Convective Storm Modeling Exercise: Analyzing the Historical Record of Tornadoes in the U.S.

Learning Objectives:

The purpose of this exercise is to familiarize you with the type of historical data that has been typically used in tornado/hail models for developing the stochastic event set, using the U.S. historical catalogue of tornado events as an example. The RMS Severe Convective Storm model no longer relies solely on observational data but also leverages meteorological methods to determine event placement and frequency. This exercise will highlight the issues that are brought about by using only historical storm data to develop a stochastic event set. By the end of the exercise, you will have learned:

- The types of information provided in a historical catalogue of events.
- How this information can be used to inform catastrophe model assumptions.
- Basic temporal and spatial methods for evaluating data completeness and potential bias in the historical record.

In addition to this handout, you have been provided with an Excel file (Tornado Reports by Year.xlsx) containing the record of reported tornado events in the United States between 1950 and 2010 based on data from the National Weather Service.

Background on the Fujita Scale and the U.S. Historical Catalogue of Tornadoes

The Fujita scale was originally developed to distinguish weak and strong tornadoes. The wind speed/expected damage relationship was a “guesstimate” for a well-constructed or strong wood frame house. In 2007, the Enhanced Fujita scale was introduced. This new scale has a more refined estimate of tornado strength through the use of highly detailed structural vulnerability estimates and ground surveys.

Tornadoes in the U.S. historical record prior to February 2007 are categorized according to the original Fujita scale. The scale is “conditional,” that is, events are classified based on observed damage in the area impacted. F-ratings are not based on any direct measurement of peak wind speeds.

F-Rating	Observed Damage	Estimated 3-Second Peak Wind Speed (mph)
F0	Light	45-78
F1	Moderate	80-118
F2	Considerable	119-161
F3	Severe	162-209
F4	Devastating	210-261
F5	Incredible	262-317

The use of the Fujita scale to classify tornado damage began in 1971 in the U.S. During the early 1970s an initiative was undertaken to classify pre-1970s tornadoes based on the photographic and written documentation of the damage. Any classification of a tornado's damage is a subjective process, but this is particularly true for those tornadoes occurring prior to the mid-1970s.

Several groups have made attempts to create a historic tornado catalogue for the U.S. The primary databases include:

- National Weather Service database, archived at the National Climatic Data Center (covering storms since 1950). This is considered the "official database," derived from the reports in the publication *Storm Data* and its predecessor, *Climatological Data National Summary - Storm Data and Unusual Phenomena.*
- The University of Chicago (DAPPLE) database, work by T. T. Fujita and collaborators at the Univ. of Chicago (covering tornadoes from 1916 to 1985). This database was developed specifically for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for the purpose of site risk assessment. It is based on the NWS database from 1950-1985, supplemented by the Report of the Chief of the Weather Bureau (1916-1934) and publications in Monthly Weather Review (1935-1949).
- The Tornado Project, work of Tom P. Grazulis contained in "Significant Tornadoes, 1680-1995." This nine year project, funded by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the National Science Foundation (NSF), was initiated to resolve differences between the two independently designed databases, for tornadoes of intensity F2 or greater. F4/F5 tornadoes were brought into agreement via an individual's subjective decisions. About 2,000 other tornadoes differing by >1 F-rating and about 5,000 other tornadoes differing by 1 F-rating were also reviewed.

Which database is best? RMS chose to use the NWS database as the primary data source in development of prior tornado/hail models, before meteorological and numerical approaches had been refined. This was selected because evidence produced by members of the National Severe Storm Laboratory indicated that this database was most consistent with the tornado databases of other countries, where equally intense tornadoes occur, but with a lower frequency. RMS' frequency assessments are based on meteorological parameters, and are no longer extracted from these databases.

Unlike the U.S., there is only one major tornado database in Canada which is maintained by Environment Canada. This database consists of tornado reports since 1912.

In addition to the Fujita damage rating, the tornado databases include the location of spin-up, the length of the path (subset of U.S. reports only), and the approximate width of path (subset of U.S. reports only).

Exercise Part 1: Temporal Analysis

Use the Excel workbook and the following tables (based on the same data) to examine estimates of tornado frequency and severity in the United States over different time periods.

U.S. Tornado Reports: All Intensities

Years Considered	Total Reported	Years in Sample	Average Number Per Year
All Years (1950-2010)	55,149	61	904
1950-1959	4,791	10	479
1960-1969	6,803	10	680
1970-1979	8,566	10	857
1980-1989	8,182	10	818
1990-1999	12,134	10	1,213
2000-2010	14,673	11	1,334

1. How do estimates of overall tornado frequency differ based on sampling various years of the historical record? List at least one key difference and a hypothesis that might explain it.

U.S. Tornado Reports by F-Rating – Average # Reports

Decade	F0	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	All Intensities
1950-1959	127	166	138	36	11	1	479
1960-1969	214	226	186	44	10	1	680
1970-1979	272	341	183	47	11	1	857
1980-1989	330	330	121	31	6	0	818
1990-1999	737	328	106	34	8	1	1,213
2000-2010*	831	359	105	31	7	1	1,334

**After January 2007 the EF scale is used.*

2. Now consider reports by intensity (F-rating) and by decade. How do estimates of tornado frequency change over time for different intensity ratings?

3. Compare the trends for F0 and F1 tornadoes with those for F2 and stronger tornadoes. What might explain the differences in reporting between these groupings?

Exercise Part 2: Spatial Analysis

Now, examine the following maps, which plot the locations of reported tornadoes throughout the U.S. by intensity category.

EF0-EF1 Tornadoes



EF2-EF3 Tornadoes



EF4-EF5 Tornadoes



4. List at least two patterns that you observe.

5. What do these patterns imply about hazard levels in different parts of the U.S.?

6. What do these patterns imply about data completeness or potential bias in the catalogue?