

Anonymous Referee #1

General comments

1. The aim of the study needs to be stated more clearly.

Thanks for this comment. We have rewritten both the objective of the paper and the main aim of the methodology in the Introduction, also according to Anonymous Referee #3, as follows: “The objective of this paper is to propose a methodology to conduct in-situ damage surveys of strong wind events from convective origin. It can contribute to improve the detection, mapping and characterization of wind damage in a homogeneous way, which is important to better describe specific meteorological phenomena, with the particularities associated with damage from convective local storms. Therefore, the main goal of the proposed methodology is to gather as much geo-referenced information as possible about relevant damaged elements (i.e. man-made structures and vegetation) to reproduce the damage scenario and complement it with other available data (witness enquiries, Automatic Weather Station -AWS- located close to the affected area, and remote-sensing data) to analyse strong-convective winds phenomena from a meteorological point of view.”.

2. The methodology is based on previous studies. The studies are just cited. There is no review of the previous literature to show how the methodology described in the current study compares with the previous methodologies.

According to this comment, we have added a new paragraph in Section 1 (Introduction) exposing the state-of-the-art about in-situ damage survey methodologies: “McDonald and Marshall (1984) and Bunting and Smith (1993) provided guidelines to carry out strong-convective wind damage surveys. There, the process of mapping data by locating images taken during the fieldwork was challenging due to non-digital cameras and the absence of Global Navigation Satellite System incorporated on these devices. Both documents recommended to complement surface observations with aerial images if available and, in the second one, it was also explained how to treat with direct witnesses and propounded to ask them for specific information about the event and damage. On the other hand, the analysis of historical events such as Gayà (2007) and Holzer et al. (2018) showed the utility of press references and in-situ images taken by witnesses on reconstructing tornado damage paths. They pointed out the necessity of geo-referencing the locations where photos were taken and the damaged elements, using GIS tools and triangulation methods. Furthermore, Holzer et al. (2018) provided useful indications for current fieldworks, such as visiting affected areas as soon as possible and also to provide an estimation of the wind intensity for each damaged element given by the pair Damage Indicator-Degree of Damage (DI-DoD) from the EF-scale (WSEC, 2006), similarly to other authors such as Burgess et al. (2014). During the first decade of the current century, the use of GPS receivers or similar systems was extended on in-situ damage assessments to geolocate gathered data, as discussed in Edwards et al. (2013). Moreover, the use of aerial imagery from helicopter (e.g., Fujita, 1981; Bech et al., 2009) and high-resolution satellites (e.g., Molthan et al., 2014; Chernokulsky and Shikhov, 2018) has also been frequent to analyse damage swaths. Recently, drones have been raised as a new device which might be useful to, at least, complement surface surveys (Bai et al., 2017).”.

Minor comments

line 2: Replace „extension” with „extent”.

Done.

lines 4–5: „[...] (i.e., tornado, downburst, straight-line winds)”.

Done.

line 5: „[...] between 2004–2018”.

Done.

line 6: „systematic collection of images”? This is also repeated toward the end of the phrase.

Here we would like to emphasise that pictures of damage are taken during the fieldwork by surveyors, whereas images of the phenomenon are taken by direct witnesses and gathered by the damage survey team. We have rewritten the sentence as “The methodology includes the collection of pictures and records of damage on man-made structures and on vegetation during the affected area in-situ visit, as well as of available Automatic Weather Station data, witness reports and images of the phenomenon, such as funnel cloud pictures, taken by casual observers.”.

line 6: The word "systematic" is used too many times in the manuscript (developing a methodology already means that will be applied systematically).

Thanks for this observation. We have removed the word “systematic” here and also from several sentences along the manuscript.

line 8: „ recorded during the damage field survey”.

We have rewritten this sentence as follows: “To synthesize the gathered data, three final deliverables are proposed:”.

line 18: „surface wind of convective origin”.

Done.

line 18–19: „(i.e., tornadoes, downbursts, straight-line winds)”.

Done.

line 19: „or even fatalities”.

Done.

line 22: „[...] devoted to the study of these phenomena”.

Done.

line 23: „(e.g., Strader et al., 2015)”.

Done.

line 24: Replace „see for example” with „e.g.”.

Done.

line 30: Replace “discriminating” with “identifying”.

We have removed this sentence.

line 36: “allows a detailed characterization”.

We have rewritten this sentence as: “wind damage fieldworks contribute to a better characterization of the affected area, making possible to estimate the length and width of the damage swath”.

lines 39–44: This paragraph needs to be rewritten and reduced for clarity; one way will be to combine this paragraph with the next one and thus to state more clearly the aim of the study.

We have rewritten for more clarity and developed the motivation part, according to this comment and also to Anonymous Referee #3: “Currently, fieldworks are usually performed to assess damage of specific strong-convective wind events, but rarely to analyse in detail most of the reported cases. The timing and economical costs, especially when helicopter flights are used, prevents to carry out fieldworks frequently (Edwards, 2020), particularly out of the USA. Therefore, there is a need for a methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events of convective origin easily reproducible anywhere, which should be efficient and optimize time and economic resources to allow analysing as much reported events as possible. This methodology may contribute to the homogeneity of severe weather reports databases, improving the knowledge of spatial-temporal distribution and characteristics of tornadoes, downbursts and straight-line winds.”.

line 44: No mention of the study area so far.

We have added a sentence briefly presenting the area of study when it is mentioned for the first time (now, in the penultimate paragraph of the Introduction): “All the analysed events have been recorded in Spain (south-western Europe), which includes a vast majority of the Iberian Peninsula and also the Balearic and Canary Islands. Nevertheless, most of these fieldworks have been carried out in Catalonia and Andalusia regions (Fig. 1), where high-densely populated areas are frequently affected by tornadoes (Bech et al., 2007, 2011; Mateo et al., 2009; Gayà et al., 2011; Sánchez-Laulhé, 2013; Riesco et al., 2015).”.

line 47–57: state more clearly the aim of the study.

As it has been explained before, we have rewritten the objective of the study in the Introduction to make it more clear.

lines 72–74: I think this example should be included in the manuscript as a section.

Thanks for this recommendation. In the first submitted version of the manuscript it was proposed a section where this event was analysed throughout results obtained from using the methodology (see <https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2019-294/nhess-2019-294.pdf>). Nevertheless, a reviewer proposed to attached it as Supplementary material. That was the motivation to remove it from the main text.

line 76: describe “previous related work”.

Here we have mentioned the cited articles which we refer to.

line 85: Remove “to geolocate damage, as mentioned previously”.

Done.

lines 84–92: Maybe this information can be summarized in a table.

We have summarized the devices which are required to perform a strong-convective wind damage survey in a table (now, Table 1), following partially this comment. Other recommendations have been remained in the main text, which has been rewritten as follows: “In Table 1 are summarized the main devices needed to carry out fieldworks throughout the proposed methodology. Moreover, as indicated in Bunting and Smith (1993) and Gayà (2018), water, food, comfortable footwear, rain jacket, spare clothes and a mobile phone spare battery are recommended, because affected areas may be far away from inhabited locations. As surveyor displacements longer than a few kilometres can be required, a well-equipped, preferably all terrain, car is necessary to save time between points-of-damage analysis. Nevertheless, difficult access areas may be found along the track, because of muddy roads and fallen trees or simply because of the absence of roads. Especially in these cases, and also to study in detail damaged areas, walking is the basic way to perform the field survey.”.

line 97: “[...] in three stages (Fig. 2)”.

Done.

lines 97–101: Add references to subsections.

Thanks. We completely agree that mentioning subsections will make more clear the article structure and it would be easier for the readers to find the information.

line 102: “To properly [...]”.

Done.

line 106–107: “[...] during the survey (Fig. 3)”.

We have removed this Figure according to Anonymous Referee #3.

line 107: “Thus, to optimize time and resources, a detailed [...]”.

Done.

line 110: “[...] reports nowadays should be collected”.

Done.

line 115–116: Why a “developed funnel cloud”? Why not a tornado? Funnel cloud may not be associated with damages. This aspect should be argued more strongly.

This is an important point, and we thank you for commenting this, because indicates that it was not clear on the text. Tornado definition implies that the vortex is in contact with the surface, causing damage if vulnerable and exposed elements are present. When we mention a developed funnel cloud instead of tornado, we are assuming that the vortex may have not been in contact with the surface and may have not produced damage. In that case (Case 2 in Fig. 2) carrying out an in-situ visit of the possible affected area would confirm if the vortex was in contact with surface (tornado) or not (only

funnel cloud without tornado). We have modified these paragraphs, also according to Anonymous Referee #3 (new line 129 to new line 145).

line 115: replace “(see Fig. 4)” with “(Fig. 4)”.

Done.

line 117: “by contacting their authors”.

Done.

line 119: “if damage reports are not available”.

Done.

line 119: Define “developed funnel cloud”.

We have included the definition of developed funnel cloud as “extended at least 50% the distance between the cloud base and surface”.

line 120–121: Provide details on how to locate these events based on radar and lightning data, or at least include references.

We have added the comment “comparing radar images and the location of precipitation features observed in photos of the event respect to the funnel cloud” and Wakimoto and Lew (1993), Wakimoto and Liu (1998) and Zehnder (2007) as references, where photogrammetry and radar observations are combined.

line 121: This sentence should be rewritten for clarity.

We have rewritten this sentence and merged with the next one: “Then, from the triangulation of those pictures of the funnel cloud it is possible to preliminarily identify a possibly affected area, which can be more precisely delimited when the number of photos or videos from different perspectives is high (Rasmussen et al., 2003).”.

line 127–130: Is this not delaying the damage survey?

The information provided by emergency services could be very useful for complementing the data gathered during in-situ damage survey. Contacting with them does not prevent surveyors to start wind damage assessment although no information is received yet, because emergency services data would be used during post in-situ survey tasks. Accordingly, we have modified the second sentence of the paragraph to clarify this fact: “This kind of information may be crucial for post in-situ damage study because clearing services might start arrangement tasks before the in-situ visit is started”.

line 134: Define “indirect eyewitnesses”.

When we mentioned indirect eyewitnesses here we wanted to refer to those people who was not in the affected area when damaging-winds took place but they know about damage. Because it could be confusing, we have removed it.

line 142: “In this case”.

Done.

line 145: Replace “relaxing” with “reducing”.

We have modified this sentence (see new line 167).

line 154: “of the damage”.

Done.

line 155: “to recover quickly”.

Done.

line 157: “(Fig. 2)”.

Done.

line 159: “[...] interviews with eyewitnesses”.

Done.

line 176: “[...] to be performed during”.

Done.

line 197: “[...] might not be”.

Done.

line 208: “(Fig. 6a)”.

Done.

line 218: Replace “To solve that” with “In this case”.

Done.

line 222: Replace “reported” with “developed”.

Done.

line 230: “[...] in their own words”.

Done.

line 238: This sentence is about photo/videos or eyewitnesses?

This sentence is about images of the event. We have rewritten the paragraph to make it clearer: “A brief and concise inquiry, with specific questions but allowing open answers that may unveil relevant information, is proposed. Recommended questions are shown in Table 3. Moreover, in some occasions a direct witness may have taken photos or videos of the phenomenon that can be helpful for the study. When pictures are available, they should be treated as described in Sect. 2.1.”.

line 262–282: Add these as bullet points.

Done.

line 328: Remove extra “)”.

Done.

lines 340–342: I do not understand this sentence.

We have modified this sentence as follows: “Despite real wind damage patterns can be very complex due to its interaction with topography or with other nearby events (Forbes and Wakimoto, 1983; Cannon et al., 2016), theoretical-idealized damage swath patterns of both tornado and downburst wind fields can be compared with observed damage patterns in order to look for similarities to assess their possible origin.”.

line 365: “[...] how debris”.

We have changed to “the way debris is spread” to avoid repeating “how”, only few words later.

lines 368–370: The authors should comment on the results, this is just a description of the figures.


These two sentences were motivated to introduce the figure about the following discussion was centred. Nevertheless, according to this comment we have rewritten all the paragraph: “As a real example, the case shown in Fig. A2 presents fallen poplar trees following a convergence pattern: in the right-half side from the damage swath, trees are blown down to the west, whereas in the left-half side they are uprooted to the north. Comparing this real case and idealised cases (Fig. A1), this damage pattern matches well the damage swath caused by a vortex with $G = 4$ and $\alpha = 45^\circ$ (Fig. A1a). This fact along with other evidences confirm the hypothesis that damage was caused by a tornado, as presented in the Supplementary material. Moreover, it is remarkable that these vortex characteristics are also coherent with the damage rated as the lower EF1 bound and the mean translational velocity of 12 m s^{-1} , estimated using radar data from the Meteorological Service of Catalonia (not shown).”.

References: Some of the abbreviations for the journals are not in the correct format (e.g., B. Am, Meteorolog. Soc. should be Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.).

Thanks for noticing this issue. We have carefully looked at other papers published in Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Science and we have checked that the abbreviation for BAMS used there is “B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.”, which we used to replace “B. Am. Meteorolog. Soc.”. We have also revised the rest of references.

Figure 1: This figure is incomplete, see the inset map.

Thanks for pointing out this misunderstanding. We have changed the shaded colour of surrounding countries -and labelled them- to remark the area of study (Spain). The name of the two main Spanish archipelagos (Balearic and Canary Islands) have also been indicated. We hope that these changes may help to clearly locate the region of interest. Moreover, we have added the following sentence in figure caption to indicate the meaning of black and grey contours in the map: “Black contours delimitate regions and grey lines, provinces.”.



Anonymous Referee #3

I really appreciate the efforts made by authors; the manuscript improved with respect to the previous version. Especially, I think that the explanation of the methodology in subsequent steps (i.e. pre in-situ survey tasks, in-situ survey tasks, and post in-situ survey tasks) really supports its understanding, as well as the inclusion of a flow chart. However, the paper still suffers from some criticalities, which prevent its publication in the present form. In the following, such criticalities are explained in detail with also some specific comments. However, I reserve to work in deeper on minor specific comments, if/when a further version of the manuscript will be submitted.

Main criticalities

Objective of the survey. The objective of the survey is still not really clear or, at least, is not univocally defined. If authors state that the objective of the study is to propose “a methodology to conduct damage survey” or “to represent the damage scenario”, I expect that the main output of the procedure is a damage assessment/map/report. This is not the case here where damage is used as proxy to estimate hazard (i.e. wind) features, along with other type of data (e.g. satellite imagery, data from Doppler radar, lightning detection systems, AWS). This is clearly explained in conclusions: i.e. “The purpose of the presented methodology is to provide a systematic and easily-reproducible methodology to carry out strong-convective wind event (damage, I would delete) surveys, mainly based on gathering geolocated information about damaged man-made structures and vegetation, with the final aim of representing the damage scenario to study the event from a meteorological point of view”, but it is ambiguously described in the whole manuscript.

Thank you for this detailed and constructive comment. In the introduction it was specified, separately, the main objective of the paper (to provide a methodology to perform damage surveys) and of the methodology (to represent the damage scenario to study strong-convective winds phenomena from a meteorological point of view, which was very similarly exposed in Conclusions). Nevertheless, according to this comment, we have rewritten more clearly that the aim of the methodology it is not only gathering data of damaged elements, but also witness experiences, and AWS and remote-sensing data for a further analysis of strong-convective wind events. Therefore, in the new submitted version it is stated in the Introduction as: “Therefore, the main goal of the proposed methodology is to gather as much geo-referenced information as possible about relevant damaged elements (i.e. man-made structures and vegetation) to reproduce the damage scenario and complement it with other available data (witness enquiries, Automatic Weather Station -AWS- located close to the affected area, and remote-sensing data) to analyse strong-convective winds phenomena from a meteorological point of view.”; and in Conclusions as: “The purpose of this article is to provide an easily reproducible methodology to carry out surface strong-convective wind event damage surveys, which optimize time and economic resources. It is mainly based on collecting geolocated information about damaged man-made structures and vegetation, with the final aim of representing the damage scenario to study the event from a meteorological point of view. Complementary data from AWS close to the affected area and witness reports should also be gathered if available, and remote-sensing data should be used to get a deeper understanding of the convective storm event.”.

I recommend authors to check the manuscript in this regard, and to avoid the use of “wind damage survey”, in favour of a more-general “wind field survey”.

We agree that the term “wind field survey” would be more general. However, we believe that in order to be consistent with the terminology used in the related literature it is important to keep the term “wind damage survey” for two reasons. Firstly, the survey methodology we propose is motivated by the occurrence of damaging winds of convective origin. Secondly, the estimation of wind conditions (intensity and direction wind field patterns, type of convective phenomenon) is done through recognition of wind effects upon damaged elements and therefore the analysis is implicitly considered only, again, for damaging winds. For these two reasons we think that the use of the term “wind damage survey” is more appropriate and precise than “wind field survey”.

Methodology. The organisation of the procedure in three steps supports readers in its understanding; the same could be ideally state for the flow chart. Unfortunately, the flow chart presently does not reproduce the procedure, which may hamper paper readability. As a first issue, the flow chart does not report many aspects of the procedure described in the text, which should be instead included. In particular, according to the text, step 1 (i.e. pre in-situ tasks) is not limited to (geo)locating damage/affected area on the bases of damage or developed funnel cloud reports (as presently described in Figure 2) but it also includes:

- Preliminary gathering of information about damage location and images available on the media and social networks
- Contacting emergency services and local authorities to verify if they recorded detailed damage data
- Analysing satellite and weather radar imagery to estimate the approximate timing of the event and the movement of the convective parent storm that may have produced the phenomenon
- checking the wind climatology of the studied area
- verifying if the studied area has been affected recently by another damaging windstorm or by a heavy snowfall which may have produced widespread damage in forest

Likewise, according to the text, final deliverables are not created only on the bases of surveyed damage data (as presently indicated in the flow chart) but also considering meteorological remote-sensing data (collected ex-post the in-situ survey, according to the text) like satellite imagery, data from Doppler radar, lightning detection systems and AWS. On the opposite, the flow chart identifies collection of AWS data, information on previous events, etc. as part of step 2 (i.e. in-situ survey), differently than what declared in the text.

We are very thankful for the constructive recommendations and comments given. We have rebuilt the flow diagram following them and being coherent with the main text. It has been added two process boxes into the first step -after the report receiving-, which are “Search information/images about the event on media and social networks” and, following, “Contact with local authorities and emergency services”. Moreover, before starting the second step, one more process box has been incorporated, where it is mentioned the necessity of analysing meteorological data to define the timing of the event, the translational direction of the convective cell, the wind climatology of the

affected area and if there has been any recent damaging event in the region of study. Note that in the main text (Sect. 2.2), when in-situ survey tasks are briefly presented, it is explained that, although during pre in-situ survey tasks it is recommended to search for AWS data in the area, it is also suggested to search other AWS during the fieldwork which were previously unknown. Moreover, it is pointed out the valuable information that outdoor security cameras may provide. Finally, the third step has been also restructured to clarify how to proceed after performing the fieldwork.

A second issue relates to the aspects presently included in the flow chart. In particular:

(1) which process/action must be performed in the rectangular box “Only developed funnel cloud report available” in step 1?


In fact, it is not an action; it is a result (that only developed funnel cloud is reported, without known damage). We have corrected the error by changing the process (rectangular) box for a data box.

(2) Question in the decision box in step 3 is not correctly formulated. According to Figure 2, if one is in case 1, no deliverables are produced, but this is not the case.

Thanks for this detailed analysis. We have reorganized the flow chart to show specifically that in case 1 the set of three deliverables are generated, according to the text.

I strongly suggest authors to redraft the working flow being coherent with the text.

We attach below the new version of the flow chart.



Standardisation. Authors introduced Table 1 and Table 3 in order to better explain the “standardization” of the methodology; these certainly help. However, I think that some aspects of the methodology are still not standardised. For instance, is there any pre-defined form to be used in field survey? e.g. by reporting the DI-DoD for each affected elements, data to be surveyed and format, etc.; this is critical to gain objective data. In particular, the implementation of the EF-scale for non-expert readers is problematic, for the full comprehension of the

procedure. I strongly recommend authors to include a brief explanation of the procedure in the text or a full explanation as supplementary material.

All the data to be surveyed and gathered is indicated on the manuscript (i.e., latitude; longitude; previous weakness -and images- of each damaged element; fall of direction for uprooted tree; trunk perimeter for snapped tree; distance between the final position and the origin of an object displaced by the wind and direction; weight of an object of interest moved by the wind). There is not any pre-defined form to be used during the fieldwork because we have seen during damage assessments performed that there are other useful and easy ways to gather them, which is now explained in Subsection 2.2: “All the in-situ measurements are related to geo-referenced damaged elements. To reduce the time of registering data in order to proceed to the visit of other affected areas, it is proposed to take a photo from the measuring device showing clearly the data (Fig. 5), following the order proposed in Table 2 (from V5 to V10). After that, a photo of the damaged element should be taken, whose metadata already contains latitude and longitude. Therefore, surveyors can associate each measure to each geolocated element during the post in-situ tasks when organising the records gathered in the fieldwork.”. We have also added a new figure (attached below, now Fig. 5) to better illustrate this procedure.



We agree that EF-scale application may be problematic for experts and non-experts (in Discussion section these challenges are explained). Nevertheless, the use of damage rating scales is the most common method to estimate the wind intensity. As indicated in the main text, the task of assigning a DI-DoD pair for each damaged element can be carried out during damage assessment, although we recommend doing it during the post in-situ damage survey analysis to optimize time. When surveyors have to carry on damage rating tasks, they consult specific documents such as WSEC (2006), a document to which readers are also referred (new line 195 to new line 198 and new line 205 to new line 209).

At last, how measure uncertainty in table 1 has been defined should be documented in the paper.

Thanks for this comment. We may did not expressed in the exact way what these errors mean. They are the maximum uncertainty recommended for each measure (in the new submitted version we have specified it on Table caption). We consider that data with greater errors may not be useful to proceed on the analysis (i.e., increasing error in

coordinates could provide deficiencies on length/width damage path estimation; in fall direction of trees would alter the estimated wind field and make more difficult to know which phenomenon took place, etc.). We have added a new paragraph commenting these considerations in the main text (Subsection 2.2; new line 190 to new line 192).

Discussion This section is weak. First, only main difficulties in implementing the methodology are discussed, while no discussion is done on its strengths. For example, in section 2 authors state “The methodology to carry out damage surveys must be efficient, making possible to visit the affected area in the shortest possible time. It must be also easily reproducible and its results should be accurate”. Does the proposed methodology satisfy these requirements? A discussion would be welcome.

Likewise, in the introduction authors state that, besides supporting the interpretation of the phenomena from a meteorological point of view, the procedure can (ideally) support others objectives like: insurance compensation, increased understanding of exposure and vulnerability to winds, improved wind intensity rating scales. Does the procedure, in its present form, actually support this objectives? While I am quite sure that compensation from insurance companies can be supported, I am not sure that the present collected data can support the other two objectives. Also in this case, a discussion would be welcome.

We appreciate this comment. In the new submitted version we have rewritten and reorganised this section, discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology (as proposed) and the use that can be made from the gathered data (please, see Section 3 in the manuscript).

Second, regarding “difficulties”, the explanation of how “the wind phenomenon type can be determined from forest damage patterns” is not a difficulty of the methodology but rather an example of how collected data can be used. This part should be put in a separate section, or removed from the paper (in fact, in my point of view, it is more in line with the supplement than with the main document).

Thanks for the comment. We agree that the determination of the strong-convective wind phenomenon type is not a handicap of the presented methodology, but a difficulty for the interpretation of results from fieldwork. For this reason, we think that it is interesting for readers to show how to relate forest damage pattern with phenomenon type. Therefore, we propound to attach this subsection as an Appendix, with the aim of providing a guide for future strong-convective wind damage surveyors to analyse fieldwork data.

Specific comments

Abstract “high-impact weather events such as floods or strong wind events” → I would not define floods as weather events, maybe weather related events?

We have made this change.

Pg. 2 line 25 → please, check if “survey assessment” is properly used here

We have removed this sentence.

Pg. 2 line 28 “When these phenomena affect a sparsely populated area, or they occur in a low visibility environment due to night darkness or intense precipitation, there is usually a lack of direct witnesses and recorded images. In that case, the task of assessing the damage intensity and discriminating if it was caused by a tornado, a downburst or another type of convective winds can be very challenging” → this sentence is not linked with previous and following ones, consider removing.

According this comment and the following one, both paragraphs (line 25 to line 38 from the previous submitted version of the manuscript) have been merged and rewritten: “The systematic elaboration of post-event forensic in-situ field surveys is still the standard way to evaluate the damage caused by a strong-convective wind event (Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2012; Zanini et al., 2017), despite the recent progress on assessing wind damage using remote sensing data such as high resolution radar observations (Wurman et al., 2013; Wakimoto et al., 2018). A detailed damage analysis from these meteorological phenomena allows to estimate the wind intensity using a wind damage scale such as the Fujita scale (F-scale, Fujita, 1981) or the Enhanced Fujita scale (EF-scale, WSEC, 2006). Similarly to field surveys of hailstorms (Farnell et al., 2009) or floods (Molinari et al., 2014; Li et al., 2018), wind damage fieldworks contribute to a better characterization of the affected area, making possible to estimate the length and width of the damage swath (e.g., Burgess et al., 2014; Meng and Yao, 2014; Bech et al., 2015). Moreover, in-situ damage survey are especially useful to determine which phenomenon took place when there is an absence of observations by analysing damage patterns on forest and how debris is spread (Hall and Brewer, 1959; Holland et al., 2006; Bech et al., 2009; Beck and Dotzek, 2010; Rhee and Lombardo, 2018). This information can be added to natural hazards databases such as the USA Storm Prediction Center Severe Weather Database (Verbout et al., 2006) or the European Severe Weather Database (Dotzek et al., 2009), making possible building up robust and homogeneous datasets.”.

Pg. 2 line 33 “... the systematic elaboration of post-event forensic field surveys is still the standard way to evaluate the damage caused by these meteorological phenomena” → this concept has been already explained few lines above (line 25); please, pay attention to repetitions

Thanks for this comment. As it has been explained in the previous item, the paragraph from where this sentence was part of has been rewritten.

Pg. 2 lines 39-46 → Discussion on motivation is quite poor. Please, elaborate more.

We have rewritten this part, according to this comment and also to Anonymous Referee #1: “Currently, fieldworks are usually performed to assess damage of specific strong-convective wind events, but rarely to analyse in detail most of the reported cases. The timing and economical costs, especially when helicopter flights are used, prevents to carry out fieldworks frequently (Edwards, 2020), particularly out of the USA. Therefore, there is a need for a methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events of convective origin easily reproducible anywhere, which should be efficient and optimize time and economic resources to allow analysing as much reported events as possible. This methodology may contribute to the homogeneity of severe weather reports databases, improving the knowledge of spatial-temporal distribution and characteristics of tornadoes, downbursts and straight-line winds.”.

Pg. 2 lines 53-61 → I would move the discussion/presentation of further uses of collected data in the discussion section (see also main criticalities)

We have moved this part to discussion section and expanded.

Pg. 3 line 77 → I think that Deliverable 1 is more than a “a summary of fieldwork” as it also includes data elaboration/interpretation (like characterisation of the event); please, consider rename/reclassify the deliverable

We agree with this comment and, therefore, we propose to rename this deliverable as “text report of the event”.

Pg. 3 line 84 “Smartphone or cameras with GPS image geolocation and orientation (azimuth pointing) capabilities provide essential data to carry out a fieldwork in order to geolocate damage, as mentioned previously” → this concept has been already explain few lines above (line 79); please, pay attention to repetitions

According to Anonymous Refree #1 we have listed required devices on a table, so we have removed this sentence.

Pg. 5 line 143 “wind speed damage thresholds may be higher than in non-windy regions” → which thresholds are authors referring to? Not clear at this point of the manuscript

In this sentence, we are referring, in general, to the wind speed over which an element can be damaged. We have rewritten as follows: “wind speed thresholds over which an element can be damaged may be higher than in non-windy regions.”.

Pg. 9 line 264 “this part also must contain the start and end date and time (in UTC)” → inclusion of time data has been already discussed few lines above (line 262); please, pay attention to repetitions

Thanks for this comment. We have removed the first time reference.

Pg. 13 line 383 → please, check if “survey assessment data” is properly used here

We have changed “survey assessment data” for “in-situ damage survey data”.

Figure 2 → please, amend as suggested (see main criticalities)

Done.

Figure 3 → please, consider removing; no added information for text comprehensibility

We have removed this Figure, according to this consideration.

Figure 5 → no reference is made in the text

Figure 5 (now, Figure 4) was already cited in the main text in Section 2.1 (Line 138 of the previous version manuscript) when it was discussed the importance of gathering high-temporal resolution data from AWS located close to the affected area. In the new version we have emphasised on the typical pattern that wind velocity and direction presents in temporal series when a vortex or a downburst passes close to the instruments: “High-temporal resolution wind data series during the passage of a tornado are usually characterized by a sudden increase of wind speed and a swift direction shift, as it is shown in Figure 4. By contrast, although a downburst event is also

described by a wind strengthening, there is a predominant wind direction without relevant changes (Orf et al., 2012).”.

Figure 9, caption → please, remove the typo “Map symbols indicate locations of damage in man-made structures (house icons) and fallen tree or damaged vegetation element (arrow or circle icons if no direction is available)”.

We have corrected the sentence “Map symbols indicate locations of AWS (orange weathervane), damage in man-made structures (house icon) and fallen trees or damaged vegetation elements (arrow and circle icon if no direction is available, respectively).”

A methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events of convective origin

Oriol Rodríguez¹, Joan Bech¹, Juan de Dios Soriano², Delia Gutiérrez², and Salvador Castán³

¹Department of Applied Physics - Meteorology, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, 08028, Spain

5 ²Agencia Estatal de Meteorología, Sevilla, 41092, Spain

³Agencia Pericial, Cornellà de Llobregat, 08940, Spain

Correspondence to: Oriol Rodríguez (orodriguez@meteo.ub.edu)

Abstract. Post-event damage assessments are of paramount importance to document the effects of high-impact weather-related events such as floods or strong wind events. Moreover, evaluating the damage and characterizing its extent and intensity can be essential for further analysis such as completing a diagnostic meteorological case study. This paper presents a methodology to perform field surveys of damage caused by strong winds of convective origin (i.e., tornado, downburst and straight-line winds). It is based on previous studies and also on 136 fieldworks performed by the authors in Spain between 2004 and 2018. The methodology includes the collection of pictures and records of damage on man-made structures and on vegetation during the affected area in-situ visit, as well as of available Automatic Weather Station data, witness reports and images of the phenomenon, such as funnel cloud pictures, taken by casual observers. To synthesize the gathered data, three final deliverables are proposed: (i). A standardised text report of the analysed event; (ii). A table consisting of detailed geolocated information about each damage point and other relevant data, and (iii). A map or a KML file containing the previous information ready for graphical display and further analysis. This methodology has been applied by the authors in the past, sometimes only a few hours after the event occurrence and, in many occasions, when the type of convective phenomenon was uncertain. In those uncertain cases, the information resulting from this methodology contributed effectively to discern the phenomenon type thanks to the damage patterns analysis, particularly if no witness reports were available. The application of methodologies as the one presented here is necessary in order to build homogeneous and robust databases of severe weather cases and high impact weather events.

1 Introduction

25 Meteorological phenomena associated with strong surface wind of convective origin (i.e., tornadoes, downbursts, straight-line winds) can cause important disruption to socio-economic activity, including injuries or even fatalities despite their local character compared to larger scale mid-latitude synoptic windstorms or tropical storms. For example, from 1950 to 2015, tornadoes in Europe caused 4,462 injuries, 316 fatalities and economic losses of at least €1 billion (Antonescu et al., 2016, 2017). Due to their economic and social impact, a large number of previous studies have been devoted to the study of these

30 phenomena both from the point of view of their consequences (e.g., Strader et al., 2015) or specifically from a meteorological point of view (e.g., Taszarek et al., 2017; Miller and Mote, 2018 or Rodríguez and Bech, 2018).

The systematic elaboration of post-event forensic in-situ field surveys is still the standard way to evaluate the damage caused by a strong-convective wind event (Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2012; Zanini et al., 2017), despite the recent progress on assessing wind damage using remote sensing data such as high resolution radar observations (Wurman et al., 2013; Wakimoto et al., 2018). A detailed damage analysis from these meteorological phenomena allows to estimate the wind intensity using a wind damage scale such as the Fujita scale (F-scale, Fujita, 1981) or the Enhanced Fujita scale (EF-scale, WSEC, 2006). Similarly to field surveys of hailstorms (Farnell et al., 2009) or floods (Molinari et al., 2014; Li et al., 2018), wind damage fieldworks contribute to a better characterization of the affected area, making possible to estimate the length and width of the damage swath (e.g., Burgess et al., 2014; Meng and Yao, 2014; Bech et al., 2015). Moreover, in-situ damage survey are especially useful to determine which phenomenon took place when there is an absence of observations by analysing damage patterns on forest and how debris is spread (Hall and Brewer, 1959; Holland et al., 2006; Bech et al., 2009; Beck and Dotzek, 2010; Rhee and Lombardo, 2018). This information can be added to natural hazards databases such as the USA Storm Prediction Center Severe Weather Database (Verbout et al., 2006) or the European Severe Weather Database (Dotzek et al., 2009), making possible building up robust and homogeneous datasets.

McDonald and Marshall (1984) and Bunting and Smith (1993) provided guidelines to carry out strong-convective wind damage surveys. There, the process of mapping data by locating images taken during the fieldwork was challenging due to non-digital cameras and the absence of Global Navigation Satellite System incorporated on these devices. Both documents recommended to complement surface observations with aerial images if available and, in the second one, it was also explained how to treat with direct witnesses and propounded to ask them for specific information about the event and damage. On the other hand, the analysis of historical events such as Gayà (2007) and Holzer et al. (2018) showed the utility of press references and in-situ images taken by witnesses on reconstructing tornado damage paths. They pointed out the necessity of georeferencing the locations where photos were taken and the damaged elements, using GIS tools and triangulation methods. Furthermore, Holzer et al. (2018) provided useful indications for current fieldworks, such as visiting affected areas as soon as possible and also to provide an estimation of the wind intensity for each damaged element given by the pair Damage Indicator-Degree of Damage (DI-DoD) from the EF-scale (WSEC, 2006), similarly to other authors such as Burgess et al. (2014). During the first decade of the current century, the use of GPS receivers or similar systems was extended on in-situ damage assessments to geolocate gathered data, as discussed in Edwards et al. (2013). Moreover, the use of aerial imagery from helicopter (e.g., Fujita, 1981; Bech et al., 2009) and high-resolution satellites (e.g., Molthan et al., 2014; Chernokulsky and Shikhov, 2018) has also been frequent to analyse damage swaths. Recently, drones have been raised as a new device which might be useful to, at least, complement surface surveys (Bai et al., 2017).

Currently, fieldworks are usually performed to assess damage of specific strong-convective wind events, but rarely to analyse in detail most of the reported cases. The timing and economical costs, especially when helicopter flights are used, prevents to carry out fieldworks frequently (Edwards, 2020), particularly out of the USA. Therefore, there is a need for a

methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events of convective origin easily reproducible anywhere, which should be efficient and optimize time and economic resources to allow analysing as much reported events as possible. This methodology may contribute to the homogeneity of severe weather reports databases, improving the knowledge of spatial-temporal distribution and characteristics of tornadoes, downbursts and straight-line winds.

The objective of this paper is to propose a methodology to conduct in-situ damage surveys of strong wind events from convective origin. It can contribute to improve the detection, mapping and characterization of wind damage in a homogeneous way, which is important to better describe specific meteorological phenomena, with the particularities associated with damage from convective local storms. Therefore, the main goal of the proposed methodology is to gather as much geo-referenced information as possible about relevant damaged elements (i.e. man-made structures and vegetation) to reproduce the damage scenario and complement it with other available data (witness enquiries, Automatic Weather Station -AWS- located close to the affected area, and remote-sensing data) to analyse strong-convective winds phenomena from a meteorological point of view.

The methodology presented here is based on previous studies (McDonald and Marshall, 1984; Bunting and Smith, 1993; Gayà, 2018; Holzer et al., 2018) and also on 136 wind damage surveys performed between 2004 and 2018 by the authors. All the analysed events have been recorded in Spain (south-western Europe), which includes a vast majority of the Iberian Peninsula and also the Balearic and Canary Islands. Nevertheless, most of these fieldworks have been carried out in Catalonia and Andalusia regions (Fig. 1), where high-densely populated areas are frequently affected by tornadoes (Bech et al., 2007, 2011; Mateo et al., 2009; Gayà et al., 2011; Sánchez-Laulhé, 2013; Riesco et al., 2015). The proposal includes the collection of pictures and records of damage on man-made structures and on vegetation, as well as AWS data available, witness reports and images of the phenomenon together with their location and orientation. Three final deliverables are suggested to synthesize the data recorded: (i). A text report of the analysed event; (ii). A table consisting of detailed geolocated information and, (iii). A map or a KML (Keyhole Markup Language) file containing the previous information ready for graphical display and further analysis.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes in detail the field survey methodology proposed. In Sect. 3 specific strengths and limitations of the methodology are discussed, as well as possible uses of fieldwork data. Finally, Sect. 4 presents a summary and final conclusions of the study. As Supplementary material, an example of deliverables (text report, table and KML file) of a damage survey of a recent tornadic event is provided with the aim to better illustrate the methodology proposed and to facilitate its application.

2 METHODOLOGY

As stated in Bunting and Smith (1993) and Doswell (2003), the basic idea behind wind damage surveys is collecting as much information as possible about the relevant consequences of the convective phenomenon, geolocating properly the damage. The methodology to carry out damage surveys must be efficient, allowing to visit the affected area in the shortest

time possible. It must be also easily reproducible, and its results should be accurate. Geolocating damage using pictures or videos recorded with smartphones, or cameras with a Global Navigation Satellite System such as GPS fulfils these conditions (Edwards et al., 2013). Nevertheless, as it happens with other types of damage assessments, there are inherent uncertainties that should be taken into account when analysing field data (Beven et al., 2018), like possible GPS location errors or ambiguous application of intensity-rating assessments due to EF-scale limitations, which are discussed on Sect. 3.

In Table 1 are summarized the main devices needed to carry out fieldworks throughout the proposed methodology. Moreover, as indicated in Bunting and Smith (1993) and Gayà (2018), water, food, comfortable footwear, rain jacket, spare clothes and a mobile phone spare battery are recommended, because affected areas may be far away from inhabited locations. As surveyor displacements longer than a few kilometres can be required, a well-equipped, preferably all terrain, car is necessary to save time between points-of-damage analysis. Nevertheless, difficult access areas may be found along the track, because of muddy roads and fallen trees or simply because of the absence of roads. Especially in these cases, and also to study in detail damaged areas, walking is the basic way to perform the field survey.

Despite this may not be always feasible, it would be ideal that the damage survey team was multidisciplinary, being formed by meteorologists, insurance inspectors, forestry engineers and architects experienced on damage assessments, preferably familiar with damage reporting systems such as the EF-scale. This would facilitate an accurate and detailed analysis of the damage and the phenomenon intensity.

The proposed methodology is organized in three stages (Fig. 2). The first step includes pre in-situ damage survey tasks, preparing the actual visit of the damaged area (Sect. 2.1). Secondly, the in-situ fieldwork tasks, which include direct gathering of man-made structure and vegetation damage information, and also direct witness experiences (Sect. 2.2). Finally, post in-situ damage assessment tasks, which involve ordering and organising all the information collected into three deliverables (a text report of the event, a geolocated information table and a data location map; Sect. 2.3).

2.1 PRE IN-SITU SURVEY TASKS

To properly prepare the damage survey, a number of previous tasks must be performed. One of them is planning the route of the in-situ survey. As mentioned in Holzer et al. (2018) it is strongly recommended to start damage surveys as soon as possible, especially if urban areas have been affected. Emergency and clearing services may start repairing tasks only a few hours after the event, which can alter the quality and quantity of possible information available during the survey. Thus, to optimize time and resources, a detailed planning is necessary to carry out the field survey.

Firstly, preliminary information should be collected about damage location and images available on the media and social networks, which are the main providers of strong-convective winds reports nowadays (Hyvärinen and Saltikoff, 2010; Knox et al., 2013; Kryvasheyeu et al., 2016). Citizen science collaborative platforms covering different geographical domains such as the European Severe Weather Database (ESWD, Dotzek et al., 2009), the severe weather database of the Spanish Meteorological Agency (SINOBAS, Gutiérrez et al., 2015) or the meteorological spotters platform of the Meteorological Service of Catalonia (XOM, Ripoll et al., 2016), are also examples of valuable sources of tornado and downburst reports.

These reports may contain information about damage and/or a developed funnel cloud (i.e., extended at least 50% the distance between the cloud base and surface). Funnel clouds (Fig. 3) are a typical feature of tornadic storms though sometimes may form without developing a tornado, i.e. when the air rotating column associated with the funnel does not reach the ground. When damage reports are available (Case 1 in Fig. 2), their location should be found by contacting their authors and/or using GIS cartography, proceeding as the case described in Holzer et al. (2018). Applications such as Google Street View can be very useful to carry out this task.

Nevertheless, if damage reports are not available but only developed funnel cloud images are reported (Case 2 in Fig. 2) then authors have to be asked for the location where photos were taken and their orientation. If for any reason this information is not accessible, it should be estimated from meteorological observations such as weather radar and satellite imagery (e.g., comparing radar images and the location of precipitation features observed in photos of the event respect to the funnel cloud, as described by Wakimoto and Lew, 1993; Wakimoto and Liu, 1998; Zehnder, 2007) and GIS cartography. Then, from the triangulation of those pictures of the funnel cloud it is possible to preliminarily identify a possibly affected area, which can be more precisely delimited when the number of photos or videos from different perspectives is high (Rasmussen et al., 2003). However, at this stage it has to be kept in mind the possibility that the funnel cloud may have not produced damage, either due to the lack of man-made structures or trees in the area intercepted by the tornado, or because the strong rotation associated to the funnel cloud actually did not touch down. This possibility will be verified during the in-situ survey tasks.

Contacting emergency services and local authorities can also provide valuable information, as they may record detailed damage data, especially if an urban area is affected. This kind of information may be crucial for post in-situ damage study because clearing services might start arrangement tasks before the in-situ visit is started. Occasionally, they may take damage aerial recordings, which can be very useful to complement the damage survey assessment.

Analysis of satellite and weather radar imagery is required to estimate the approximate timing of the event and the movement of the convective parent storm that may have produced the phenomenon. That information should be considered in order to extend the initial evidences of a preliminary damage path (looking for possible initial and ending damage path points) and to assess the consistence of reports by eyewitnesses.

On the other hand, existing AWS in the area of interest can play an important role to determine the phenomenon type, the timing of the event and also to estimate the wind strength (Letchford and Chay, 2002; Karstens et al., 2010). Therefore, it is strongly recommended to search and locate all weather stations in the area of study, requesting the data with the maximum temporal resolution, and performing basic quality control (time consistency and comparison with official observations) before use. High-temporal resolution wind data series during the passage of a tornado are usually characterized by a sudden increase of wind speed and a swift direction shift, as it is shown in Figure 4. By contrast, although a downburst event is also described by a wind strengthening, there is a predominant wind direction without relevant changes (Orf et al., 2012).

Another important task before starting the actual in-situ damage assessment is to check the wind climatology of the studied area, particularly in windy regions (either because of the orography or the prevailing synoptic conditions; Feuerstein

et al., 2011). In this case, man-made structures and vegetation are adapted to resist strong winds –sometimes from specific directions– and wind speed thresholds over which an element can be damaged may be higher than in non-windy regions. Therefore, if a weak tornado or microburst affects a region usually influenced by strong winds, it is possible that little or no damage is found. Similarly, the application of an intensity damage scale in very windy regions may require some adjustments -i.e. increasing the wind speed thresholds for specific damages- as discussed in Feuerstein et al. (2011).

In some occasions, the studied area may have been affected recently by another damaging windstorm or by a heavy snowfall which may have produced widespread damage in forests – for example due to wet snow as described in Bech et al. (2013) and Llasat et al. (2014). In those cases, the data collection process may be hampered by possible overlapping damage and, consequently, great care must be taken to identify the most recent one. A possible way to mitigate this problem is asking locals about previous events and paying attention to the dryness from affected trees and broken branches, which can indicate if forest damage is recent or not.

2.2 IN-SITU SURVEY TASKS

To avoid alterations of the damage scenario due to clearing services, the fieldwork should preferably start on the most resilient areas, i.e. where socio-economic activity is more intense and are more likely to recover quickly. The proposed priority order is to visit urban areas first, then damaged electrical transmission or telecommunication lines, industrial parks and urban parks and, finally, forest and other surrounding areas (Fig. 2).

As a general principle, the highest possible number of relevant damaged elements should be analysed on the affected area, both man-made structures and natural (vegetation) elements. Moreover, if any previously unknown AWS is detected during the fieldwork, it should be considered to contact with its owner asking for data. The same process should be carried out for outdoor security cameras, which may record the event and could provide valuable information in order to determine which phenomenon took place. Interviews with eyewitnesses, which can provide key information about the event and other damaged areas, are also very important.

All the in-situ measurements are related to geo-referenced damaged elements. To reduce the time of registering data in order to proceed to the visit of other affected areas, it is proposed to take a photo from the measuring device showing clearly the data (Fig. 5), following the order proposed in Table 2 (from V5 to V10). After that, a photo of the damaged element should be taken, whose metadata already contains latitude and longitude. Therefore, surveyors can associate each measure to each geolocated element during the post in-situ tasks when organising the records gathered in the fieldwork.

Note also that Table 2 lists maximum uncertainties recommended for each measure type. Values with greater uncertainties could modify results from the data analysis (e.g., increasing fall tree direction error may alter the derived wind field or greater errors on coordinates may yield unrealistic estimates of damage swath length and width). The next subsections cover all these aspects in more detail.

2.2.1 MAN-MADE STRUCTURES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT

Man-made structural damage analysis is essential to estimate the phenomenon wind intensity, for example using the EF-scale. As explained in WSEC (2006), the Enhanced Fujita scale considers several Degrees of Damage (DoD) from a total of 23 Damage Indicators (DI) related to constructions and 3 DI from other man-made structures that can be used to determine the 3-seconds wind gust speed associated to these damages.

In the present methodology it is proposed to geolocate every damaged structure on the affected area, whose coordinates (latitude and longitude) can be obtained from the GPS receiver of the photo camera (with a precision greater than $\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ deg., see Table 2). It is also convenient to take one or more pictures from each damaged element, both general and detailed views that may be of interest to evaluate the damage intensity (Marshall, 2012; Roueche and Prevatt, 2013). These photos should also be used during the post in-situ damage survey analysis to study which type of strong convective wind phenomenon caused the damage.

Moreover, for each affected man-made structure, the pair of DI-DoD data values should be provided by using an intensity-rating scale as the EF-scale, as proposed by several authors such as Burgess et al. (2014) and Holzer et al. (2018). This task can be carried out during the damage survey, but it is recommended to be performed during the post in-situ damage assessment analysis. The main reason is to optimize the time and sources devoted to the in-situ survey. In case that no DI could be associated to the damaged element, it should be explicitly shown as 'unrated'.

It is highly recommendable to check the maintenance status of the damaged man-made structures to avoid a biased intensity determination. Previous weaknesses or deficiencies on construction can make structures more vulnerable to strong winds and so a higher Degree of Damage might be caused for an expected wind speed (Doswell et al., 2009). For example, if an absence of anchors or the presence of rust on metal beams from a roof are observed, this should be explicitly documented by pictures and a brief description to be taken into account when a damage-rating scale is applied, as already proposed by Fujita (1992).

The estimated trajectory and distance covered by wind-borne debris, as well as its size and weight, may also provide valuable information to estimate wind velocity associated to the studied phenomenon (Knox et al., 2013). Therefore, it is recommended to measure the dragged or flying distance and direction of objects of interest, if origin and final locations are known, using a tape measure or GIS tools (Table 2). It is also interesting to document its weight, either estimated consulting bibliography or measuring it by a portable balance in case of small objects (the relative error should be less than 10 %).

2.2.2 FOREST DAMAGE ASSESSMENT

As mentioned in Sect. 1 the maximum wind field (direction and intensity) associated with a strong-convective wind event can be approximately derived from the fallen trees pattern. Therefore, if a substantial number of trees are damaged to produce a clear damage pattern, a detailed forest damage study is recommended. As described in detail in the Appendix, if fallen trees present a convergence and rotational pattern along a linear path, it is likely it was caused by a tornado, whereas if

a divergent damage pattern, mostly nonlinear, is observed, the most likely cause is a downburst. This analysis is especially interesting for those cases where there is no image nor direct witness of the phenomenon to determine the damage origin.

The forest damage survey should be carried out similarly to the man-made structure damage assessment, taking pictures of every relevant damaged vegetation element and registering its location (latitude and longitude). In case of uprooted trees, the fall direction (azimuth) should be measured using a compass with, at least, 5 deg. of precision (see Table 2). However, it should be noted that fall tree directions may be influenced by local factors and might not be representative of the wind direction. For example, trees falling on a steep slope terrain (favouring one fall direction over others) or the presence of another nearby tree falling first can alter the tree direction with respect to the dominant wind. Therefore, in these cases it is recommendable not to consider the data. In case of snapped trees, trunk diameters should be measured with a measuring tape (with a minimum resolution of 5 cm; Table 2). This data can help in the damage-rating task. However, as there may be a large number of damaged trees in a forest area, it is advisable to collect data from the most representative ones (for example, where tree fall direction changes or converges, probably indicating the effects of air rotation; or where damage is most significant, and surrounding damaged trees to delimitate the damage swath width).

Damage in forest areas can be also useful to evaluate the phenomenon intensity. The EF-scale (WSEC, 2006) describes different wind velocity ranges for five Degrees of Damage (DoD), namely small limbs broken, large branches broken, trees uprooted, trunks snapped, and trees debarked with only stubs of largest branches remaining. As wind effect on trees also depends on the tree species (Foster, 1988; Fig. 6a), the EF-scale also distinguishes between softwood and hardwood trees. Thus, DI-DoD pairs for each analysed vegetation element should be provided.

Moreover, soil characteristics can affect tree stability; in case of very moist soil, or thin soil over rocky subsoil, trees can be uprooted more easily, as it is illustrated in Fig. 6b. Trees health can also alter the resistance to strong winds. As it is done for man-made structures, these debilities must be stated in the report. In order to refine intensity-rating tasks in forests, it is recommended to calculate the ratio of affected trees in 50 m x 50 m areas if possible; it can be related to the EF-scale, according to Godfrey and Peterson (2017). High-resolution aerial imagery (i.e. from helicopter or drone) can be useful to carry out this task. This analysis is especially interesting in the most severely affected forest area of the damage swath.

Most tornado damage paths are less than 5 km long; for example, in Spain only 25 % of tornado identified tracks are longer than 5 km (Gayà, 2018). Therefore, a detailed forest damage analysis is usually possible. However, in cases where damage is widespread, a complete detailed analysis may be not be feasible. In this case, it is recommended to study discontinuous segments every 250-500 metres along the expected damage path. This allows estimating the path width and looking for the damage continuity. In addition, as previously commented, aerial images can enhance the forest damage analysis, especially in case of large damage swaths and difficult access areas (Karstens et al., 2013). Alternative approaches to surveys over widespread forest damaged areas are satellite image processing, as recently developed by Molthan et al. (2014), Chernokulsky and Shikhov (2018), Shikhov and Chernokulsky (2018) and Shikhov et al. (2019).

2.2.3 WITNESS ENQUIRIES

Direct witnesses, if available, are an important source of information often essential to determine which type of strong convective wind phenomenon occurred. Witnesses experience of the event and their possible knowledge of other casual witnesses in nearby damaged locations can be very useful to complement a damage survey. In Bunting and Smith (1993) and Gayà (2018) it is noted that a direct witness may have been emotionally or physically affected by the phenomenon (for example private property damaged or close persons injured) so it is necessary to be respectful and careful during the enquiry.

It is important to let witnesses explain in their own words their experience of the event, and interviewers should avoid using key words such as tornado, downburst or gust front, particularly in those cases when the phenomenon type is not known yet. The terms used by the witness may provide valuable clues about what happened. In addition, it is necessary to consider that previous media reports can alter the explanation of witnesses; for example, if the event has already been described as a tornado in the media, even if evidences of rotation are not found in the damaged area, people will probably say that a tornado has occurred.

A brief and concise inquiry, with specific questions but allowing open answers that may unveil relevant information, is proposed. Recommended questions are shown in Table 3. Moreover, in some occasions a direct witness may have taken photos or videos of the phenomenon that can be helpful for the study. When pictures are available, they should be treated as described in Sect. 2.1.

2.3 POST IN-SITU SURVEY TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

When the in-situ damage survey is completed, the event analysis should be complemented revising meteorological remote-sensing data, which now can be compared with the records obtained in the survey. The information collected by direct witnesses, pictures, and videos usually allow to restrict the event occurrence to a temporal window of about 15 minutes to 2 hours. Satellite imagery and data from Doppler radar, lightning detection systems and AWS (particularly if located within or close to the damage swath) from the period of interest can provide the necessary information to verify that the identification of the convective structure as the responsible of the damage performed during pre in-situ damage survey was correct. In particular, the starting and ending time of the event can be estimated by checking the time when the convective structure passed over the initial and the final point of the damage swath, respectively, with an error typically less than 5 minutes. It is recommended to perform this comparison with Doppler radar observations, if available, with data in original polar coordinates keeping the highest spatial resolution (see for example Bech et al 2009; 2011; 2015). In some cases, it is even possible to estimate the mean translational velocity and direction of the convective cell, knowing the distances between initial and final damage path and the starting and ending time of the event. This can be very useful to compare theoretical surface wind vortex models with observed damage patterns over forest areas (Bech et al., 2009; see the Appendix for further details).

Finally, all the information gathered needs to be organized and archived in an easily interpretable way to analyse the strong-convective wind event. In the following subsections, three final deliverables are proposed to achieve this objective: (i).

290 A standardised **text report of the event**, (ii). A geolocated information table, and (iii). A data location map. These deliverables are illustrated explicitly with the example of the 15 October 2018 Malgrat de Mar – Massanes tornado case (see location in Fig. 1), provided as Supplementary material. **Then, according to the flow diagram shown in Fig. 2, in Case 1 and in Case 2 and new damage found, it can be concluded that a strong-convective damaging wind event (tornado, downburst, straight-line winds) occurred, whereas if a developed funnel cloud was reported and during the fieldwork no damage was found, it might**
295 **be deduced that funnel cloud did not touch down or there was not any exposed and/or vulnerable element in the tornado track to be damaged.**

2.3.1 **TEXT REPORT OF THE EVENT**

The **text report of the event** should be an overview of the analysed episode, including a brief description of the information gathered during the fieldwork and the main conclusions from the analysis of these data. The proposed deliverable
300 is divided in seven parts.

- General event information. It includes geographic data of the analysed meteorological phenomenon following current international standards for disaster reports losses (De Groeve et al., 2014), such as names and codes of country (ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 specification), regions or provinces (NUTS code) and municipalities (LAU code). This part must also contain the start and end date and time (in UTC) of the event
305 and hazard classification according to the Integrated Research on Disaster Risk peril classification and hazard glossary (IRDR, 2014), including the family, the main event and the peril type.
- Fieldwork information. It describes specific data about team members, including their affiliation and email address. Moreover, date and time of the visits, estimation of the fieldwork coverage over the total affected area and a brief description of difficult access areas should also be provided.
- Initial sources of information. It contains information available (web pages and links) on media and social
310 networks and developed funnel cloud images (if any), together with a brief explanation from the initial information gathered before starting the damage survey.
- Meteorological conditions. This part describes weather conditions before, during and after the event according to direct witnesses, the visibility (darkness, precipitation), AWS data (location and a summary of the most relevant recorded data) and other data of interest derived from an overview of remote-sensing tools.
315
- Damage observed. A general description of the observed damage is given (i.e. the most common and the most relevant seen during the fieldwork), including the maximum DoD for every DI noticed.
- Direct witness inquiries. This part summarizes witness enquiries (which should also be attached entirely apart). It should contain, if available, the duration of the strong winds and a brief description of the
320 experience of each witness.

- Characterization of the event. This final section contains the length and average and maximum width of the damage swath, the maximum wind intensity (specifying the intensity scale used), the translational direction and other data of interest such as the convective cell translation velocity.

2.3.2 GEOLOCATED INFORMATION TABLE

325 A geolocated information table providing disaggregated data for each point-of-damage is proposed, similarly as in Holzer et al. (2018). It should contain all relevant geolocated information gathered during the fieldwork and also damage locations provided by local authorities, emergency services, media and social networks, which have been previously collected and analysed. To better organise the information displayed, seven different location types (L1 to L7, see Table 4) are considered. Note that L1 to L3 (vegetation and man-made structures) correspond to points-of-damage locations so that, if possible, they should include information about intensity rating (DI-DoD), according to Sect. 2.2. The rest of locations describe positions of AWS, witnesses, pictures or wind-borne debris.

2.3.3 DATA LOCATION MAP

335 The third deliverable consists of a map or a KML file format containing geolocated information gathered during the field survey in order to allow further graphical analysis, for example using Google Earth software (Gorelick et al., 2017). It is proposed that each of the seven location types presented in Sect. 2.3.2 are represented with a different icon, with a specific colour for points-of-damage (L1 to L3 from Table 4) depending on its intensity. Moreover, in case of damage in trees with fall direction (L1) it is convenient to display on the map an arrow icon, whose direction should be the fall direction. Thereby, a damage tree pattern analysis to discriminate between damage caused by a tornado or by a downburst should be easily carried out. Damage swath characteristics (length and width) should also be calculated using the data location map.

340 As an example, Fig. 7 shows the data location map of part of the fieldwork carried out on 25 March 2012 to study the EF1 tornado that affected the municipalities of Castellnou de Seana and Ivars d'Urgell (Catalonia) on 21 March 2012 (Bech et al., 2015). It displays the information contained in a fallen tree damage-point type (in this case, latitude, longitude, tree fall direction, DI-DoD, a brief description and a photo) and in the non-official Ivars d'Urgell AWS location (here, latitude, longitude, AWS type and maximum wind speed plot), which registered a maximum wind gust of 26.4 m s^{-1} during the event.

345 3 DISCUSSION

The proposed methodology is formulated in a convenient, feasible and detailed way so it can be readily used, but its practical application may present some weaknesses. Among the advantages of the proposed methodology are the relative simplicity of the devices required (Table 1), which are not neither unusual nor expensive tools, so meteorological services, public research institutions and private entities may perform systematically damage surveys of reported events, analysing even suspicious developed funnel clouds from which it is previously unknown if reached the ground. Moreover, the easy to

reproduce fieldwork process, and the generation of the proposed three final deliverables support the main objectives of the fieldwork, which are identifying the phenomenon type, estimating wind intensity and characterising the event and the damage swath. Besides, the methodology is also intended to optimize time during in-situ measurements in order to make possible visiting the whole affected area as soon as possible to avoid the alteration of the damage scenario by clearing services, as commented in Sect. 2.1.

Surface in-situ analysis provides more detailed information than aerial surveys or analysis based only in remote sensing data. For instance, minor damage on vegetation and on man-made structures are more easily detected (e.g., Marshall et al., 2012). In addition, it is possible to study in detail the soil state in forest areas and the degraded state or previous weaknesses of damaged elements, which are essential to assess the wind intensity, and measuring data of interest such as snapped trunk diameter or small wind-borne debris weight. On the other hand, tornado outbreaks and widespread events (such as derechos – e.g., Peterson 2019; Chmielewski et al., 2020) may be cases where it is challenging to apply the methodology. Nevertheless, in Sect. 2.2 some clues to mitigate these problems have been provided, such as making a discontinuous analysis in forest areas studying transversal stripes along the damage track every 250 to 500 metres if possible. Another option would be to distribute areas to be analysed among the members of the surveyors team to carry out several fieldworks in parallel. Especially in those cases, and also in complex terrain events, aerial imagery could be useful to complement surface data, providing an overview of the damaged area and information from difficult access zones.

On the other hand, the geolocation of damaged elements and data of interest has a strong dependence on GPS signal reception. Geolocation accuracy depends on a number of factors including local terrain geometry, quality of the receiver antenna system or number of satellites observed. Photo cameras and smartphones have location errors usually ranging from 5 to 20 meters, typically being greatest in deep valleys, or close to large buildings or structures blocking satellite signals. To minimize geolocation errors, it is recommended to check the accuracy with manually selected reference locations and, if necessary, to correct damage locations on the summary map and on the geolocated information table. This is feasible in urban or periurban areas, where buildings or other elements are easily identifiable using high-resolution aerial images such as orthophotos, but not in forests or other natural areas without evident references where this verification may not be possible.

The estimation of wind intensity of convective origin is based on damage-rating scales, which relate the damage observed with the wind speed. Despite the proposed methodology is illustrated using the EF-scale, it should be noted that other intensity scales could be used such as the TORRO scale (Meaden et al., 2007). The practical application of the EF-scale has some limitations (Doswell et al., 2009), in spite of the progress made some years ago by introducing a more detailed intensity-rating scale (WSEC, 2006) compared to the original and simpler Fujita scale (Fujita, 1981, 1992). The Enhanced Fujita scale, developed in the USA, is mainly based on the damage caused by wind on standard US buildings and elements (schools, hospitals, automobile showrooms, etc.), so-called Damage Indicators (DI). When applied to areas outside the USA many DI may not exist, hampering its application as discussed in detail in Feuerstein et al. (2011) and Holzer et al. (2018). Moreover, there are elements which are susceptible to be damaged such as traffic signals, walls and fences, trash bins and vehicles, which are not included on the EF-scale.

385 The data gathered can have several uses, apart from contributing to build up homogeneous severe weather databases,
which at the same time enhance the knowledge about tornado, downburst and straight-line winds occurrence. Insurance and
reinsurance companies can be one of the major benefitted sectors from results of fieldworks, which usually need to know the
affected area by a strong-convective wind event and its intensity to cover compensations and, in some specific cases as in
Spain, the phenomenon type (De Groeve et al., 2014).

390 Data collected from damage on buildings (general photos and detailed pictures of deficiencies or previous
weaknesses) may also contribute to study exposure and vulnerability of constructions in an area of interest and also to assess
the failure modes (e.g., north-eastern Italy; Zanini et al., 2017; Pipinato, 2018), as it is pointed out in De Groeve et al., (2013,
2014). Even though, to perform this kind of studies it may be necessary more detailed information, so further in-situ visits of
experts to the affected area might be carried out. Moreover, the identification of typical damaged buildings using the
395 information provided in the set of final deliverables can give a guideline for adapting intensity-rating scales, such as the EF-
scale, out of the USA, solving partially those deficiencies on assessing wind intensity. In this work line, some authors have
propounded new Damage Indicators to append to the above-mentioned scale using information derived from tens of fieldworks
(Mahieu and Wesolek, 2016), to adapt them to typical man-made structures from other countries, as recently reported in Canada
(Environment Canada, 2013) or Japan (Japan Meteorological Agency, 2015), or even to develop a standardised International
400 Fujita Scale, as proposed in Groenemeijer et al. (2019). Similarly, in some articles it has been discussed how to assess wind
intensity throughout effects in vehicles, with data given by fieldworks (Paulikas et al., 2016), similarly than presented here.
As provided in the geolocated information map, where each point-of-damage with its DI-DoD pair is given, it is possible to
assess the degree of damage severity along the damage swath of a tornadic event. This information is extremely valuable to
analyse the impact of tornadoes in different scenarios and future projections (Ashley et al., 2014; Rosencrants and Ashley,
405 2015).

4 SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In-situ damage survey data are used to study the consequences of natural hazards, such as floods or strong-convective
damaging winds. The latter can be specifically characterized carrying out fieldworks, estimating the damage path length and
width, and also the intensity of the event. Moreover, throughout an analysis of the data gathered it might be possible to clarify
410 which phenomenon caused the damage (tornado, downburst or straight-line winds) in case neither images nor direct witness
reports exist.

The purpose of this article is to provide an easily reproducible methodology to carry out surface strong-convective
wind event damage surveys, which optimize time and economic resources. It is mainly based on collecting geolocated
information about damaged man-made structures and vegetation, with the final aim of representing the damage scenario to
415 study the event from a meteorological point of view. Complementary data from AWS close to the affected area and witness
reports should also be gathered if available, and remote-sensing data should be used to get a deeper understanding of the

convective storm event. With all this information, three final deliverables are generated (a standardised text report of the event, a table consisting of detailed geolocated information, and a map or a file in KML format). The whole data set allows further analysis and achieve purposes.

This methodology is based on previous studies and has been refined during the elaboration of 136 strong-convective wind damage surveys carried out in Spain between 2004 and 2018. Known limitations of its application include geolocation errors of damage, applicability of the EF-scale outside the USA and difficulties on analysing extensive events or complex topography areas. Nevertheless, surface-based detailed data provided, such as previously degraded state of damaged elements, minor damage on man-made structures and vegetation, snapped trees trunk diameter and soil state in forest areas, might be helpful to better analyse event consequences compared to other methodologies. In any case, the field survey data obtained are valuable for further analysis, complementing meteorological detailed case studies based on operational remote sensing such as Doppler weather radar data, surface observations and Numerical Weather Prediction model output. Moreover, the methodology proposed may contribute to standardise detailed field surveys, which are essential to build up and maintain robust and homogeneous databases of severe weather phenomena.

APPENDIX: TORNADO VS. DOWNBURST DAMAGE PATTERNS

The determination of the damaging wind phenomenon (tornado, downburst or straight-line wind) can be rather challenging in some cases. As reported in previous studies (Hall and Brewer, 1959; Holland et al., 2006; Bech et al., 2009; Beck and Dotzek, 2010; Rhee and Lombardo, 2018), it can be assumed that the direction of fallen trees indicate the direction of maximum wind speed in strong-convective wind events, provided there are no influences from the terrain (i.e. slope favouring a specific fall direction) or from another tree fall interacting with the tree considered. Despite real wind damage patterns can be very complex due to its interaction with topography or with other nearby events (Forbes and Wakimoto, 1983; Cannon et al., 2016), theoretical-idealized damage swath patterns of both tornado and downburst wind fields can be compared with observed damage patterns in order to look for similarities to assess their possible origin.

As explained in previous studies (e.g., Holland et al. 2006; Bech et al. 2009), a simple approximation to describe a tornado vortex wind field near the surface is given by the Rankine vortex model. This approach combines an inner rigidly rotating core with an outer region with decreasing rotation speed. The wind field velocity module is defined in polar coordinates by Eq. (1):

$$v(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{v_{max}}{R} r & \text{if } r \leq R \\ \frac{v_{max} R}{r} & \text{if } r > R \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $v(r)$ is the wind velocity in function of the distance to the centre of the vortex r , v_{max} is the maximum wind velocity, and R is the vortex radius where $v(r) = v_{max}$.

445 Note that according to Eq. (1), the Rankine vortex can describe in simple terms only a rotating vortex and its nearby environment, i.e. a stationary vortex. To model real tornadoes, a Rankine vortex with both tangential and radial wind components is combined with a translational movement, i.e. a homogeneous wind field. As described in Bech et al. (2009), according to Peterson (1992), two parameters are used to characterize this model: parameter G , which is the ratio between tangential velocity and translational velocity, and parameter α , which is the angle between radial velocity and tangential velocity, corresponding 0° to a pure inflow, 90° to a pure tangential case and 180° to a pure outflow.

450 Examples of two-dimensional wind fields with different parameter configurations are shown in Fig. A1, including also their associated damage swath pattern shown as a rectangular panel below each two-dimensional wind field. The damage swath pattern is obtained computing the maximum wind vector of the wind field along the y axis, as the examples assume a northern translation of the vortex. In the first row (Fig. A1 a, b, and c panels), translational velocity is $1/4$ tangential velocity ($G = 4$) and, in the second row (Fig. A1 d, e and f panels) translational velocity is equal to tangential velocity ($G = 1$).

In Fig. A1a, where tangential and inflow velocities are equal ($\alpha = 45^\circ$), a convergence damage pattern is identified, whereas in Fig. A1b, where the radial component is zero ($\alpha = 90^\circ$, i.e. pure tangential flow), the damage swath presents a rotational pattern. Fig. A1c presents pure outflow with no tangential velocity ($\alpha = 180^\circ$), exhibiting a similar divergence pattern as Fig. A1f, in the damage swath, which could correspond with a classical downburst pattern.

460 Thus, based on this simple model, if fallen trees patterns present convergence or rotation, it can be assumed that a vortex caused the damage, whereas a divergent pattern would suggest the effects of a downburst. Similarly, the way debris is spread or how a roof is collapsed or lifted can indicate winds with either a rotation and upward pattern (i.e. a tornado), or with a divergent and downward pattern (i.e. a downburst) – see Rhee and Lombardo (2018) for a more detailed discussion.

465 Nevertheless, it is also noticeable that in cases where tangential and translational velocities are similar ($G \approx 1$, see for example the second row of the Fig. A1), damage swaths may present only little differences among them. This can occur in weak (EF0 or EF1) tornado or downburst events that affect a small area. In these cases, damage also may be sparse, scattered and unconnected, which makes unidentifiable any damage pattern consistent with a tornado or a microburst (Bech et al., 2009; Rhee and Lombardo, 2018). Then, even a detailed damage survey, if there are neither images nor direct witnesses, it may not be sufficient to determine which type of phenomena caused the damage. This situation of inconclusive results regarding the phenomenon type occurred in 7 % of the 136 damage surveys carried out in Spain by the authors between 2004 and 2018.

475 As a real example, the case shown in Fig. A2 presents fallen poplar trees following a convergence pattern: in the right-half side from the damage swath, trees are blown down to the west, whereas in the left-half side they are uprooted to the north. Comparing this real case and idealised cases (Fig. A1), this damage pattern matches well the damage swath caused by a vortex with $G = 4$ and $\alpha = 45^\circ$ (Fig. A1a). This fact along with other evidences confirm the hypothesis that damage was caused by a tornado, as presented in the Supplementary material. Moreover, it is remarkable that these vortex characteristics are also coherent with the damage rated as the lower EF1 bound and the mean translational velocity of 12 m s^{-1} , estimated using radar data from the Meteorological Service of Catalonia (not shown).

Data availability. The data used in this paper is available from the authors upon request.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements. The authors gratefully acknowledge individuals supporting wind damage assessments carried out during these years, especially to Joan Arús, Andrés Cotorruelo, Petra Ramos and particularly to Miquel Gayà for his pioneer systematic studies of tornadoes in Spain, the Consorcio de Compensación de Seguros (CCS) support, and also three anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions that improved the present article. This research was performed with partial funding from projects CGL2015-65627-C3-2-R (MINECO/FEDER), CGL2016-81828-REDT (AEI) and RTI2018-098693-B643-C32 (AEI), and also from the Water Research Institute (IdRA) of the University of Barcelona.

References

- Antonescu, B., Schultz, D. M., Holzer, A., and Groenemeijer, P.: Tornadoes in Europe: An underestimated threat, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 98, 713–728, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0171.1>, 2017.
- Antonescu, B., Schultz, D. M., Lomas, F., and Kühne, T.: Tornadoes in Europe: Synthesis of the observational datasets, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 144(7), 2445–2480, <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-15-0298.1>, 2016.
- Ashley, W.S., Strader, S., Rosencrants, T. D., and Krmenc, A. J.: Spatiotemporal Changes in Tornado Hazard Exposure: The Case of the Expanding Bull’s-Eye Effect in Chicago, Illinois, *Weather Clim. Soc.*, 6, 175–193, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-13-00047.1>, 2014.
- Bai, L., Meng, Z., Huang, L., Yan, L., Li, Z., Mai, X., Huang, Y., Yao, D., and Wang, X.: An Integrated Damage, Visual, and Radar Analysis of the 2015 Foshan, Guangdong, EF3 Tornado in China Produced by the Landfalling Typhoon Mujigae (2015), *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 98, 2619–2640, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0015.1>, 2017.
- Bech, J., Arús, J., Castán, C., Pineda, N., Rigo, T., Montanyà, J., and van der Velde, O.: A study of the 21 March 2012 tornadic quasi linear convective system in Catalonia, *Atmos. Res.*, 158–159, 192–209, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2014.08.009>, 2015.
- Bech, J., Gayà, M., Aran, M., Figuerola, F., Amaro, J., and Arús, J.: Tornado damage analysis of a forest area using site survey observations, radar data and a simple analytical vortex model, *Atmos. Res.*, 93, 118–130, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.10.016>, 2009.
- Bech, J., Pascual, R., Rigo, T., Pineda, N., López, J. M., Arús, J., and Gayà, M.: An observational study of the 7 September 2005 Barcelona tornado outbreak, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 7, 129–139, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-7-129-2007>, 2007.

- 510 Bech, J., Pineda, N., Rigo, T., and Aran, M.: Remote sensing analysis of a Mediterranean thundersnow and low-altitude heavy snowfall event, *Atmos. Res.*, 123, 305–322, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2012.06.021>, 2013.
- Bech, J., Pineda, N., Rigo, T., Aran, M., Amaro, J., Gayà, M., Arús, J., Montanyà, J., and van der Velde, O.: A Mediterranean nocturnal heavy rainfall and tornadic event. Part I: Overview, damage survey and radar analysis, *Atmos. Res.*, 100(4), 621–637, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2010.12.024>, 2011.
- 515 Beck, V., and Dotzek, N.: Reconstruction of Near-Surface Tornado Wind Fields from Forest Damage, *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 49, 1517–1537, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAMC2254.1>, 2010.
- Beven, K. J., Aspinall, W. P., Bates, P. D., Borgomeo, E., Goda, K., Hall, J. W., Page1, T., Phillips, J. C., Simpson, M., Smith, P. J., Wagener, T., and Watson, M.: Epistemic uncertainties and natural hazard risk assessment – Part 2: What should constitute good practice?, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18, 2769–2783, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-2769-2018>,
520 2018.
- Bunting, W.F., and Smith, B.E.: A guide for conducting damage surveys. NOAA Tech. Memo. NWS-SR-146, Scientific Services Division, Southern Region, Fort Worth, TX, 44 pp., 1993.
- Burgess, D., Ortega, K., Stumpf, G., Garfield, G., Kartens, C., Meyer, T., and Smith, B.: 20 May 2013 Moore, Oklahoma, Tornado: Damage Survey and Analysis, *Weather Forecast.*, 29, 1229–1237, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-14-00039.1>, 2014.
525
- Cannon, J. B., Hepinstall-Cymerman, J., Godfrey, C. M., and Peterson, C. J.: Landscape-scale characteristics of forest tornado damage in mountainous terrain, *Landscape Ecol.*, 31, 2097–2114, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0384-8>, 2016.
- Chernokulsky, A., and Shikhov, A.: 1984 Ivanovo tornado outbreak: Determination of actual tornado tracks with satellite data, *Atmos. Res.*, 207, 111–121, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2018.02.011>, 2018.
- 530 Chmielewski, T., Szer, J., and Bobra, P.: Derecho wind storm in Poland on 11–12 August 2017: results of the post-disaster investigation, *Environ. Hazards*, 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2020.1730154>, 2020.
- De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., and Ehrlich, D.: Recording disasters losses: recommendation for a European approach. JRC Scientific and Policy Report, available at: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/29296/1/lbna26111enn.pdf>, last access: 2
535 December 2019, 2013.
- De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., Ehrlich D., and Corbane C.: Current status and best practices for disaster loss data recording in EU Member States. JRC Scientific and Policy Report, available at: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC92290/lbna26879enn.pdf>, last access: 2 December 2019, 2014.
- 540 Doswell III, C. A.: A guide to F-scale damage assessment, NOAA Rep., 101 pp., available at: [www.wdtd.noaa.gov/courses/ef-scale/lesson2/ FinalNWSF-scaleAssessmentGuide.pdf](http://www.wdtd.noaa.gov/courses/ef-scale/lesson2/FinalNWSF-scaleAssessmentGuide.pdf), 2003.
- Doswell III, C. A., Brooks, H. E., and Dotzek, N.: On the implementation of the enhanced Fujita scale in the USA, *Atmos. Res.*, 93, 554–563, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.11.003>, 2009.

- Dotzek, N., Groenemeijer, P., Feuerstein, B., and Holzer, A. M.: Overview of ESSL's severe convective storms research using the European Severe Weather Database ESWD, *Atmos. Res.*, 93, 575–586, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.10.020>, 2009.
- Edwards, R.: Frequently Asked Questions about Tornadoes, Storm Prediction Center (NOAA), available at: <https://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/index.html>, last access: 19 March 2020, 2020.
- Edwards, R., LaDue, J. G., Ferree, J. T., Scharfenberg, K., Maier, C., and Coulbourne, W. L.: Tornado Intensity Estimation: Past, Present, and Future, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 94, 641–653, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00006.1>, 2013.
- Environment Canada: Enhanced Fujita Scale Damage Indicators and Degrees Of Damage, available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/seasonal-weather-hazards/enhanced-fujita-scale-wind-damage.html>, last access: 11 August 2019, 2013.
- Farnell, C., Busto, M., Aran, M., Andrés, A., Pineda, N., and Torà, M.: Study of the hailstorm of 17 September 2007 at the Pla d'Urgell. Part one: fieldwork and analysis of hailpads, *Tethys*, 6, 67–79, <https://doi.org/10.3369/tethys.2009.6.05>, 2009.
- Feuerstein, B., Groenemeijer, P., Dirksen, E., Hubrig, M., Holzer, A. M., and Dotzek, N.: Towards an improved wind speed scale and damage description adapted for Central Europe, *Atmos. Res.*, 100, 547–564, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2010.12.026>, 2011.
- Forbes, G. S., and Wakimoto, R. M.: A Concentrated Outbreak of Tornadoes, Downbursts and Microbursts, and Implications Regarding Vortex Classification, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 111, 220–236, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1983\)111<0220:ACOOTD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1983)111<0220:ACOOTD>2.0.CO;2), 1983.
- Foster, D. R.: Species and stand response to catastrophic wind in Central New England, U.S.A., *J. Ecol.*, 76, 135–151, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2260458>, 1988.
- Fujita, T. T.: Tornadoes and downbursts in the context of generalized planetary scales, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 38(8), 1511–1534, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1981\)038<1511:TADITC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1981)038<1511:TADITC>2.0.CO;2), 1981.
- Fujita, T. T.: Mystery of severe storms. Wind Research Laboratory Research Paper 239, Dept. of Geophysical Sciences, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, 298 pp, 1992. [NTIS PB-182021.]
- Gayà, M.: The 1886 tornado of Madrid, *Atmos. Res.*, 83(2–4), 201–210, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2005.10.017>, 2007.
- Gayà, M.: Els Fiblons a Espanya: Climatologia i catàleg de tornados i trombes (Whirlwinds in Spain: Climatology and Catalog of Tornadoes and Waterspouts, in Catalan), Second edition, Edicions UIB, Palma, Spain, 619 pp., 2018.
- Gayà, M., Llasat, M. C., and Arús, J.: Tornadoes and waterspouts in Catalonia (1950–2009), *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 11(7), 1875–1883, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-1875-2011>, 2011.
- Godfrey, C. M., and Peterson, C. J.: Estimating Enhanced Fujita Scale Levels Based on Forest Damage Severity. *Weather Forecast.*, 32: 243–252, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-16-0104.1>, 2017.

- Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., and Moore, R.: Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 202, 18–27, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031>, 2017.
- Groenemeijer, P., Holzer, A. M., Hubrig, M., Kühne, T., Kaltenberger, R., Soriano, J. D., Bock, L., Guitiérrez, D., van de Ploeg, B., Strommer, G., and Schreiner, T.: The International Fujita Scale: A Globally Applicable Scale for Tornado and Wind Damage Classification, 10th European Conference on Severe Storms, Kraków, Poland, 4–8 November 2019, 2019.
- Gutiérrez, D., Riesco, J., and Ponce, S.: SINOBAS, a tool for collaborative mapping applied to observation of “singular” weather phenomena, 15th EMS Annual Meeting & 12th European Conference on Applications of Meteorology (ECAM), Sofia, Bulgaria, 7–11 September 2015, EMS2015-413, 2015.
- Hall, F., and Brewer, R. D.: A sequence of tornado damage patterns, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 87, 207–216, 1959.
- Holland, A. P., Riordan, A. J., and Franklin, E. C.: A simple model for simulating tornado damage in forests, *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 45, 1597–1611, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAM2413.1>, 2006.
- Holzer, A. M., Schreiner, T. M. E., and Púčik, T.: A forensic re-analysis of one of the deadliest European tornadoes, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18, 1555–1565, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-1555-2018>, 2018.
- Hyvärinen, O., and Saltikoff, E.: Social Media as a Source of Meteorological Observations, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 138, 3175–3184, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3270.1>, 2010.
- IRDR: Peril Classification and Hazard Glossary, Integrated Research on Disaster Risk, 28 pp., available at: <http://www.irdrinternational.org/2014/03/28/irdr-peril-classification-and-hazard-glossary/>, last access: 27 December 2019, 2014.
- Japan Meteorological Agency (JMA): Guidelines for the Japanese Enhanced Fujita Scale, 113 pp., available at: https://www.data.jma.go.jp/obd/stats/data/bosai/tornado/kaisetsu/jefscale_en.html, last access: 11 August 2019, 2015.
- Karstens, C. D., Samaras, T. M., Lee, B. D., Gallus, W. A., and Finley, C. A.: Near-Ground Pressure and Wind Measurements in Tornadoes, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 138, 2570–2588, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3201.1>, 2010.
- Karstens, C. D., Gallus, W. A., Lee, B. D., and Finley, C. A.: Analysis of Tornado-Induced Tree Fall Using Aerial Photography from the Joplin, Missouri, and Tuscaloosa–Birmingham, Alabama, Tornadoes of 2011, *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 52, 1049–1068, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-12-0206.1>, 2013.
- Knox, J. A., Rackley, J. A., Black, A. W., Gensini, V. A., Butler, M., Dunn, C., Gallo, T., Hunter, M. R., Lindsey, L., Phan, M., Scroggs, R., and Brustad, S.: Tornado Debris Characteristics And Trajectories During The 27 April 2011 Super Outbreak As Determined Using Social Media Data, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 94, 1371–1380, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00036.1>, 2013.
- Kryvasheyev, Y., Chen, H., Obradovich, N., Moro, E., Van Hentenryck, P., Fowler, J., and Cebrian M.: Rapid assessment of disaster damage using social media activity, *Sci. Adv.*, 3(2), e1500779, <http://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500779>, 2016.

- 610 Letchford, C. W., and Chay, M. T.: Pressure distributions on a cube in a simulated thunderstorm downburst. Part B: moving downburst observations, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.*, 90, 733–753, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6105\(02\)00163-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6105(02)00163-0), 2002.
- Li, L., Yang, J., Lin, C.-Y., Chua, C. T., Wang, Y., Zhao, K., Wu, Y.-T., Liu, P. L.-F., Switzer, A. D., Mok, K. M., Wang, P., and Peng, D.: Field survey of Typhoon Hato (2017) and a comparison with storm surge modeling in Macau, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18, 3167–3178, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-3167-2018>, 2018.
- 615 Llasat, M. C., Turco, M., Quintana-Seguí, P., and Llasat-Botija, M.: The snow storm of 8 March 2010 in Catalonia (Spain): a paradigmatic wet-snow event with a high societal impact, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14(2), 427, <http://www.doi.org/10.5194/nhess-14-427-2014>, 2014.
- Mahieu, P., and Wesolek, E.: Tornado Rating in Europe with the EF-scale, *KERAUNOS*, 65 pp., available at: <http://www.keraunos.org/tornado-rating-in-europe-with-the-enhanced-fujita-scale.pdf>, last access: 11 August 2019,
- 620 2016.
- Marshall, T. P.: Tornado damage survey at Moore, Oklahoma, *Weather Forecast.*, 17, 582–598, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434\(2002\)017<0582:TDSAMO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(2002)017<0582:TDSAMO>2.0.CO;2), 2002.
- Marshall, T., Davis, W., and Runnels, S.: Damage survey of the Joplin tornado, 26th Conference on Severe Local Storm, Nashville, TN, USA, 5–8 November 2012, 6.1, available at: <https://ams.confex.com/ams/26SLS/webprogram/Manuscript/Paper211662/Joplinmerger.pdf>, last access: 11 August
- 625 2019, 2012.
- Mateo, J., Ballart, D., Brucet, C., Aran, M., and Bech, J.: A study of a heavy rainfall event and a tornado outbreak during the passage of a squall line over Catalonia, *Atmos. Res.*, 93(1–3), 131–146, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.09.030>, 2009.
- 630 **McDonald, J. R., and Marshall, T. P.: Tornado Damage Documentation, Institute for Disaster Research, 16 pp., 1984.**
- Meaden, G. T., Kochev, S., Kolendowicz, L., Kosa-Kiss, A., Marcinoniene, I., Sioutas, M., Tooming, H., and Tyrrell, J.: Comparing the theoretical versions of the Beaufort scale, the T-Scale and the Fujita scale, *Atmos. Res.*, 83(2–4), 446–449, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2005.11.014>, 2007.
- 635 Meng, Z., and Yao, D.: Damage Survey, Radar, and Environment Analyses on the First-Ever Documented Tornado in Beijing during the Heavy Rainfall Event of 21 July 2012, *Weather Forecast.*, 29, 702–724, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-13-00052.1>, 2014.
- Miller, P. W., and Mote, T. L.: Characterizing severe weather potential in synoptically weakly forced thunderstorm environments, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18(4), 1261–1277, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-1261-2018>, 2018.
- 640 Molinari, D., Menoni, S., Aronica, G. T., Ballio, F., Berni, N., Pandolfo, C., and Minucci, G.: Ex post damage assessment: an Italian experience, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 901–916, <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-14-901-2014>, 2014.

- Molthan, A. L., Bell, J. R., Cole, T. A., and Burks, J. E.: Satellite-based identification of tornado damage tracks from the 27 April 2011 severe weather outbreak, *J. Operational Meteor.*, 2(16), 191–208, <http://doi.org/10.15191/nwajom.2014.0216>, 2014.
- 645 Orf, L., Kantor, E., and Savory, E.: Simulation of a downburst-producing thunderstorm using a very high-resolution three-dimensional cloud model, *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.*, 104–106, 547–557, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2012.02.020>, 2012.
- Paulikas, M. J., Schmidlin, T. W., and Marshall, T. P.: The Stability of Passenger Vehicles at Tornado Wind Intensities of the (Enhanced) Fujita Scale, *Weather Clim. Soc.*, 8, 85–91, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-15-0051.1>, 2016.
- 650 Peterson, R. E.: Johannes Letzmann: a pioneer in the study of tornadoes, *Weather Forecast.*, 7 (1), 166–184, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434\(1992\)007<0166:JLAPIT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(1992)007<0166:JLAPIT>2.0.CO;2), 1992.
- Peterson, C. J.: Damage diversity as a metric of structural complexity after forest wind disturbance, *Forests*, 10 (2), 85, <https://doi.org/10.3390/f10020085>, 2019.
- Pipinato, A.: Recent northeast Italian tornado events: lesson learned for improving structures, *Nat. Hazards*, 655 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3380-2>, 2018.
- Rasmussen, E. N., Davies-Jones, R., and Holle, R. L.: Terrestrial Photogrammetry of Weather Images Acquired in Uncontrolled Circumstances, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 20, 1790–1803, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426\(2003\)020<1790:TPOWIA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0426(2003)020<1790:TPOWIA>2.0.CO;2), 2003.
- Rhee, D. M., and Lombardo, F. T.: Improved near-surface wind speed characterization using damage patterns, *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.*, 180, 288–297, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2018.07.017>, 2018.
- 660 Riesco, J., Polvorinos, F., Núñez, J. A., Soriano, J. D., and Jiménez, C.: Climatología de tornados en España Peninsular y Baleares (Tornado Climatology in the Peninsular Spain and Balearic Islands, in Spanish), Spanish Meteorological Agency (AEMet), 83 pp., available at: http://www.aemet.es/documentos/es/conocerlas/publicaciones/Climatologia_tornados/Climatologia_tornados.pdf, 665 last access: 11 August 2019, 2015.
- Ripoll, R., del Amo, X., and Vendrell, R.: The weather observers network of the Meteorological Service of Catalonia, WMO Technical Conference on Meteorological and Environmental Instruments and Methods of Observation (CIMO TECO 2016), Madrid, Spain, 27–30 September 2016, P2(57), 2016.
- Rodríguez, O., and Bech, J.: Sounding-derived parameters associated with tornadic storms in Catalonia, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 38, 670 2400–2414, <http://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5343>, 2018.
- Rosencrants, T. D., and Ashley, W. S.: Spatiotemporal analysis of tornado exposure in five US metropolitan areas, *Nat. Hazards*, 78, 121–140, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1704-z>, 2015.
- Roueche, D. B., and Prevatt, D. O.: Residential Damage Patterns Following the 2011 Tuscaloosa, AL and Joplin, MO Tornadoes, *J. Disaster Res.*, 8(6), 1061–1067, 2013.

- 675 Sánchez-Laulhé, J. M.: El tornado de Málaga del 1 de Febrero de 2009 (The 1 February 2009 tornado of Malaga, in Spanish),
Spanish Meteorological Agency (AEMet), 3 pp., available at:
https://repositorio.aemet.es/bitstream/20.500.11765/2724/1/TyC_2009_24_03.pdf, last access: 11 August 2019,
2013.
- Shikhov, A., and Chernokulsky, A.: A satellite-derived climatology of unreported tornadoes in forested regions of northeast
680 Europe, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 204, 553–567, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.10.002>, 2018.
- Shikhov, A. N., Perminova, E. S., and Perminov, S. I.: Satellite-based analysis of the spatial patterns of fire-and storm-related
forest disturbances in the Ural region, Russia, *Nat. Hazards*, 1–26, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-019-03642-z>,
2019.
- Strader, S. M., Ashley, W., Irizarry, A., and Hall, S.: A climatology of tornado intensity assessments, *Meteorol. Appl.*, 22,
685 513–524, <https://doi.org/10.1002/met.1482>, 2015.
- Taszarek, M., Brooks, H. E., and Czernecki, B.: Sounding-Derived Parameters Associated with Convective Hazards in Europe,
Mon. Weather Rev., 145, 1511–1528, <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-16-0384.1>, 2017.
- Verbout, S. M., Brooks, H. E., Leslie, L. M., and Schultz, D. M.: Evolution of the US tornado database: 1954–2003, *Weather
Forecast.*, 21(1), 86–93, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF910.1>, 2006.
- 690 WSEC: A Recommendation for an Enhanced Fujita Scale (EF-scale), Wind Science and Engineering Center, 111 pp., available
at: <http://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/EFScale.pdf>, last access: 11 August 2019, 2006.
- Wakimoto, R. M., and Lew, J. K.: Observations of a Florida Waterspout during CaPE, *Weather Forecast.*, 8, 412–423,
[https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434\(1993\)008<0412:OOAFWD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(1993)008<0412:OOAFWD>2.0.CO;2), 1993.
- Wakimoto, R. M., and Liu, C.: The Garden City, Kansas, Storm during VORTEX 95. Part II: The Wall Cloud and Tornado,
695 *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 126, 393–408, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1998\)126<0393:TGCKSD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1998)126<0393:TGCKSD>2.0.CO;2), 1998.
- Wakimoto, R. M., Wienhoff, Z., Bluestein, H. B., and Reif, D.: The Dodge City Tornadoes on 24 May 2016: Damage Survey,
Photogrammetric Analysis Combined with Mobile Polarimetric Radar Data, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 146(11), 3735–
3771, <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-18-0125.1>, 2018.
- Wurman, J., Kosiba, K., and Robinson, P.: In situ, Doppler radar, and video observations of the interior structure of a tornado
700 and the wind–damage relationship, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 94(6), 835–846, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00114.1>, 2013.
- Zanini, M. A., Hofer, L., Faleschini, F., and Pellegrino, C.: Building damage assessment after the Riviera del Brenta tornado,
northeast Italy. *Nat. Hazards*, 86, 1247–1273, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-2741-6>, 2017.
- Zehnder, J.A., Hu, J., and Razdan, A.: A Stereo Photogrammetric Technique Applied to Orographic Convection, *Mon. Weather
705 Rev.*, 135, 2265–2277, <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR3401.1>, 2007.





Figure 1. Location of 136 analysed events in Spain using the proposed methodology between 2004 and 2018, mostly concentrated in Andalusia and Catalonia. Symbols indicate locations of tornadoes (red triangles), downbursts (blue squares), undetermined phenomena (grey circles) and other phenomena such as gust fronts, funnel clouds which did not touch down, or dust devils (white circles). The case study location for which final deliverables are attached as Supplementary material is indicated on the map. Black contours delimitate regions and grey lines, provinces.



715 **Figure 2.** Flow diagram of the structure and application of the proposed methodology to carry out strong-convective winds fieldwork damage assessment. Start and end are shaded in yellow, processes in green, decisions in orange and inputs/outputs in blue.





Figure 3. (a) Developed funnel cloud observed in Santa Eulàlia de Ronçana (Catalonia) on 4 April 2010 (Author: @CalabobosChaser), and (b) Developed funnel cloud observed in Bellpuig (Catalonia) on 1 December 2017 (Author: Edgar Aldana). In both cases no evident tornado was actually observed (i.e. touchdown) but nearby damage was reported suggesting tornado occurrence.



725

Figure 4. Wind gust (red line) and wind gust direction (green bars) registered by an AWS in Mataró (Catalonia) with 1 minute temporal resolution data. The AWS was located 240 m west of the estimated centre of the EF0 tornado track, on 23 November 2016. Data source: Meteomar, Consell Comarcal del Maresme.



Figure 5. (a) Measure of the fall direction of a tree and (b) measure of trunk diameter during the damage survey of an EF1 tornado on 13 October 2016 in Llinars del Vallès (Catalonia) and an EF2 tornado on 7 January 2018 in Darnius (Catalonia), respectively (Author: Oriol Rodríguez).




Figure 6. (a) Drone image of a mixed Mediterranean forest in Darnius (Catalonia) where most pine trees were blown down whereas cork oaks were only slightly affected with broken branches by an EF2 tornado, on 7 January 2018 (Author: Jonathan Carvajal). (b) Pine blown down by an EF0 tornado in Perafort (Catalonia) in a very thin, moist soil area, on 14 October 2018 (Author: Oriol Rodríguez).



M:007

Latitude: 41.7395664° Longitude: 2.6652414°

Fallen tree direction: 350°

Tree uprooted.

EF-Scale

Damage Indicator: Trees: Softwood (TS)

Degree of Damage: 3/5 Trees uprooted



Photo Author: Xavier Coll

AWS:001

Latitude: 41.6781280° Longitude: 0.9907130°

Ivars d'Urgell AWS (non-official, Davis Vantage Pro) registered a maximum wind gust of 26.4 m/s between 18:50 and 19:00 UTC.




Figure 7. Data location map and two examples of recorded information from the 21 March 2012 EF1 Ivars d'Urgell (Catalonia) tornado track. Map symbols indicate locations of AWS (orange weathervane), damage in man-made structures (house icon) and fallen trees or damaged vegetation elements (arrow and circle icon if no direction is available, respectively). Icon colours indicate damage intensity using the EF-scale: EF0 (yellow), EF1 (orange) and unrated (white). The background orthophoto is from the Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC), <http://www.icc.cat> (last access: September 2019), under a CC BY 4.0 license.




Figure A1. Two dimensional near surface horizontal wind fields and damage swaths for the cases: (a) $G = 4$ and $\alpha = 45^\circ$, (b) $G = 4$ and $\alpha = 90^\circ$, (c) $G = 4$ and $\alpha = 180^\circ$, (d) $G = 1$ and $\alpha = 45^\circ$, (e) $G = 1$ and $\alpha = 90^\circ$, and (f) $G = 1$ and $\alpha = 180^\circ$.

750 Adapted from Figures 3 and 4 of Bech et al. (2009).




Figure A2. (a) A poplar plantation from Fogars de la Selva (Catalonia) affected by the 15 October 2018 EF1 Malgrat de Mar – Massanes tornado, and (b) fallen trees directions of the same poplar plantation. Map symbols indicate locations of damage in man-made structures (house icon) and fallen tree or damaged vegetation element (arrow or circle icon if no direction is available). Icon colours indicate damage intensity: EF0 (yellow), EF1 (orange) and unrated (white). The white discontinuous line separates the right-half and the left-half sides of the damage swath where predominant fall tree direction are west and north, respectively. The background orthophoto is from the Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC), <http://www.icc.cat> (last access: September 2019), under a CC BY 4.0 license.

Table 1. Devices required to perform strong-convective wind damage surveys.

Device reference	Device
D1	Smartphone or camera with GPS image geolocation and orientation (azimuth pointing) capabilities
D2	Compass
D3	Tape measure
D4	Hand-counter
D5	Suitcase balance

765 **Table 2.** Variables and maximum uncertainties recommended of data descriptors for damaged man-made structures and vegetation elements. The first four variables are required for all damaged elements (both man-made structures and vegetation). Dragged distance, direction and weight of wind-borne debris should be measured. Fallen tree direction and trunk diameter should be measured in case of uprooted and snapped trees, respectively. Degraded state or previous weakness of damaged elements should also be reported.

Index	Variable	Uncertainty	Comments
V1	Latitude	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ deg.	Measured with GPS camera.
V2	Longitude	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ deg.	Measured with GPS camera.
V3	Damage Indicator (DI)	---	Determined during the post in-situ damage survey using intensity-rating scales as EF-scale.
V4	Degree of Damage (DoD)	---	Determined during the post in-situ damage survey using intensity-rating scales as EF-scale.
V5	Fallen tree direction	± 5 deg.	In case of uprooted trees. Measured with a compass.
V6	Dragged direction object	± 5 deg.	Direction of the displacement. Measured with a compass or GIS tools.
V7	Trunk diameter	± 5 cm	In case of snapped trees. The trunk perimeter is measured with a tape measure and then the diameter can be calculated.
V8	Dragged distance object	± 1 m	Distance between the final position and the origin of an object displaced by the wind. Measured with a tape measure or GIS tools.
V9	Weight of wind-borne debris	$\pm 10\%$	Weight of an object of interest moved by the wind. In case of small objects, measured with a balance if possible.
V10	Previous weakness	---	Description of deficiencies that can increase the vulnerability of elements to strong winds.

Table 3. Witness questionnaire (reference and question).

Question reference	Question
Q1	At what time did the phenomenon occur?
Q2	Where were you when the phenomenon took place?
Q3	How long did the strongest winds last? (Some seconds, around one minute, several minutes...).
Q4	During the phenomenon, did you hear any special or rare noise?
Q5	How was the weather like before, during and after the phenomenon? (Light rain, heavy rain, small hail, large hail, snow, no precipitation).
Q6	Have you noticed other areas with damage?
Q7	Do you remember any similar phenomenon in this area before?

Table 4. Information location types (reference, description and data that should be presented).

Location reference	Description	Data
L1	Damage in trees with fall direction	Latitude, longitude, DI-DoD, previous weaknesses, fall direction
L2	Damage in trees without fall direction	Latitude, longitude, DI-DoD, previous weaknesses, trunk diameter (if snapped tree)
L3	Damage in man-made structures	Latitude, longitude, DI-DoD, previous weaknesses
L4	AWS location	Latitude, longitude, data (maximum wind gust, direction of maximum wind gust and hour)
L5	Witness location	Latitude, longitude of the witness location at the moment of the meteorological event and a brief description of his experience
L6	Image of the phenomenon	Latitude, longitude from the point where image was recorded and orientation
L7	Wind-borne debris	Latitude, longitude, distance and direction of the displacement, size and weight of the object if measured