POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863
SCUOLA DI INGEGNERIA CIVILE
AMBIENTALE E TERRITORIALE

Characterizing Compound Hydro-Meteorological Hazards: An Integrated Multi-Regional Analysis of Atmospheric Forcing

TESI DI LAUREA MAGISTRALE IN
ENVIRONMENTAL AND LAND PLANNING ENGINEERING – INGEGNERIA PER L'AMBIENTE E IL TERRITORIO

Authors:
Ahmed Sayed Dariwsh Nasr
Mugtaba Hayder Saeed Khalid

Student ID: 10928352
Student ID: 10942627
Advisor: Prof. Carlo Di Michele
Academic Year: 2025-2026

Abstract

This thesis examines the dynamics of compound hydro-meteorological hazards through a multi-regional comparative analysis that integrates ERA5 reanalysis datasets with EM-DAT disaster records. The study examines the coupled behavior of atmospheric forcing (10 m zonal and meridional wind components, total precipitation) and hydrological response variables (surface runoff, subsurface runoff, and volumetric soil water content) across ten major disaster events from 2020 to 2024.

The spatial severity classification of ERA5-derived variables shows that flood intensity is not only affected by the amount of rain that falls but also by how the rain accumulates, how saturated the soil is before the rain, how efficiently the runoff is converted, the slope of the terrain, and how long the low-level wind is blowing. In multiple case studies, runoff coefficients exceeded 0.75–0.86, which indicates that near-total infiltration capacity was exceeded and that precipitation rapidly transformed into overland flow. Landslide initiation was strongly correlated with volumetric soil water content thresholds approaching 0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, consistent with pore-pressure-induced reduction in effective stress and shear strength failure.

Wind field analysis shows that increased low-level convergence and horizontal wind shear greatly improved the movement of moisture and the efficiency of precipitation, especially in compound storm-flood systems. The spatial concordance between ERA5 hazard intensity classes and documented EM-DAT impacts confirms the robustness of reanalysis-based hazard characterization for forensic disaster assessment.

The results show that when meteorological and hydrological factors work together, they have a bigger effect on society and the economy than when only one hazard happens. This research advances integrated multi-hazard assessment methodologies and supports the incorporation of runoff efficiency and soil saturation thresholds into operational early warning and risk reduction frameworks under intensifying hydro-climatic extremes.

Keywords: ERA5 Reanalysis, EM-DAT, Compound Hazards, Hydrometeorology,
Runoff Efficiency, Soil Saturation.

Abstract in lingua italiana

Questa tesi esamina la dinamica dei rischi idrometeorologici composti attraverso un'analisi comparativa multiregionale che integra i dataset di rianalisi ERA5 con i registri dei disastri EM-DAT. Lo studio esamina il comportamento accoppiato della forza atmosferica (componenti zonali e meridionali del vento a 10 m, precipitazioni totali) e delle variabili di risposta idrologica (deflusso superficiale, deflusso sotterraneo e contenuto volumetrico d'acqua nel suolo) in dieci grandi disastri dal 2020 al 2024.

La classificazione della gravità spaziale delle variabili derivate da ERA5 mostra che l'intensità delle inondazioni non è influenzata solo dalla quantità di pioggia che cade, ma anche da come si accumula, da quanto è saturo il suolo prima della pioggia, da quanto efficiente viene convertito il deflusso di decollo, dalla pendenza del terreno e da quanto tempo soffia il vento a bassa quota. In diversi casi di studio, i coefficienti di deflusso superavano 0,75–0,86, il che indica che la capacità di infiltrazione quasi totale era stata superata e che le precipitazioni si trasformavano rapidamente in flusso superficiale. L'inizio della frana è stato fortemente correlato con soglie volumetriche di contenuto idrico nel suolo che si avvicinano a 0,46–0,50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, compatibili con una riduzione della tensione effettiva e del cedimento della resistenza al taglio indotta dalla pressione dei pori.

L'analisi del campo del vento mostra che una maggiore convergenza a bassa quota e il taglio orizzontale del vento migliorano notevolmente il movimento dell'umidità e l'efficienza delle precipitazioni, specialmente nei sistemi di diluvio e diluvio composti. La concordanza spaziale tra le classi di intensità di rischio ERA5 e gli impatti documentati EM-DAT conferma la robustezza della caratterizzazione dei rischi basata su rianalisi per la valutazione forense dei disastri.

I risultati mostrano che quando fattori meteorologici e idrologici collaborano, hanno un impatto maggiore sulla società e sull'economia rispetto a quando si verifica un solo pericolo. Questa ricerca promuove metodologie integrate di valutazione multi-rischio e supporta l'incorporazione delle soglie di efficienza del deflusso e saturazione del suolo nei quadri operativi di allerta precoce e riduzione del rischio in condizioni di intensificarsi di estremi idroclimatici.

Parole chiave: Rianalisi ERA5, EM-DAT, Rischi Composti, Idrometeorologia, Efficienza del deflusso e saturazione del suolo.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Abstract in lingua italiana 3

1. Introduction 7

2. Literature Review 8

2.1 Compound Hydro-Meteorological Hazards 8

2.2 ERA5 Reanalysis and EM-DAT as Tools for Disaster Assessment 8

2.3 Precipitation as a Primary but Insufficient Driver 8

2.4 Runoff Generation and Hydrological Amplification 8

2.5 Infiltration Capacity Exceedance and Threshold Behavior 9

2.6 Soil Moisture and Antecedent Wetness 9

2.7 Soil Saturation Thresholds and Landslide Initiation 9

2.8 Wind Fields, Moisture Transport, and Storm Intensification 9

2.9 Spatial Classification and Comparative Multi-Case Analysis 10

2.10 Uncertainty, Variability, and Statistical Robustness 10

2.11 Socioeconomic Amplification of Compound Events 10

2.12 Research Gap and Contribution of the Present Study 10

3. Methodology 11

4. Analysis 14

4.1. Italy 14

4.1.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff May 2-3 14

4.1.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff May 16-17 17

4.2. Canada 20

4.2.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 20

4.2.2. Storm Characteristics and Wind Impact 23

4.3. Cuba 26

4.3.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 26

4.3.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 28

4.4. Costa Rica 31

4.4.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 31

4.4.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 33

4.5. France 36

4.5.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 36

4.5.2. Flood Impact Based on Water Level Elevation 38

4.6. Republic of Korea 40

4.6.1. Cyclone Influence and Atmospheric Forcing 40
4.6.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 42
4.7. Brazil 45
4.7.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 45
4.7.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 47
4.8. PERU 2020 50
4.8.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation 50
3.8.2. Soil Saturation and Mudslide Initiation Conditions 53
4.9. URUGUAY 2020 56
4.9.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 56
4.9.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 59
4.10. SRI LANKA 2021 62
4.10.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 62
4.10.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 65
4.11. SPAIN 2023 67
4.11.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 67
4.11.2. Meteorological and Environmental Conditions Contributing to Wildfire Risk 69
4.12. CHINA 2021 72
4.12.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 72
4.12.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 75
4.13. USA 2021 77
4.13.1. Wildfire (Bootleg Fire and Western U.S. Wildfire Conditions) 77
4.13.2. Flood Impacts Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 81
4.13.3. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 84
4.14. CHILE 2024 87
4.14.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 87
4.14.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 90
4.15. INDIA 2025 93
4.15.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification 93
4.15.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 96
4.16. INDIA 2020 98
4.16.1 Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff 98
4.16.2 Soil Saturation and Mass Movement (Wet) 100
5. Conclusion 102
6. References 103

7. Appendices 103
List of Figures 104
List of Tables 105

1. Introduction

Hydro-meteorological disasters increasingly manifest as compound events, where atmospheric forcing and land-surface processes interact to generate cascading hazards with amplified impacts. Contemporary disaster records reveal that extreme precipitation, storm winds, surface runoff, and soil saturation frequently operate as interconnected components of a coupled atmospheric–hydrological system rather than independent drivers of risk.

Conventional hazard analyses frequently identify rainfall intensity or peak wind speed as principal explanatory variables. However, emerging evidence indicates that flood magnitude and landslide occurrence are strongly modulated by antecedent soil moisture conditions, runoff generation efficiency, terrain morphology, and sustained low-level wind dynamics. In many extreme events, precipitation totals alone fail to explain observed damage patterns; instead, infiltration capacity exceedance and runoff amplification mechanisms play decisive roles in determining hydrological thresholds.

This thesis adopts an integrated multi-case analytical framework to evaluate compound hazard dynamics across geographically diverse events occurring in North America, Latin America, Europe, and Asia between 2020 and 2024. ERA5 reanalysis products provide high-resolution atmospheric and land-surface variables, including total precipitation (TP@SFC), surface runoff (SRO@SFC), subsurface runoff (SSRO@SFC), volumetric soil water content (SWVL1 and SWVL2), and 10 m wind components (10U@SFC, 10V@SFC). These variables are spatially classified into intensity categories to quantify hazard severity and evaluate threshold exceedance behavior.

The research is structured around three central hypotheses:

1. Flood severity is primarily controlled by precipitation-to-runoff conversion efficiency rather than precipitation magnitude alone.

2. Landslide initiation is strongly associated with critical volumetric soil water thresholds approaching full pore saturation, leading to effective stress reduction and slope failure.

3. Sustained low-level wind forcing increases the amount of moisture that comes together and the amount of rain that falls, which makes the hydrological response stronger during compound storm events.

By systematically comparing multiple international case studies, this study identifies consistent physical mechanisms underlying compound storm–flood–landslide interactions. Particular emphasis is placed on runoff coefficients, infiltration capacity exceedance, soil saturation gradients, and wind-induced moisture transport dynamics.

The goal is to improve quantitative multi-hazard assessment by connecting atmospheric drivers to hydrological and geomorphological response mechanisms in a single analytical framework. The results provide evidence that compound hazard amplification is driven by nonlinear coupling between atmospheric circulation patterns and land-surface saturation states. This integrated perspective is essential for improving early warning systems, refining disaster risk modeling, and strengthening climate resilience strategies under projected increases in extreme hydroclimatic variability.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Compound Hydro-Meteorological Hazards

The scientific literature increasingly recognizes that hydro-meteorological disasters are rarely the result of a single isolated driver. Instead, floods, storms, runoff surges, and landslides often emerge as **compound hazards**, where atmospheric and hydrological processes interact and amplify one another. The thesis material strongly supports this perspective by showing that extreme precipitation, near-surface wind forcing, runoff generation, and soil saturation act as interconnected components of a coupled system rather than as separate variables. In this framework, disaster severity depends not only on the intensity of rainfall or wind but also on the timing, persistence, and interaction of multiple processes.

This integrated view reflects an important shift in hazard research. Older approaches often treated storms, floods, and landslides as independent categories. More recent work, however, emphasizes that flood magnitude may be amplified by saturated soils, that landslides may be triggered by prolonged rainfall combined with subsurface pore-pressure buildup, and that storm-related winds may intensify precipitation through enhanced moisture transport and low-level convergence. The thesis therefore fits clearly within the emerging literature on **multi-hazard and cascading disaster systems**.

2.2 ERA5 Reanalysis and EM-DAT as Tools for Disaster Assessment

A major methodological trend in recent literature is the use of **reanalysis datasets** to reconstruct hazard evolution over space and time. ERA5 has become especially valuable because it provides consistent atmospheric and land-surface variables such as total precipitation, surface runoff, subsurface runoff, soil moisture, and wind components. The thesis material uses this strength to classify hazard severity spatially and to compare these classifications with documented disaster impacts from EM-DAT. The close correspondence between ERA5-derived intensity classes and reported impacts in multiple countries supports the growing view that reanalysis products are powerful tools for forensic disaster assessment.

The combined use of ERA5 and EM-DAT is especially important because it links **physical hazard mechanisms** with **real-world consequences**. ERA5 provides environmental dynamics, while EM-DAT provides evidence of mortality, displacement, infrastructural damage, and economic losses. This dual approach strengthens interpretation by moving beyond meteorological description alone and connecting atmospheric forcing directly to human and socioeconomic outcomes.

2.3 Precipitation as a Primary but Insufficient Driver

A large part of the literature identifies precipitation as the principal trigger of flood disasters. However, the material in this study repeatedly shows that precipitation by itself cannot fully explain the severity of impacts. In the introduction, the thesis explicitly argues that conventional hazard analyses often overemphasize rainfall totals, while observed damage patterns are more strongly shaped by runoff amplification, antecedent wetness, terrain morphology, and sustained wind forcing. This is a major theme of the literature review and one of the core arguments of the thesis.

This argument is visible across the case studies. In Brazil, municipalities in Rio Grande do Sul such as Lajeado, Muçum, Encantado, and Roca Sales experienced the most severe flood impacts, where precipitation values reached the upper classes of 0.007–0.022 m. Yet the thesis does not stop at rainfall amount; it interprets these values together with the resulting runoff and the broader hydrological response. Similarly, in Costa Rica, higher precipitation classes in Puntarenas and Guanacaste corresponded to stronger flood impacts, but the text emphasizes that rainfall severity translated into damage through runoff production and basin response rather than by rainfall totals alone.

2.4 Runoff Generation and Hydrological Amplification

One of the strongest themes in the literature is that **flood severity is closely linked to the efficiency with which rainfall is converted into runoff**. This idea is central to the thesis. The uploaded material repeatedly uses runoff coefficient (RC) as a quantitative measure of hydrological amplification and shows strong event-to-event contrasts.

For example, Cuba exhibited an RC of approximately **0.0111**, meaning that only about 1.1% of rainfall became direct surface runoff. This reflects an infiltration-dominated response with low hydrological amplification. In Brazil, the Taquari Valley event showed an RC of **0.115**, meaning about 11.5% of rainfall was converted into direct runoff, which is considerably higher and indicates stronger flood-generation efficiency. Costa Rica displayed an even stronger hydrological response, with an event-scale RC of about **0.1813**, reflecting the role of prolonged rainfall, terrain, and drainage limitations in generating flood impacts. This variation across events is highly important in literature because it confirms that similar rainfall magnitudes can produce very different impacts depending on catchment behavior. The thesis

therefore contributes to the broader understanding that runoff efficiency is a better indicator of flood severity than rainfall alone in many cases.

2.5 Infiltration Capacity Exceedance and Threshold Behavior

The literature increasingly describes flooding as a **threshold-driven process**. Once rainfall intensity or duration exceeds infiltration capacity, additional precipitation is rapidly transformed into overland flow. The thesis repeatedly supports this idea. In the abstract, it notes that runoff coefficients in some case studies exceeded **0.75–0.86**, indicating near-total infiltration-capacity exceedance and rapid conversion of precipitation into overland flow. This is a crucial contribution because it places flood generation in a nonlinear threshold framework rather than a simple linear rainfall-response model.
Sensitivity analyses in several case studies further reinforce this threshold behavior. In Cuba, changing precipitation by ±10% produced only minor changes in RC (runoff coefficient), confirming a stable infiltration-dominated system. In Costa Rica, however, the RC changed from about **0.165 to 0.201** under ±10% precipitation perturbation, indicating stronger nonlinear basin behavior. Such differences demonstrate that some hydrological systems remain buffered against rainfall variability, while others respond sharply once saturation or runoff thresholds are crossed.

2.6 Soil Moisture and Antecedent Wetness

Another major theme in recent literature is the importance of **antecedent soil moisture** in shaping flood and landslide outcomes. The thesis material repeatedly emphasizes that the amount of rainfall falling during an event is not enough to explain impacts unless the prior wetness of the soil is also considered. According to the introduction, antecedent soil moisture strongly modulates flood magnitude and landslide occurrence by controlling infiltration capacity, runoff efficiency, and hydrological thresholds.
The contrast between cases illustrates this clearly. In Cuba, very low soil moisture values were associated with limited runoff generation and a low RC (runoff coefficient), meaning that much of the rainfall infiltrated rather than flowed overland. In Brazil, by contrast, soil moisture was relatively uniform and moderately high across multiple layers, indicating stable antecedent wetness that likely enhanced runoff generation during the event. Costa Rica also showed meaningful soil-moisture involvement, although uncertainty remained high in runoff-related variables. These comparisons align with the wider hydrological literature, which treats antecedent wetness as one of the strongest controls on flood response.

2.7 Soil Saturation Thresholds and Landslide Initiation

A particularly important contribution of the thesis is its treatment of **soil saturation thresholds** as a predictor of landslide initiation. The abstract states that landslide initiation was strongly correlated with volumetric soil water content approaching **0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$**, which is interpreted as a critical threshold where pore-water pressure rises enough to reduce effective stress and shear strength. This interpretation is highly consistent with geotechnical and landslide literature, which identifies near-saturation as a key precondition for slope failure.
This threshold-based reasoning moves the analysis beyond simple rainfall-trigger models. The thesis contends that landslides do not solely result from heavy rainfall; rather, rainfall becomes detrimental when it induces the soil column to approach full or near-full saturation. In this condition, the soil structure weakens, infiltration capacity collapses, and additional water can trigger slope detachment and mass movement. This is one of the most important physical insights in the whole study and supports the inclusion of soil-moisture indicators in operational landslide warning systems.

2.8 Wind Fields, Moisture Transport, and Storm Intensification

The literature on storm dynamics shows that near-surface wind fields are important not only because they cause direct damage but also because they control **moisture transport, convergence, and precipitation efficiency**. The thesis strongly reflects this understanding. In the abstract and introduction, it argues that increased low-level convergence and horizontal wind shear improve moisture transport and enhance precipitation processes, particularly in compound storm-flood systems.
Costa Rica provides a particularly clear example. There, both 10U and 10V exhibited strong variability, and their combined action generated significant low-level wind shear. The thesis interprets this shear as a mechanism that strengthened atmospheric instability, increased uplift, sustained convection, and raised the probability of secondary hazards, such as flooding and landslides. The most severe impacts were concentrated in Pacific regions such as Puntarenas and Guanacaste, where stronger storm classes coincided with severe hydrological disruption.

This supports the wider meteorological literature, which argues that low-level wind forcing should not be treated as a secondary variable. Instead, it acts as a core mechanism linking storm organization to hydrological consequences on the ground.

2.9 Spatial Classification and Comparative Multi-Case Analysis

Another valuable feature of the thesis is its use of **spatial severity classification** across multiple international case studies. This approach is important in literature because it allows comparison of hazard behavior across different climates, terrains, and hydrological systems. By using the same analytical structure across North America, Latin America, Europe, and Asia, the study identifies both common mechanisms and regional differences.

The comparative framework shows, for example, that some cases are rainfall-dominated, others runoff-dominated, and others strongly influenced by wind-supported storm organizations. Cuba represents a case with low runoff efficiency despite heavy rainfall, while Brazil and Costa Rica show stronger rainfall-runoff coupling. This kind of structured cross-case comparison is a major strength because it helps distinguish universal hydro-meteorological processes from region-specific responses.

2.10 Uncertainty, Variability, and Statistical Robustness

Modern hazard literature increasingly emphasizes the need to quantify **uncertainty** rather than report only average environmental conditions. The thesis responds to these concerns clearly by using standard deviation, coefficient of variation, confidence intervals, and sensitivity analysis for precipitation, runoff, soil moisture, and wind.

The case studies indicate that hydrological variables generally have greater variability than atmospheric ones. In Costa Rica, wind speed had low uncertainty and a relatively stable coefficient of variation, while runoff-related variables showed extremely high variability. In Brazil, the dominant sources of uncertainty were surface runoff generation, precipitation distribution, and runoff coefficient estimation, whereas wind intensity and soil moisture showed lower uncertainty. These results are important because they reveal that the biggest uncertainties in compound hazard analysis often come from how the land surface converts rainfall into runoff, not simply from the atmospheric input itself.

This supports a broader point in literature: high natural variability does not automatically mean poor statistical reliability. With large sample sizes, even highly variable processes may still yield robust mean estimates and narrow confidence intervals.

2.11 Socioeconomic Amplification of Compound Events

An important trend in disaster research is the recognition that compound events generate **larger socioeconomic impacts** than single hazards occurring in isolation. The thesis makes this point explicitly, stating that when meteorological and hydrological factors act together, they produce stronger social and economic consequences than when only one hazard is present.

The case studies support this conclusion. In Costa Rica, the combination of heavy rainfall, storm conditions, road closures, and hydrological disruption affected a very large population and damaged infrastructure, utilities, and communications. In Brazil, severe rainfall and flooding disrupted municipalities, transport systems, and residential areas across Rio Grande do Sul. These examples align with the disaster-risk literature, which emphasizes that cascading interactions between meteorological and hydrological hazards lead to more severe losses, longer recovery periods, and greater pressure on emergency response systems.

2.12 Research Gap and Contribution of the Present Study

The literature reviewed in the thesis suggests an important research gap: many previous studies have focused on one hazard type, one variable, or one region at a time. In contrast, the present study builds an integrated framework that links atmospheric forcing, hydrological response, soil saturation, and documented disaster impacts across multiple regions. This is one of its main academic contributions.

The study also contributes by promoting the use of **runoff efficiency** and **soil saturation thresholds** as practical variables for early warning and risk reduction. Rather than depending only on rainfall totals or wind maxima, the thesis shows that operational frameworks should include rainfall-to-runoff conversion, antecedent wetness, and critical soil-moisture thresholds. This is especially important under intensifying hydro-climatic extremes, where compound events are expected to become more frequent and more damaging.

3. Methodology

This study uses an integrated multi-case analytical strategy to investigate the linkage between atmospheric forcing and land-surface hydrological responses in compound hydro-meteorological hazards. The analytical framework provides a uniform platform for comparison of diverse disaster events among multiple regions and meteorological circumstances. The purpose of the research is to find out the key physical processes leading to storm, flood and landslide effects with the help of the same analytical framework for each case study. Such mechanisms include increases in runoff, saturation of soil, concentration of precipitation, and wind-driven transfer of moisture.

Each case study is accompanied with a statistical and uncertainty assessment. Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, and 95% confidence intervals are computed for the key variables. These metrics assist define the spatio-temporal variability of each of the hazard variables. The coefficient of variation is determined as: $CV=\mu/\sigma$

where CV is the coefficient of variation, σ is the standard deviation, and μ is the mean . The value is important for relative variability comparisons of different variables and occurrences.

To quantify the uncertainty, the study adopts a sensitivity analysis with a perturbation of ±10% on the precipitation data . i.e., precipitation is increased and lowered by 10% to explore how runoff generation and runoff efficiency respond to change of rainfall input. This stage is critical because hydrologic responses are generally non-linear. Runoff can increase much more than the increase in precipitation alone, especially when soils are already wet. Thus, the sensitivity analysis assists in assessing the robustness of the results and in identifying scenarios in which the runoff response is very sensitive to changes in precipitation.

In general this methodology provides a consistent and systematic approach to the analysis of compound hydro-meteorological threats. Combining ERA5 physical variables, EM-DAT impact data, spatial classification, hydrological measurements, wind diagnostics and statistical uncertainty analysis, the study investigates the physical drivers and societal implications of each occurrence. This comprehensive approach enables comparison of multi-region case studies and allows the identification of the main processes responsible for compound storm, flood and landslide consequences.3. Approach

This study uses an integrated multi-case analytical strategy to investigate the linkage between atmospheric forcing and land-surface hydrological responses in compound hydro-meteorological hazards. The analytical framework provides a uniform platform for comparison of diverse disaster events among multiple regions and meteorological circumstances. The purpose of the research is to find out the key physical processes leading to storm, flood and landslide effects with the help of the same analytical framework for each case study. Such mechanisms include increases in runoff, saturation of soil, concentration of precipitation, and wind-driven transfer of moisture.

The methodology is based on a combination of disaster impact records and reanalysis data. Atmospheric and land-surface variables are derived from ERA5 reanalysis data. The selected variables are total precipitation, surface runoff, subsurface runoff, volumetric soil water content and near-surface wind components. Total precipitation determines the spatio-temporal distribution of rainfall for each event. Surface runoff and subsurface runoff are used to evaluate the hydrological response of the land surface following rainfall. Soil moisture variables are examined for various soil layers to assess saturation levels and their likely influence to flood or landslide development. The 10 m zonal and meridional wind components are also used to study wind direction, moisture transport and storm circulation patterns.

In addition to ERA5, this analysis employs the EM-DAT International Disaster Database. The EM-DAT database includes

documented data on disaster events, such as affected areas, number of fatalities, number of displaced persons, and economic losses. These records are used to aid understanding of the physical data and to connect the reanalysis results to real-world implications. The combination of ERA5 and EM-DAT allows the study to relate the atmospheric and hydrological conditions to the disaster impacts being reported. This allows to evaluate if areas with high precipitation, runoff, soil moisture or wind intensity correspond to zones of significant damage and human impacts.

For each case study, the selected ERA5 parameters are spatially processed and divided into five severity classes. These categories indicate varying levels of hazard intensity from low to very high values. This classification enables the study to examine the spatial distribution of each variable in different places and events. The data are represented in standardized color scales, e.g. light to dark blue for precipitation and runoff, and light to deep red for soil moisture or wind-related intensity. The geographical classification is useful to identify the places where the thresholds of hazards are surpassed and when several dangerous circumstances overlap. It also supports the analysis of spatial agreement between physical hazard severity and reported disaster impacts.

The behavior of each event is quantified by several hydrological and atmospheric variables. The most essential indicator is the runoff coefficient, which is the ratio of surface runoff to total precipitation. This coefficient is a measure of the efficiency of conversion of precipitation to runoff. A higher runoff coefficient signifies a greater proportion of rainfall becoming surface runoff, which can raise the risk of flooding, especially in saturated or urbanized regions. The runoff coefficient is given in: RC= TP SRO

where TP is total precipitation, SRO is surface runoff and RC is runoff coefficient

The conditions of soil moisture are also analyzed based on the volumetric soil water content in the various layers of the soil. These variables are critical to understand the influence of antecedent wetness and saturation on the genesis of floods and landslides. When soil moisture approaches high levels of saturation, generally between 0.46 and 0.50m 3 m −3 , the soil may lose some capacity to absorb more rain. Under these conditions, pore water pressure can increase reducing effective stress and shear strength This process can contribute to slope instability, and raise the risk of landslides, especially in mountainous or steep areas.

Methodology also consists in wind field diagnostics. Near-surface wind behavior is reconstructed by combining the 10 m zonal wind component with the 10 m meridional wind component. This enables the analysis of wind speed and direction during storm events for the study. Wind patterns are essential because they influence moisture transfer, low-level convergence and storm intensification. Strong wind fields may also have a direct role in storm damage, especially when coupled with severe precipitation and saturated land-surface conditions.

Each case study is accompanied with a statistical and uncertainty assessment. Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, and 95% confidence intervals are computed for the key variables. These metrics assist define the spatio-temporal variability of each of the hazard variables. The coefficient of variation is determined as: $CV=\mu/\sigma$

where CV is the coefficient of variation, σ is the standard deviation, and μ is the mean. The value is important for relative variability comparisons of different variables and occurrences.

To quantify the uncertainty, the study adopts a sensitivity analysis with a perturbation of ±10% on the precipitation data. i.e., precipitation is increased and lowered by 10% to explore how runoff generation and runoff efficiency respond to changes in rainfall input. This stage is critical because hydrologic responses are generally non-linear. Runoff can increase much more than the increase in precipitation alone, especially when soil is already wet. Thus, the sensitivity analysis

assists in assessing the robustness of the results and in identifying scenarios in which the runoff response is very sensitive to changes in precipitation.

In general this methodology provides a consistent and systematic approach to the analysis of compound hydro-meteorological threats. The study couples ERA5 physical variables, EM-DAT impact data, spatial classification, hydrological measurements, wind diagnostics and statistical uncertainty analysis to explore both the physical drivers and the societal implications of each event. This integrated methodology allows for the comparison of multi-regional case studies and for the identification of the primary processes responsible for the impacts of compound storm, flood and landslide events.

4. Analysis

4.1. Italy

4.1.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff May 2-3




Figure 4.1.1. Italy: Emilia-Romagna Catastrophic Flood & Associated Landslides (MAY 2-3, 2023)

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the heavy rain that fell for a long time between May 2 and 3, 2023, in the **Emilia-Romagna region of Italy** caused widespread flooding. The provinces of **Bologna, Ravenna, Forlì-Cesena, Modena, and Ferrara** were the hardest hit. We divided total precipitation values into five groups, from **0–0.001 to 0.005–0.005** (with tight upper threshold values going up to 0.005324). We then used a light-to-deep blue color scale to show the results, where darker shades show more rain and a higher risk of flooding.

The northernmost parts of Ferrara were the only places with minimal rain and hydrological reaction. Slightly higher readings (0.002–0.002) mean that it is raining gently but steadily, which is causing the surface to become wet and runoff to rise slightly toward the central and coastal plains. Moderate amounts of rain (0.003–0.003) lead to more runoff and higher river levels. This is especially true for floodplains and cities around Bologna and Ravenna.

When the amount of rain falls in the **0.004–0.004** range, it means that the rain is so heavy that it can cause extensive river flooding, quick overbank flow, and flooding of farmland in the Romagna plains. The darkest blue shading shows the highest precipitation class, which includes values from **0.005 to 0.005**. This class shows the places that get the greatest rain, with the heaviest rain falling across the Apennine crest south of Forlì and Cesena and extending toward San Marino. These districts were hit the hardest since they were the main places where huge amounts of water flowed into the river networks, causing terrible floods, damage to homes and infrastructure, and problems with transportation.

ERA5 **Total Runoff (RO@SFC) and Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC)** were used to look at both surface and total hydrological responses. There were five exact groups for Total Runoff**: 0–0.000013, 0.000014–0.000063, 0.000064–0.000097, 0.000098–0.000363, and 0.000364–0.000849**. The lowest runoff classifications show that the surface conditions are steady and there is very little overland flow. As you move south, moderate runoff values (0.000064–0.000097) show that overland flow is getting stronger and pooling is happening in certain areas. The higher runoff classes (0.000098–0.000363) show that there is a lot of surface flow that is more than what natural and manmade drainage systems can handle. The highest class (0.000364–0.000849) shows areas where runoff is building up quickly, which is exactly what happened when it rained heavily in the Apennine foothills. **Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC)** also went up through five classes **(0–0, 0.001–0, 0.001–0.001, and 0.002–0.002, to a peak of 0.003–0.003)**. This increase was

significantly linked to extensive flooding and long-term waterlogging in the lower plains.

Sub-surface Runoff (SSRO@SFC) adds to the surface data by showing how water from the ground and infiltration contributed to the event. The data, which are broken down into five groups **(0–0.000011, 0.000012–0.000061, 0.000062–0.000155, 0.000156–0.000303, and 0.000304–0.000572)**, demonstrate that quick soil saturation caused large sub-surface fluxes. The greatest values for subsurface runoff (0.000304–0.000572) were also found in the same southern mountainous areas, which means that the soil's ability to absorb water was entirely overwhelmed. The strong spatial relationship between heavy rain, high surface runoff, and saturated subsurface flows shows that too much rain on very responsive catchments was the main cause of flooding during this event. 3.9.1.1. Conditions that can cause landslides to happen.

4.1.1.1. Associated Landslide Triggering Conditions

In addition to catastrophic flooding, quickly saturated soil profiles made the slopes very unstable, which caused several secondary landslides, mudflows, and debris flows throughout the Apennines' upland and hilly areas. We used ERA5 Volumetric Soil Water Layer 1 (SWVL1@DBLY) to look at the moisture levels in the surface soil. It was divided into five groups, from −0.000012–0.061955 to 0.402775–0.438921, and shown with a white-to-deep red color scale. Lower SWVL1 values mean that the surface soils are reasonably stable. Moderate saturation levels (0.061956–0.208266 and 0.208267–0.316708) mean that the conditions are critically wet, which greatly lowered the cohesion of the surface soil across the central plains. Higher saturation classes (0.316709–0.402774) mean that the surface soils are quite wet. The highest SWVL1 class (0.402775–0.438921), which is mostly near Bologna, Forlì, and Cesena, shows where the surface is very saturated and where the slope is most likely to fail. Using Volumetric Soil Water Layer 2 (SWVL2@DBLY), we looked at the subsurface conditions in the shallow root zone. They were between −0.000013 and 0.075614 in the lowest class and between 0.374685 and 0.43828 in the highest class.

We used Volumetric Soil Water Layer 3 (SWVL3@DBLY) and Layer 4 (SWVL4@DBLY) to look at deeper soil profiles to better understand the deep-seated instability. There were five different ranges for SWVL3: −0.000012–0.122124, 0.122125–0.224161, 0.224162–0.281364, 0.281365–0.335475, and 0.335476–0.394223. Water's deep penetration into this third layer raised pore-water pressure a lot and made structural integrity worse at important failure planes, which could lead to increased risk of landslides or structural collapse in the affected areas. Finally, the deepest profile that was looked at, SWVL4, showed the long-term hydrological loading in groups that ranged from 0 to 0.137, 0.138 to 0.244, 0.245 to 0.276, 0.277 to 0.309, and finally reached a peak of 0.310 to 0.375. The high moisture levels in all four separate volumetric layers show that the vertical soil column is completely saturated. This entire saturation not only made the huge amounts of water that flooded the Emilian and Romagnol plains worse, but it also weakened the geomechanical stability of the Apennine slopes, making it easier for deep-seated landslides to start and spread throughout the area.

4.1.1.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

In the Emilia-Romagna region, specifically affecting the municipalities of Fontanelice, Castel Bolognese, and the provinces of Forlì-Cesena, a hydrological crisis triggered by heavy rains lasted for approximately four days. The disaster resulted in 2 deaths and forced the evacuation of 500 people. Widespread landslides involving mud and rock compromised local geography. Significant infrastructural strain occurred due to the overflowing of the Senio, Sillaro, and Lamone Rivers, leading to the displacement of residents and immediate regional disruption.

4.1.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 1,152** grid–time observations were analyzed for the May 2023 Emilia-Romagna flood event. The assessment includes precipitation (tp), surface runoff (sro), subsurface runoff (ssro), total runoff (ro), upper soil moisture layers (swvl1–swvl4), and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Uncertainty is quantified using standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.1.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.1.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
Value	1,152	1.156	1.271	1.099	1.083 – 1.229	55.49	48

Interpretation

Rainfall averaged **1.156 mm per timestep**, producing **55.49 mm total**. Variability is moderate-to-high (CV ≈ 1.10), consistent with convective–frontal interactions typical of early-May Mediterranean systems. The narrow CI reflects **high statistical precision**.

Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.1.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.1.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff (mm)
Value	0.133	0.336	2.524	0.114 – 0.153	6.397

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **high variability** (CV ≈ 2.52), reflecting nonlinear runoff generation in partially saturated soils. Despite dispersion, the CI remains narrow due to the large sample size.

4.1.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table4.1.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	Total subsurface runoff (mm)
Value	0.0109	0.0350	3.211	0.524

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff is small but highly variable relative to its mean, indicating localized infiltration–drainage processes.

4.1.1.3.4. Total Runoff (RO)

Table 4.1.1.3.4. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean RO/step (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)
Value	0.144	0.347	2.406	0.124 – 0.164	6.921

Interpretation

Total runoff reflects the combined surface and subsurface contributions, with high variability but strong statistical stability.

4.1.1.3.5. Soil Moisture (swvl1–swvl4)

Table 4.1.1.3.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.343	0.306	0.236	0.248
CV	0.366	0.426	0.416	0.422
95% CI	0.336 – 0.351	0.298 – 0.313	0.231 – 0.242	0.242 – 0.254

Interpretation

Soil moisture values indicate **moderately wet antecedent conditions**, with increasing variability at deeper layers. Values remain below saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$), but sufficiently elevated to enhance runoff efficiency.

4.1.1.3.6. Runoff Coefficient (RC = SRO/TP)

Table 3.1.1.3.6. Event-scale runoff coefficient

Parameter	n	Mean RC	STD	CV	95% CI
Value	907	0.0709	0.1053	1.485	0.0640 – 0.0778

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient of **0.115 (event-scale)** and **0.071 (grid-scale mean)** indicates **modest hydrological amplification**, consistent with partial soil saturation and moderate rainfall intensity.

4.1.1.3.7. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.1.1.3.7. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC	0.1153	0.1281	0.1048

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **nonlinear sensitivity** to precipitation perturbations, confirming threshold-like hydrological behavior typical of early-season flood events in Emilia-Romagna.

4.1.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff May 16-17




Figure 4.1.2. Italy: Emilia-Romagna Catastrophic Flood & Associated Landslides (May 16-17, 2023)

The ERA5 total precipitation (TP@SFC) analysis demonstrates that the heavy rain that fell in the Emilia-Romagna region from May 16 to 17, 2023, caused massive and deadly flooding. The provinces of Bologna, Ravenna, and Forlì-The heaviest hit areas were Cesena and the territories that stretched south near San Marino. We split the total amount of rain into five groups, from 0 to 0.001 to 0.006 to 0.008 (with the highest values going up to 0.008168). These results are displayed using a light-to-deep blue color scale, where the darkest shades represent the highest volume of rain and the most severe flooding risk.

The northernmost parts, close to Ferrara, and the coastal edges that go into Venice got very little rain and didn't react much in terms of water flow. Slightly higher readings (0.002–0.002, with upper bounds of 0.00173) indicate steady, moderate rainfall, which initiated surface wetting and a slight rise in runoff toward the central plains. When the rain got heavier and fell in the 0.003–0.003 and 0.004–0.005 ranges (with highest values of 0.004613), the surface runoff increased a lot. This much water was too much for the rivers to handle, so it quickly flowed over the banks and into the floodplains around Bologna, Ravenna, and Modena. The darkest blue shading shows the areas with the most rain (0.006–0.008), which are the most important. The strongest rain poured severely in the Apennine crest south of Bologna, Forlì, and into San Marino. This sent huge amounts of water directly into the river networks and caused a lot of damage to infrastructure.

ERA5 Total Runoff (RO@SFC) and Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC) were looked at to see how the surface and total hydrological responses were. There were five exact groups for Total Runoff: 0–0.000011, 0.000012–0.000025, 0.000026–0.000041, 0.000042–0.000084, and 0.000085–0.000173. The lowest ratings show that the surface conditions are stable and there isn't much overland movement in the northern plains. As you move south toward the Apennine foothills, moderate to high runoff values (0.000026–0.000084) show that water is pooling and flowing overland more forcefully. The highest class (0.000085–0.000173) shows the locations where runoff built up the fastest, which is the same as the flow rates that caused the most damage during the heaviest rain.

Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC) also has an extreme path, which was broken down into five groups based on visual labels of 0–0, 0.001–0.001, 0.002–0.002, 0.003–0.003, and 0.004–0.005 (with a genuine top limit of 0.005249). This huge amount of water on the surface was directly linked to the extensive flooding of crops and waterlogging in the lower Romagna plains.

Sub-surface Runoff (SSRO@SFC) gives more information by showing how deep the ground could soak up water during the event. The data is divided into five groups based on upper limits ≤0.000058, ≤0.000173, ≤0.000327, ≤0.000526, and ≤0.001636. It shows that quick soil saturation caused huge sub-surface fluxes. The greatest values for sub-surface runoff (up to 0.001636) were quite similar to the surface data and were mostly seen in the southern mountainous and hilly areas. This proves that the soil's ability to hold water was completely overwhelmed, turning practically all of the rain that fell after that into harmful runoff.

4.1.2.1. Associated Landslide Triggering Conditions

The soil profiles quickly became saturated, which made the slopes very unstable and caused several mudflows, debris flows, and deep-seated landslides across the Apennine uplands. This was in addition to the terrible floods on the plains. We used the ERA5 Volumetric Soil Water Layer 1 (SWVL1@DBLY) to check how wet the surface soil was. We split this into five groups and used a color scale from white to deep red to show it: -8.892e-06–6.637e-02, 6.638e-02–2.086e-01, 2.087e-01–3.490e-01, 3.491e-01–4.173e-01, and 4.174e-01–4.836e-01.

Lower SWVL1 levels mean that the surface soils are quite stable. But moderate to high saturation levels (0.208–0.417) mean that the ground was quite moist, which made the soil in the central foothills between Parma, Modena, and Bologna much less stable. The highest SWVL1 class (4.174e-01–4.836e-01), shown in deep red, covers the area from Parma down through the Apennines to San Marino. This shows where the surface was completely soaked and the slopes were in danger of failing right away.

Volumetric Soil Water Layer 2 (SWVL2@DBLY) was looked at to find out what was going on below the surface in the shallow root zone. The lowest class of these values was from -0.000013 to 0.140794. The next three classes were 0.140795 to 0.292864, 0.292865 to 0.364206, and 0.364207 to 0.418651. The highest class was 0.418652 to 0.478729. We then used Volumetric Soil Water Layer 3 (SWVL3@DBLY) and Layer 4 (SWVL4@DBLY) to look at the deeper soil profiles and figure out why the structure was unstable at such a deep level. There were five different ranges for SWVL3: -0.000012–0.10449, 0.104491–0.253777, 0.253778–0.324689, 0.32469–0.390002, and 0.390003–0.475842. Water penetrated deeply into this third layer, which greatly increased the pore-water pressure and weakened the structural integrity of important failure planes in the hillsides.

Finally, SWVL4 looked at the long-term hydrological loading at the deepest profile that was looked at. There were five groups in this layer: 0–0.136, 0.137–0.280, 0.281–0.334, 0.335–0.380, and 0.381–0.444 (with an absolute highest limit of 0.444016). The very high moisture levels in all four volumetric layers show that the vertical soil column was completely saturated. This complete saturation not only made the huge amount of floodwater that flooded the Emilian and Romagnol plains even worse, but it also completely destroyed the geomechanical stability of the Apennine slopes. This made the perfect conditions for the widespread and destructive landslides that happened on May 16 and 17.

4.1.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

A catastrophic flooding event fueled by Storm Minerva impacted eight provinces across Northern Italy, including Bologna, Ferrara, Forlì-Cesena, Modena, Parma, Ravenna, Reggio Emilia, and Rimini. Over a five-day peak period, the disaster claimed 15 lives and led to the massive displacement of 46,000 people. Economic damages were extreme, with total losses estimated at approximately $9,750,000 and total affected costs reaching over $10,037,577. The environmental impact was worsened by secondary disasters, specifically landslides and mudslides, which devastated the landscape and crippled regional transport and communication networks.

4.1.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 2,880** grid–time observations were analyzed for the 2023 flood event in Italy. The assessment includes precipitation (tp), surface runoff (sro), subsurface runoff (ssro), total runoff (ro), upper soil moisture layers (swvl1–swvl4), and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Uncertainty is quantified using standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.1.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.1.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total Rainfall (mm)
Value	2,880	1.408888	1.492628	1.059	1.354 – 1.463	67.6266

Interpretation

Rainfall totaled **67.63 mm**, with a mean of **1.41 mm per timestep**. Variability is moderate-to-high (CV ≈ 1.06), typical of tropical convective rainfall. The narrow CI reflects **very high statistical confidence**.

4.1.2.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.1.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total SRO (mm)
Value	0.364952	0.728251	1.995	0.338 – 0.392	17.5177

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **very high variability** (CV ≈ 2.00), reflecting nonlinear runoff generation under tropical rainfall. Despite dispersion, the CI remains narrow due to the large sample size.

4.1.2.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.1.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total ssro (mm)
Value	0.030368	0.085779	2.825	0.027 – 0.034	0.5240

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff is small but highly variable relative to its mean, indicating localized infiltration–drainage processes.

4.1.2.3.4. Total Runoff (RO)

Table 4.1.2.3.4. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean RO/step (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total RO (mm)
Value	0.395327	0.765864	1.937	0.367 – 0.423	6.9209

Interpretation

Total runoff reflects combined surface and subsurface contributions, with high variability but strong statistical stability.

4.1.2.3.5. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.1.2.3.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Metric	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.3319	0.3271	0.2740	0.2523
STD	0.1557	0.1543	0.1404	0.1294
CV	0.469	0.472	0.513	0.513
95% CI	0.326–0.338	0.321–0.333	0.269–0.279	0.248–0.257

Interpretation

Soil moisture values indicate **moderately dry antecedent conditions**, with variability increasing with depth. These conditions limit runoff generation and promote infiltration.

4.1.2.3.6. Runoff Coefficient (RC = SRO/TP)

Table 4.1.2.3.6. Event-scale runoff coefficient

Parameter	n	Mean RC	STD	CV	95% CI
Value	2,570	0.176565	0.548452	3.106	0.155 – 0.198

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient of **0.259 (event-scale)** and **0.177 (grid-scale mean)** indicates **low-to-moderate hydrological amplification**, consistent with dry soils and infiltration-dominated behavior.

4.1.2.3.7. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.1.2.3.7. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient

Parameter	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
Value	0.259036	0.287817	0.235487

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to precipitation perturbations, confirming threshold-like hydrological behavior.

4.2. Canada

4.2.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.2.1. Analysis of Southern Manitoba Flood, 21-22 April 2022 (TP@SFC & RO@SFC)

The spatial analysis of **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** and **surface runoff (RO@SFC)** derived from the ArcGIS classification clearly identifies **southern Manitoba** as the region that experienced the most severe and devastating impacts during the **April 21–22, 2022** flood event. In particular, the **Winnipeg metropolitan area and the Red River Basin** were exposed to the highest combined values of precipitation and runoff, indicating extreme hydrological stress. Flooding was the primary driver of the event, fueled by significant cumulative rainfall. ERA5 total precipitation (**TP@SFC**) values were classified into five categories represented by a light-to-dark blue color scale: **0–0.000298 m**, **0.001–0.001 m**, **0.002–0.002 m**, **0.003–0.003 m**, and **0.004–0.005 m**. Lower classes (0–0.000298 m) correspond to minimal rainfall, while moderate rainfall capable of contributing to soil saturation is represented by the 0.001–0.002 m range. Severe precipitation accumulation is captured by the upper classes between 0.003 and 0.005 m, identifying areas exposed to the highest intensity and persistence.

The spatial analysis identifies the Winnipeg metropolitan area and the Red River Basin as the regions exposed to the highest precipitation values (0.004–0.005 m). Further north, locations such as Dauphin and Grand Rapids experienced

more moderate precipitation, typically falling within the 0.001 to 0.002 m classes. Further east, the Lake of the Woods region saw values ranging from 0.002 to 0.004 m, indicating a significant but slightly lower atmospheric forcing compared to the southern corridor. The extreme rainfall and seasonal snowmelt rapidly translated into exceptional surface runoff due to the near-complete saturation or frozen state of the soil typical of early spring in the Canadian Prairies. ERA5 surface runoff (**RO@SFC**) outputs indicate widespread runoff values classified into five categories: **0–0.000002 m**, **0.000003–0.000005 m**, **0.000006–0.000008 m**, **0.000009–0.000012 m**, and **0.000013–0.000017 m**.
The Winnipeg metropolitan area and the Red River Basin peaked at the highest runoff class (**0.000013–0.000017 m**), suggesting that a large proportion of precipitation was rapidly converted into surface flow, overwhelming both natural drainage and engineered flood defenses. In areas west and southwest of Winnipeg, including Brandon, runoff values reached **0.000006–0.000012 m**, which was sufficient to cause significant river overflow and agricultural inundation despite slightly lower precipitation levels. The Lake of the Woods region exhibited runoff values in the highest class (**0.000013–0.000017 m**) despite lower rainfall, reflecting shallow soils and limited storage capacity that led to rapid lake inflows.

4.2.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The interaction between precipitation and runoff efficiency, rather than precipitation intensity alone, controlled the April 2022 flood event. The high rains and resulting floods caused a major socioeconomic disaster that affected **1,000 people**. The catastrophe caused significant damage to infrastructure and forced local evacuations as water levels rose across twelve administrative divisions.
The flooding across Southern Manitoba disrupted agricultural operations, cut off rural transport routes, and caused damage to homes and roads in both urban centers like Winnipeg and rural municipalities. Saturated spring soils and heavy rain caused widespread flooding, covering large areas of farmland and putting a lot of pressure on flood-control systems, especially along the Red River corridor, where the highest levels of rain and runoff happened together.
Overall, the **TP@SFC and RO@SFC** datasets demonstrate that the **April 2022** flood event was not solely controlled by precipitation intensity but by the **interaction between precipitation and runoff efficiency**. Regions where high precipitation coincided with extreme runoff, particularly southern Manitoba and parts of northwestern Ontario, experienced the most devastating impacts. This confirms that runoff-dominated hydrological responses, driven by antecedent soil and seasonal conditions, played a decisive role in amplifying flood severity during this event.

4.2.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

Uncertainty was assessed using **28,512 spatial–temporal samples**, representing all grid cells and time steps associated with the flood event. For each hydrometeorological variable, the mean (μ), standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV = σ/μ), and 95% confidence intervals (CI95) were computed. The CV provides a normalized measure of dispersion: **Low variability:** CV < 1, **Moderate variability:** CV = 1–2, **High variability:** CV > 2

4.2.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.2.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.5005	0.7408	1.48	0.492 – 0.509	Moderate

Interpretation
Precipitation exhibits **moderate dispersion** (CV ≈ 1.48), consistent with spatial–temporal variability typical of large-scale storm systems. The confidence interval is narrow due to the large sample size, indicating **high statistical reliability**.

4.2.1.2.2. Runoff (RO)

Table 4.2.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.02674	0.10535	3.94	0.0255 – 0.0280	High

Interpretation
Runoff shows **substantial spread** (CV ≈ 3.94), reflecting nonlinear hydrologic behavior and localized runoff generation. High variability is expected due to strong contrasts in infiltration, soil storage, and microtopographic controls.

4.2.1.2.3. Runoff Coefficient (RC)

Table 4.2.1.2.3. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event

Parameter	Mean RC	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.05343	—	4.62	—	Very High

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient displays **extreme variability** (CV ≈ 4.62).
This arises from dividing runoff by **very small precipitation values**, which amplifies the ratio.
RC is therefore **not reliable at the grid scale** and should be interpreted **only at the event scale**.

4.2.1.2.4. Event-Scale Hydrological Metrics

Event totals and timestep-averaged values were derived from basin-mean series (**n = 96 timesteps**).

Table 4.2.1.2.4. Event Summary Metrics

Metric	Total Rainfall	Mean Rainfall per timestep	Rainfall 95% CI	Total Runoff (RO)	Mean Runoff per timestep	Runoff 95% CI	Runoff Coefficient (RO/TP)	Number of timesteps
Value	48.05 mm	0.5005 mm	0.391 – 0.610 mm	2.567 mm	0.02674 mm	0.0188 – 0.0347 mm	0.05343	96

Interpretation

Only **5.34%** of rainfall was converted to surface runoff, indicating Moderate infiltration, Significant basin storage, and Absence of rapid rainfall-to-runoff conversion
Runoff volumes remain small relative to precipitation, confirming **dominant retention processes**.
Narrow confidence intervals indicate **a high reliability of event-integrated** estimates.

4.2.1.2.5. Sensitivity Analysis (±10% Precipitation)

Table 4.2.1.2.5. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
Runoff Coefficient	0.05343	0.05937	0.04858

Interpretation

A ±10% change in precipitation modifies RC by approximately **±0.005**.
Relative variation is **9–11%**, indicating **moderate hydrological sensitivity**.
The system maintains **overall hydrologic stability**, with no evidence of nonlinear amplification.

4.2.2. Storm Characteristics and Wind Impact




Figure 4.2.2. Compound Hydro-Meteorological Disaster Central Canada (Manitoba & Ontario), 21-25 April 2022

The ERA5 near-surface wind analysis shows that a strong atmospheric circulation caused the devastating storm that hit Canada from April 21 to 24, 2022. This circulation affected Ontario and Manitoba. We used ERA5 10 m wind components to figure out just how strong the storm was. We put them into five groups based on how severe the storm was. The 10 m V-component wind values, showing how fast the wind blows from north to south, ranged between −18.226 and 13.544 m s^{-1}. Wind classes below **−18.226 to −7.262 m s^{-1}** and **−7.261 to −3.524 m s^{-1}** depict regions where severe southerly flows are happening. Wind speeds between −3.523 and 2.082 m s^{-1} illustrate the storm's core's transition zones. The dark red tint shows where the wind load is the strongest coming from the north. The wind class for the V-component is highest in these areas, between 2.083 and 13.544 m s^{-1}. The zonal wind **(10U@SFC)** findings, on the other hand, were between −7.673 and 15.008 m s^{-1}. The lower classes, which range from **−7.673 to −0.38 m s^{-1},** represent the system's western edge. The highest class, which goes from **7.537 to 15.008 m s^{-1},** has a lot of horizontal wind forcing. The high values in both the U and V components show that this system has a lot of energy and can knock down buildings, cut off power, and make it very impossible to move from Winnipeg to western Ontario.# Related Flooding Dynamics A strong storm was the most hazard, but the system's power and movement brought torrential rain and runoff, which flooded low-lying areas. The flooding was a secondary hazard that mostly affected places to the east and south of Lake Winnipeg. This was because the ground was already wet and it kept raining, which made the risk to local infrastructure much worse.

4.2.2.1. Associated Flood Hazard

The ERA5 total precipitation (TP@SFC) study for April 2022 shows that this one-time rain event was the main cause of Manitoba's water stress. The data for rainfall has a considerable gradient. In the north and west, there was very little rain in the research area, between 0 and 0.001 m. But the area near the international border, where the most rain fell (between 0.004 and 0.007 m), is very wet. This peak illustrates that a lot of water came in a short amount of time, which was too much for the Red River Valley and the basins around it to handle on their own.
The Surface Runoff (RO@SFC) study shows that the earth can't soak up the fast flow of water, which is another confirmation of how the water cycle is changing. The runoff values move in the same direction as the precipitation values. The most important ones are in a small area south of Winnipeg. Most of the province had runoff between 0 and 0.000379 m, however the places that were impacted the worst had runoff between 0.002 and 0.004 m, which is the highest level. The highest figure of 0.007 m for runoff shows that more than half of the entire rainfall flowed straight into the ground. The fact that there was so much runoff compared to precipitation shows that the spring weather, which may have included soils that were only partially frozen or had already been saturated, made it hard for water to soak into the ground. When natural watercourses and man-made drainage systems approached their limits, the crucial 0.002 to 0.004 m runoff range changed. During the storm, this caused floods that made it harder for emergency personnel to get to people and disrupted transportation networks.

The event had a far bigger effect since the wind and water acted together. Wind-driven processes moved water around, mixed lakes better, and sped up erosion along riverbanks and shorelines.

4.2.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The combined effects of extreme precipitation and strong winds resulted in significant socioeconomic and infrastructural impacts across Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario. Reported losses from the **April 22–25** period include approximately **USD 60 million in insured damages**, in addition to substantial uninsured losses. Flooding and storm damage disrupted transportation networks, municipal services, and local livelihoods, while prolonged recovery periods contributed to long-term psychosocial stress within affected communities.
Environmental impacts included soil erosion, degradation of water quality, and the potential for long-term ecological and nutrient-cycle changes, particularly in floodplain areas. The frequency and the high cost of these compound events shows that the region is becoming more vulnerable to extreme hydroclimatic hazards.

4.2.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A comprehensive uncertainty evaluation was conducted using **152,352 spatial–temporal samples per variable**, representing all grid cells and time steps associated with the storm period. The analysis quantifies variability in precipitation, runoff, and near-surface wind fields using the mean, standard deviation (SD), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI95), providing a robust assessment of physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.2.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.2.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	152,352	0.368	0.693	1.88	0.365 – 0.372	Moderate–High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **1.88** indicates substantial spatial–temporal variability, consistent with **convective storm structures** producing sharp rainfall gradients. The CI is narrow due to the large sample size, confirming a **well-constrained mean estimate**.

4.2.2.3.2. Total Runoff (RO)

Table 4.2.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.0225	0.0782	3.47	0.0212 – 0.0291	Very High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **3.47** indicates **extreme hydrological variability**, reflecting localized infiltration, storage, and surface flow processes. Runoff responses are highly uneven across the basin.

4.2.2.3.3. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.2.2.3.3. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	−1.88	3.05	1.62	−1.90 – −1.87	Moderate–High

Interpretation

Variability is moderate to high, with SD exceeding the magnitude of the mean.
The negative mean indicates **persistent westerly flow** during the storm.

4.2.2.3.4. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.2.2.3.4. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	−1.24	3.84	3.10	−1.26 – −1.22	High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **3.10** indicates strong directional variability. The negative mean reflects a **dominant southward flow**, consistent with storm-scale circulation.

4.2.2.3.5. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.2.2.3.5. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	4.85	2.36	0.49	4.84 – 4.87	Low–Moderate

Interpretation

CV ≈ **0.49** indicates **relatively stable wind intensity**, even though directional components fluctuate more strongly.

4.2.2.3.6. Runoff Coefficient (RC = RO/TP)

Table 4.2.2.3.6. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the storm event

Parameter	Mean RC	SD	CV	95% CI	Uncertainty Level
Value	4.28×10^{6}	2.06×10^{7}	4.82	4.17×10^{6} – 4.38×10^{6}	Extremely High

Interpretation

The extremely large CV (≈ **4.82**) reflects **severe instability** in grid-scale RC values.
This is driven by grid cells with **very small precipitation**, causing the ratio to explode.
RC should, therefore, be interpreted **only at the event scale**, not at the grid scale.

4.2.2.4. Event-Scale Hydrometeorological Summary

Table 4.2.2.4. Event Summary Statistics

Metric	Total Rainfall	Mean Rainfall per Timestep	Rainfall 95% CI	Total Runoff (RO)	Mean Runoff per Timestep	Runoff 95% CI	Runoff Coefficient (RO/TP)	Mean Wind Speed (10 m)	Wind Speed 95% CI	Maximum Wind Speed	Timestep
Value	35.35 mm	0.368 mm	0.298 – 0.439 mm	2.16 mm	0.0225 mm	0.0195 – 0.0255 mm	0.061	4.85 m/s	4.57 – 5.14 m/s	7.06 m/s	96

Hydrological Interpretation

The storm delivered **moderate cumulative rainfall** (~35 mm).
Surface runoff represented **6.1%** of precipitation, indicating Predominant infiltration, Moderate hydrologic response, and Absence of flash-flood-type rapid conversion
Subsurface and storage processes likely dominated the basin response.
Wind speeds averaged ~5 m/s with gusts above 7 m/s, confirming a **combined wind–rain storm environment**.

4.2.2.5. Sensitivity Analysis (±10% Precipitation)

Table 4.2.2.5. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event

Scenario	Base	TP −10%	TP +10%
RC	0.061	0.0679	0.0556

Interpretation

A ±10% change in rainfall modifies RC by roughly **±0.006**, indicating **modest hydrological sensitivity**.
The runoff response remains **largely proportional**, with no evidence of nonlinear amplification.
Event-scale hydrological efficiency is therefore **stable under small rainfall perturbations**.

4.3. Cuba

4.3.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.3.1. Tropical Cyclone (Storm), Near-Surface Zonal Wind (10U@SFC & 10V@SFC)

The June 2022 storm event affecting Cuba, which later evolved into Tropical Storm Alex, was characterized by persistent and spatially extensive near-surface wind anomalies. To evaluate the wind forcing related to this event, near-surface wind fields from the ERA5 reanalysis were examined at 10 m above ground level, concentrating on the zonal **(10U@SFC)** and meridional **(10V@SFC)** wind components. These variables jointly describe the horizontal wind circulation responsible for surface wind stress and associated impacts.

The zonal wind component, **10U@SFC**, represents the east–west component of the wind at 10 m height, with positive values indicating flow from west to east and negative values indicating flow from east to west. ERA5 **10U@SFC** values over Cuba during the event ranged from **−4.317 to 15.293 m s⁻¹** and were classified into five intensity classes**: −4.317 to 1.605 m s⁻¹**, **1.606 to 3.912 m s⁻¹**, **3.913 to 6.526 m s⁻¹**, **6.527 to 9.372 m s⁻¹**, and **9.373 to 15.293 m s⁻¹**. The lowest class, corresponding to weak or variable zonal winds, was mainly observed outside the core impact areas. Moderate wind intensities dominated central regions of the island, while the strongest wind classes were concentrated in western Cuba, particularly over the provinces of Pinar del Río, Artemisa, Havana, and Mayabeque. These high values indicate sustained and intense zonal wind forcing associated with the storm circulation.

The meridional wind component**, 10V@SFC**, describes the north–south component of the near-surface wind, with positive values indicating south-to-north flow and negative values indicating north-to-south flow. Although the spatial distribution presented emphasizes the zonal component, the meridional wind played a critical role in shaping the overall wind field. Enhanced **10V@SFC** values contributed to the cyclonic circulation pattern and to the persistence of storm-related winds over western and central Cuba by reinforcing low-level convergence and directional shear.

The combined use of **10U@SFC** and **10V@SFC** allows for the reconstruction of the total near-surface wind vector, from which wind speed and direction can be derived as the vector magnitude and orientation of the horizontal wind components. This approach is essential for accurately representing surface wind stress, storm structure, and the interaction between atmospheric circulation and exposed infrastructure. During the **June 2022** event, the joint behavior of the zonal and meridional wind components reveals a broad and slowly evolving storm system that maintained elevated wind speeds over the same regions for an extended period.

Despite the system remaining partially disorganized due to strong vertical wind shear, the near-surface wind field indicates severe storm conditions. Peak wind gusts in the surrounding region reached approximately **49–51 knots**, consistent with tropical-storm-force winds. The spatial persistence of the highest wind intensity classes reflects the slow translation speed of the system, which increased cumulative wind exposure and amplified damage potential.

These wind conditions had significant societal impacts. According to **EM-DAT** records, approximately 158,000 electricity customers were affected as a result of damage to the electrical grid, highlighting the vulnerability of essential services to sustained near-surface wind stress. The close spatial correspondence between areas exhibiting the highest

ERA5 wind intensity classes and reported infrastructure damage confirms the dominant role of storm-related winds in determining the overall impact of the June 2022 event.
Overall, the **ERA5** near-surface wind analysis demonstrates that the storm was characterized by strong, persistent, and spatially extensive wind anomalies, with the most severe effects concentrated in western and central Cuba. The results emphasize the importance of analyzing both zonal and meridional wind components to fully capture storm dynamics and associated impacts in tropical and subtropical storm events.

4.3.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The tropical system that caused the weather event affected approximately 6,780 individuals in Havana, Pinar del Río, Artemisa, Sancti Spíritus, and Matanzas. Three people died because of the cyclone. The storm affected five provinces, causing many people to have to leave their homes and public services to be disrupted. The electrical lines, telecommunications, and roofs of homes were all badly damaged by strong winds and the rain that came with them. The economical effects were most noticeable in cities like Havana and rural areas like Artemisa, where old infrastructure and storm forcing made the catastrophe worse.

4.3.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 45,360** grid–time observations were analyzed for the 2022 storm event. The statistical assessment includes precipitation (TP), zonal wind (U10), meridional wind (V10), and derived 10-m wind speed magnitude. Uncertainty was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.3.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.3.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	45,360	0.875	1.593	1.82	0.860 – 0.889	41.99 mm	48

Interpretation
The storm produced approximately **42 mm of total rainfall over 48 timesteps**. The coefficient of variation (CV ≈ 1.82) indicates **substantial temporal and spatial variability**, typical of convective storm environments. Despite this variability, the confidence interval remains narrow, reflecting **strong statistical reliability** due to the large number of samples.
Uncertainty level: Moderate–high variability with very high statistical confidence.

4.3.1.2.2. Zonal Wind Component (10U)

Table 4.3.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	−3.64	2.53	−0.70	−3.66 – −3.61	−1.73

Interpretation
The negative mean indicates a **dominant westward atmospheric flow**. The magnitude of variability relative to the mean suggests **moderate directional fluctuations**, typical during storm development.

4.3.1.2.3. Meridional Wind Component (10V)

Table 4.3.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	4.83	3.58	0.74	4.80 – 4.86	7.24

Interpretation
The positive mean indicates a **dominant northward wind component**. Compared with the zonal component, the meridional wind exhibits a **stronger magnitude and moderate variability**, suggesting a pronounced directional flow structure during the storm.

4.3.1.2.4. Wind Speed at 10 m (Derived Magnitude)

Table 4.3.1.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	6.65	3.40	0.51	6.62 – 6.68	8.16

Interpretation

Wind speed magnitude shows **lower variability than the individual vector components**, as directional fluctuations partially cancel when computing scalar magnitude. The mean wind speed (~6.7 m/s) indicates **strong boundary-layer forcing**, consistent with an active storm system affecting the region.

4.3.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.3.2. Cuba, June 2022: Flood Analysis & Extreme Precipitation

The ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** analysis shows that the intensity of rainfall varied across Cuba during the June 2022 event, with the most extreme rainfall occurring in the western and central provinces. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories based on ERA5 output, ranging from **0–0.001 m** to **0.012–0.029 m**, and visualized using a light-to-dark blue color scale.

Areas classified within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0.001 m**) experienced negligible rainfall accumulation and were largely unaffected by flood impacts. Slightly higher precipitation amounts, represented by the **0.002–0.002 m** class, indicate low rainfall intensity, resulting in limited surface water accumulation and minimal hydrological response.

Moderate precipitation levels, corresponding to values between **0.003 and 0.005 m**, reflect sustained rainfall capable of generating surface runoff and localized flooding, particularly in areas with reduced drainage capacity.

Higher precipitation intensities, classified within the **0.006–0.011 m** range, indicate significant rainfall accumulation leading to soil saturation, rising river levels, and increased flood susceptibility. The highest precipitation class, represented by the darkest blue color and corresponding to values between **0.012 and 0.029 m**, identifies areas exposed to extreme rainfall during the event. These values dominate large portions of **Pinar del Río, Artemisa, Mayabeque, Havana, and the Isla de la Juventud**, marking them as the primary flood impact zones.

Ground observations confirm the severity of this class, with recorded precipitation reaching up to **301 mm within approximately 30 hours** in Pinar del Río. The spatial concentration of extreme precipitation values clearly identifies western Cuba as the most severely affected region. Prolonged rainfall led to widespread surface water accumulation, river overflow, and extensive inundation of low-lying areas.

The spatial distribution of the highest precipitation classes shows strong agreement with reported flood impacts in the EM-DAT database, including population displacement and extensive damage to housing and infrastructure. In **Pinar del Río alone, authorities displaced more than 4,480 people, with additional evacuations** reported in **Havana and**

Matanzas. The persistence of rainfall within the upper precipitation classes indicates that flooding was driven not only by rainfall intensity but also by prolonged accumulation over successive hours.
Overall, the ERA5 total precipitation results demonstrate that flood impacts during the **June 2022** event were strongly controlled by the spatial concentration and persistence of extreme rainfall values, particularly within the **0.012–0.029 m** class, confirming western and central Cuba as the most severely affected regions.
ERA5-derived surface runoff (SROQ@SFC) results show a strong hydrological response to the heavy rain that fell in Cuba in June 2022. Runoff values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0** to **0.000006–0.000011 m**, represented by a light-to-dark blue color scale. The spatial distribution of runoff shows that the highest values are concentrated in western Cuba, particularly in **Pinar del Río, Artemisa, and Mayabeque**.
Areas classified within the lowest runoff classes (**0–0** and **0.000001–0.000001 m**) exhibit negligible surface runoff, indicating limited hydrological response and effective infiltration. Moderate runoff values, represented by the **0.000002–0.000002 m** and **0.000003–0.000005 m** classes, correspond to areas where rainfall intensity exceeded local infiltration capacity, resulting in noticeable surface flow and localized accumulation of water.
The highest runoff class, represented by the darkest blue color and corresponding to values between **0.000006 and 0.000011 m**, identifies areas exposed to extreme runoff generation. These values indicate conditions of near-complete soil saturation, where additional rainfall was rapidly converted into surface runoff. The areas of extreme precipitation and the highest runoff classes spatially overlap, indicating that the event exceeded infiltration capacity early on.
As the rain continued, the high runoff rates caused rapid river discharge and intense overland flow, which led to flash flooding and severe river overflow. The most significant hydrological impacts were observed along the **Cuyaguateje River**, which reached levels described as the highest since **1982**. The concentration of extreme runoff in western Cuba highlights the combined effects of prolonged rainfall, saturated soils, and limited drainage capacity.

4.3.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The extreme runoff substantially amplified flood impacts by increasing water depth and flow velocity, triggering landslides and structural failures, particularly in **Havana**, where multiple building collapses were reported. The flooding also had a severe impact on agricultural areas, inundating approximately 3,200 hectares of cropland. The strong spatial agreement between runoff intensity, precipitation severity, and reported impacts confirms surface runoff as a critical mechanism linking atmospheric forcing to the observed flood damage during the **June 2022** event.
The hydrological flooding event affected over 2,300 people in the provinces of Matanzas and Pinar del Río, including the municipality of San Juan y Martínez, due to prolonged torrential rains. Three people died as a result of the accident. The catastrophe had a big impact on the economy, with recorded reconstruction expenditures and insured losses reaching $25000. Damage to infrastructure and homes in the area, together with the saturation of farmland, made it challenging for people to make a living in the western and central territories, which meant that recovery would take a long time.

4.3.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 113,400** grid–time observations were analyzed for the 2022 flood event in Cuba. The statistical analysis includes precipitation (TP), surface runoff (SRO), subsurface runoff (SSRO), soil moisture in the upper soil layer (SWVL1), and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Uncertainty was quantified using standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.3.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.3.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	113,400	0.570	1.202	2.11	0.563 – 0.577	68.45 mm	120

Interpretation
The event produced **68.45 mm of total rainfall over 120 timesteps**. The coefficient of variation (CV ≈ 2.11) indicates **high spatial and temporal variability**, typical for tropical rainfall systems. However, the narrow confidence interval indicates **strong statistical reliability** due to the large number of observations.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.3.2.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.3.2.2.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)
Value	0.00635	0.0780	12.30	0.00589 – 0.00680	0.762

Interpretation

Surface runoff values were **extremely low relative to precipitation**. The very high coefficient of variation reflects **strong spatial heterogeneity**, but the overall runoff magnitude remained small.

4.3.2.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.3.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	Total runoff (mm)
Value	0.00091	0.0175	19.24	0.109

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff remained minimal, suggesting that rainfall was largely **absorbed by infiltration or retained within soil storage** rather than being converted into runoff.

4.3.2.2.4. Soil Moisture (SWVL1)

Table 4.3.2.2.4. Statistical summary of soil moisture (swvl1) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m^3/m^{-3})	STD	CV	95% CI
Value	0.061	0.131	2.15	0.060 – 0.062

Interpretation

Soil moisture levels were **very low**, indicating **dry antecedent conditions**. This significantly limited runoff generation, as rainfall infiltrated rather than producing overland flow.

4.3.2.2.5. Runoff Coefficient

Table 4.3.2.2.5. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event

Parameter	RC
Value	0.0111

Only **~1.1% of precipitation was converted into surface runoff**, indicating **extremely low hydrological amplification**.

4.3.2.2.6. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.3.2.2.6. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.0111	0.0124	0.0101

The runoff coefficient showed **only minor sensitivity to precipitation perturbation**, confirming a **stable infiltration-dominated system**.

4.4. Costa Rica

4.4.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.4.1. Costa rica 2024 Tropical Cyclone (storm) (10U@SFC & 10V@SFC)

The near-surface wind field associated with the storm over **Costa Rica** was characterized by pronounced variability in both the zonal **(10U@SFC**) and meridional **(10V@SFC)** wind components, indicating strong low-level dynamical forcing. The **zonal wind component (10U@SFC)** exhibited values ranging from approximately **−3.72 to 8.12 m s⁻¹**, reflecting alternating westward and eastward airflow across the region. Negative 10U values indicate westward-directed flow, which contributed to the transport of moist air from the eastern Pacific toward the interior, while positive values indicate eastward-directed winds that enhanced horizontal wind shear. The strongest zonal winds, exceeding **4.5 m s⁻¹**, were concentrated near coastal and mountainous areas, where terrain-induced acceleration intensified wind speeds and supported storm organization.

Simultaneously, the **meridional wind component (10V@SFC)** ranged from **−3.72 to 8.12 m s⁻¹**, indicating strong variability in north–south airflow. Negative values between **−3.72 and −0.04 m s⁻¹** represent southerly flow, which played a critical role in advecting warm, moisture-laden air from equatorial latitudes toward the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. Positive values between **0.04 and 3.11 m s⁻¹** dominated much of the lowland and coastal regions, indicating sustained northerly flow and promoting low-level convergence. The highest meridional wind speeds, reaching **4.59–8.12 m s⁻¹**, were concentrated along the Pacific coastal belt and adjacent mountainous terrain, where orographic effects further enhanced wind acceleration.

The combined magnitude and directional variability of **10U and 10V** generated significant **low-level wind shear**, which is a key mechanism for storm intensification. This shear enhanced atmospheric instability by increasing horizontal convergence and vertical uplift, thereby sustaining convective development. As a result, the storm maintained strong vertical motion, amplified precipitation efficiency, and increased the likelihood of secondary hazards, including **flash flooding, landslides, and wind-related impacts** across western and central Costa Rica, particularly in areas surrounding **San José**.

The spatial distribution of the classified storm intensity shows that the most severe impacts were concentrated in the Pacific regions of Costa Rica, particularly in **Puntarenas and Guanacaste**. Puntarenas is predominantly characterized by **dark orange and red classes (values > 4.006)**, indicating very strong to extreme storm intensity. These areas coincide with reported flooding, river overflow, landslides, and significant hydrological disruption documented in the EM-DAT database. The persistence of high values throughout the central phase of the event reflects sustained rainfall and high moisture availability in this region.

Guanacaste exhibits a wider range of storm intensity classes, with large areas falling within the **orange and dark orange categories (2.246–5.294)** and localized zones reaching the **red class (> 5.295)**. These intensity levels correspond to strong wind activity combined with heavy rainfall, resulting in agricultural damage, infrastructure disruption, and environmental

impacts. Compared to Puntarenas, flooding in Guanacaste was generally less extensive; however, wind-related impacts were more pronounced due to the region's exposure and terrain characteristics.
Areas represented by **yellow and light orange classes (≤ 2.245)** experienced limited to moderate impacts, with localized disturbances and minimal reported damage. These regions lie mainly outside the core impact zones and reflect the spatial decay of storm intensity away from the Pacific-facing provinces.
Overall, the classified storm intensity values show a strong spatial agreement with the impact patterns reported in EM-DAT. The highest impact classes (dark orange and red) correspond to the most severely affected regions, confirming **Puntarenas and Guanacaste** as the primary impact zones of the 2024 storm event. The results demonstrate that the severity of observed impacts increases consistently with the classified storm intensity values derived from ERA5 data.

4.4.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

Tropical Cyclone "Sara" and its accompanying weather conditions affected approximately 3,418 individuals along the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. There were no deaths or injuries reported as a result of the storm. The storm's indirect effects caused heavy rain, which cut off entire settlements in the southern region near the Panamanian border. Guanacaste's infrastructure suffered severe damage, leading to the temporary closure of the local international airport and many roads due to landslides and river overflows. The socioeconomic effects hit communities that depended on tourism the hardest, since they had very limited access to coastal areas during the height of the emergency.

4.4.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The storm-phase analysis covers **n = 10,080 timesteps**, representing the peak intensity window. Statistical uncertainty was evaluated using μ, σ, CV, and CI95.

4.4.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.4.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	10,080	0.709475	0.999200	1.408366	0.689966 – 0.728983	Moderate

4.4.1.2.2. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.4.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (m/s)	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	48	2.442661	2.331389 – 2.553932	3.288051	Low

Interpretation

10U shows a **tight confidence interval**, indicating **low uncertainty** and stable zonal wind behavior during the storm.

4.4.1.2.3. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.4.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (m/s)	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	48	2.092198	1.998176 – 2.186220	2.624743	Low

Interpretation

10V also exhibits **low uncertainty**, with a narrow CI and consistent meridional flow.

4.4.1.2.3. Wind Speed Magnitude (10 m)

Table 4.4.1.2.3. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	10,080	3.680893	2.177441	0.591552	3.638381 – 3.723406	Very Low

Interpretation

Wind speed magnitude shows **low variability** (CV ≈ 0.59) and a **tight CI**, indicating **very high confidence** in the aerodynamic characterization of the storm.

4.4.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.4.2. Costa Rica 2024 Flood: Multi-Variable Analysis of Precipitation & Runoff

The flood component of the 2024 event was analyzed using total precipitation fields derived from ERA5, which represent the cumulative rainfall associated with both the storm and flood phases of the event. The precipitation intensity was classified into five impact classes using a color-coded scale ranging from light blue to dark blue, allowing for a detailed spatial assessment of flood severity across Costa Rica.

The light blue color for the lowest precipitation class, which ranges from 0 to 0.001, shows areas that had little to no rain during the event. These regions are characterized by limited hydrological response and minimal flood-related impacts. Slightly higher precipitation amounts are shown in **medium light blue**, with values ranging from **0.002 to 0.002**, indicating low but measurable rainfall that may contribute to minor surface runoff without significant flooding.

The **blue** class, associated with values between **0.003 and 0.004**, represents moderate precipitation accumulation. Areas within this range experienced sustained rainfall capable of generating surface runoff and localized flooding, particularly in regions with limited drainage capacity. The **dark blue** class, corresponding to values between **0.005 and 0.008**, identifies zones of high cumulative precipitation, where prolonged rainfall led to increased river discharge, soil saturation, and heightened flood risk.

The highest precipitation class, shown in **very dark blue** and corresponding to values between **0.009 and 0.019**, marks areas exposed to extreme rainfall accumulation during the event. These zones represent the most severe flood impact areas, where intense and persistent precipitation resulted in widespread flooding, river overflow, and significant hydrological disruption.

Spatially, the highest precipitation classes are concentrated primarily in the **Pacific regions of Costa Rica**, with **Puntarenas** exhibiting extensive areas within the dark blue and very dark blue classes. This spatial pattern indicates that Puntarenas experienced the most severe flood impacts, which aligns with the flooding and hydrological damage reported in EM-DAT. **Guanacaste** also shows elevated precipitation values, predominantly within the blue and dark blue classes, indicating significant but comparatively lower flood intensity than Puntarenas.

Regions represented by the lighter blue classes are located mainly outside the core impact zones and correspond to areas with limited or moderate flood impacts. Overall, the spatial distribution of total precipitation shows strong agreement with observed flood impacts, confirming that areas with higher cumulative rainfall values experienced more severe flooding. These results demonstrate that total precipitation played a critical role in driving the flood impacts of the 2024 storm event. The combined storm and flood analysis highlights the close relationship between cumulative rainfall intensity and the spatial extent of observed flood damage across Costa Rica, particularly in the provinces of Puntarenas and Guanacaste.

Surface runoff associated with the **2024 storm–flood event** was analyzed using ERA5-derived runoff fields to assess the hydrological response to the observed precipitation. The runoff intensity was classified into five classes and represented

using a color-coded scale ranging from very light blue to dark blue, allowing for a spatial evaluation of runoff severity across Costa Rica.
The lowest runoff class, represented by **very light blue** and corresponding to values between **0 and 0**, indicates areas where runoff generation was negligible. These regions experienced a limited hydrological response despite the occurrence of rainfall, suggesting either high infiltration capacity or low rainfall intensity. Light blue shows slightly higher runoff values, with values up to **0.000371**, representing areas with minimal surface runoff and localized water accumulation.
The **medium blue** class, associated with values up to **0.000717**, indicates regions where moderate runoff occurred. These areas experienced sufficient rainfall to exceed infiltration capacity locally, resulting in surface flow along slopes and drainage channels. The **blue** class, corresponding to values up to **0.001433**, represents zones of high runoff generation, where persistent rainfall led to significant surface water movement and increased pressure on river systems.
The highest runoff class, shown in **dark blue** and corresponding to values between **0.002 and 0.006**, indicates areas exposed to extreme runoff conditions. These zones represent the most hydrologically impacted regions, where intense and sustained rainfall produced substantial overland flow, contributing directly to flooding, river overflow, and erosion processes.
Spatially, the highest runoff values are concentrated mainly in the **Pacific regions of Costa Rica**, particularly in **Puntarenas**, where dark blue and blue classes dominate. This pattern reflects the combined effects of high precipitation accumulation, steep terrain, and limited drainage capacity. **Guanacaste** shows moderate to high runoff values, primarily within the medium blue and blue classes, indicating significant runoff generation but generally lower intensity than in Puntarenas.
Areas represented by lighter blue classes are located outside the main impact zones and correspond to regions with limited runoff response. Overall, the spatial distribution of runoff intensity shows strong agreement with the precipitation-based flood impact results and the storm intensity classification, confirming runoff as a key driver of flooding during the **even**t. These results demonstrate that surface runoff played a critical role in translating extreme precipitation into observed flood impacts. The consistency between runoff severity, precipitation intensity, and reported impacts reinforces the hydrological linkage between storm dynamics and flood damage across Costa Rica.

4.4.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

About 1,098,668 people in the multi-regional area, including Guanacaste and Puntarenas, were affected by a major hydrological crisis that lasted for two weeks and was worsened by the passage of Tropical Wave and Tropical Storm Sara. The disaster claimed the lives of eight people, but no one sustained injuries. The first losses were more than $925,000. Damage to critical infrastructure was widespread, affecting water, electricity, and communication networks. Landslides on major national routes made it harder for emergency responders to arrive at the scene and for businesses to trade.

4.4.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The flood analysis used **75,600 spatial–temporal observations**, providing a statistically robust basis for evaluating uncertainty in precipitation, runoff, soil moisture, and the runoff coefficient. Metrics include the mean (μ), standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV = σ/μ), and 95% confidence intervals (CI95).

4.4.2.2.1. Total Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.4.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.6778	1.29	1.9049	0.6686 – 0.6870	Moderate

Interpretation
CV ≈ **1.90** indicates **moderate natural variability**, consistent with episodic rainfall during the flood.
The CI width (~2.7% of the mean) shows **high statistical precision**.
Overall uncertainty is **low**, confirming reliable precipitation estimates.

4.4.2.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.4.2.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.1229	0.55	4.5145	0.1189 – 0.1268	Very High

Interpretation
CV ≈ **4.51** indicates **extreme variability**, more than double that of precipitation.
Runoff occurred in **short, intense pulses**, reflecting nonlinear hydrological behavior.
Spatial heterogeneity in infiltration and flow pathways drives this high dispersion.

4.4.2.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.4.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.1932	0.45	2.343	0.1899 – 0.1964	High

Interpretation
SSRO shows **high variability but** less extreme than surface runoff.
Indicates **mixed infiltration–redistribution processes** across the basin.

4.4.2.2.4. Soil Moisture (SWVL1)

Table 4.4.2.2.4. Soil Moisture Uncertainty Metrics

Parameter	Mean (m^3/m^3)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.1812	0.21	1.1537	0.1797 – 0.1827	Moderate

Interpretation
Soil moisture shows **moderate variability**, reflecting spatial differences in antecedent wetness.
CI is narrow, indicating **stable soil moisture fields**.

4.4.2.2.5. Runoff Coefficient (RC)

Table 4.4.2.2.5. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event

Parameter	Mean RC	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI	Uncertainty Level
Value	15.849	1,734.18	109.419	3.487 – 28.211	Extremely High

Interpretation
RC shows **extreme volatility**, with CV > 100.
The CI is wider than the mean itself, indicating **severe instability**.
This occurs because RC is highly sensitive to **very small precipitation values**, making grid-scale RC unreliable.
Justifies the need for **event-scale aggregation** and **sensitivity testing**.

4.4.2.2.6. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.4.2.2.6. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
Runoff Coefficient (RC)	0.1813	0.2014	0.1648

Interpretation
A 10% decrease in rainfall **increases** RC to 0.201, while a 10% increase **reduces** RC to 0.165.
This inverse response reflects **threshold behavior** linked to basin wetness and saturation.
The system shows **moderate sensitivity**, but the directionality highlights **nonlinear rainfall–runoff dynamics**.

4.4.2.2.7. Summary of Data Reliability

Table 4.4.2.2.7. Flood Event Data Reliability Summary

Metric	Total Rainfall (mm)	Mean Rainfall per timestep (mm)	Rainfall 95% CI (mm)	N timesteps (rain)	Total Surface Runoff (mm)	Mean Surface Runoff per timestep (mm)	Surface Runoff 95% CI (mm)	N timesteps (sro)	Total Subsurface Runoff (mm)	Runoff Coefficient (SRO/TP)
Value	244.0151	0.6778	0.6222 – 0.7334	360	44.2354	0.1229	0.1080 – 0.1377	360	69.5378	0.1813

Interpretation
Event-scale rainfall and runoff estimates are **statistically robust**, with narrow CIs.

Surface runoff represents **18.1%** of total rainfall, indicating a **moderately efficient hydrological response**. Subsurface runoff exceeds surface runoff, showing **strong infiltration and delayed flow contributions**.

4.5. France

4.5.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.5.1. France 2023, Extra-tropical Storm, Near-Surface Zonal Wind

The **10 m zonal wind component (10U@SFC)** over **France and western Europe** displays a wide range of values from **−5.65 to 15.16 m s⁻¹**, indicating strong variability in **west–east near-surface airflow** during the storm event. The most negative values, between **−5.65 and −1.08 m s⁻¹**, are observed primarily over parts of **western and southwestern France**, representing **westward-directed flow** that favored onshore moisture transport from the Atlantic Ocean into the interior. This westward component contributed to sustained low-level moisture supply, particularly affecting regions such as **Brittany, Pays de la Loire, and Nouvelle-Aquitaine**.

Moderate zonal wind values ranging from **−1.08 to 2.35 m s⁻¹** extend across much of **central and southern France**, indicating relatively weak but persistent west–east airflow. These conditions supported widespread moisture advection without strong ventilation, allowing precipitation systems to persist locally. Stronger eastward-directed winds, with values between **2.35 and 5.61 m s⁻¹**, dominate large portions of **northern and central France**, including areas around **Paris and the Loire Basin**, reflecting enhanced zonal flow associated with frontal passage and storm organization.

The highest 10U values, reaching **5.62–10.10 m s⁻¹** and locally **10.10–15.16 m s⁻¹**, are concentrated over **northern and northeastern France**, extending toward **Belgium and the English Channel region**. Wind speeds of this magnitude at 10 m height indicate **intense eastward airflow** capable of producing **damaging surface winds**, increasing **horizontal wind shear**, and accelerating storm systems. These strong zonal winds enhanced storm propagation and interacted with meridional wind components to generate pronounced **low-level wind shear**, a key mechanism for storm intensification.

Overall, the magnitude and spatial gradient of **10U@SFC** played a critical role in shaping the storm impacts across France. The combination of strong west–east airflow, sustained moisture transport from the Atlantic, and enhanced wind shear contributed to **organized convection, intense rainfall, and wind damage**, particularly across **northern, western, and central regions of France**, with secondary impacts extending into **Belgium and southern England**.

The **10 m meridional wind component (10V@SFC)** over **western and central Europe**, with a core impact over **France**, exhibits a wide range of values from **−14.57 to 18.46 m s⁻¹**, indicating exceptionally strong variability in **north–south near-surface airflow** during the event. The most negative values, between **−14.57 and −3.17 m s⁻¹**, are observed primarily over the **northwestern Atlantic margin and parts of western France**, representing intense **southerly flow** directed from lower latitudes toward northern France and the English Channel. Such strong southerly winds are indicative of deep cyclonic circulation and play a critical role in transporting warm, moisture-laden air toward the storm core.

Moderate meridional wind values ranging from **−3.17 to 0.72 m s⁻¹** extend across large portions of western France, reflecting transitional flow regimes where north–south wind direction fluctuated and contributed to atmospheric instability. Positive values between **0.72 and 3.83 m s⁻¹** dominate much of **central and southern France**, indicating sustained **northerly-directed flow** that promoted low-level convergence when interacting with opposing southerly winds to the north. Strong meridional winds in the range of **3.83 to 7.58 m s⁻¹** are widespread across **northern and eastern France**, highlighting zones of enhanced wind acceleration associated with the storm's frontal structures.
The highest meridional wind class, reaching **7.58–18.46 m s⁻¹**, is concentrated over **northeastern France, Belgium, and adjacent regions**, indicating extreme north–south wind forcing. Wind speeds of this magnitude at 10 m height are sufficient to generate **damaging surface winds**, promote **vigorous vertical uplift**, and intensify frontal rainfall bands.
The strong meridional wind gradients across France contributed directly to **low-level wind shear**, enhancing storm organization and persistence. As a result, the event was associated with **severe wind impacts, intense precipitation, and an elevated risk of flooding**, particularly across **northern, eastern, and central France**, as well as neighboring parts of **Belgium and the United Kingdom**.

4.5.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

Storm "Domingos," an extra-tropical storm with winds that might reach 151 Kph, affected about 50 persons in numerous departments, including Deux-Sèvres, Charente-Maritime, Isère, and Pas-de-Calais. The weather incident hurt 50 people. Damage to roads, roofs, and the electricity grid, together with extensive transit problems, made socioeconomic hardship worse in the affected Western and Southeast regions.

4.5.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 155,232** grid–time observations were analyzed for the 2023 storm event in France. The assessment includes precipitation (TP), zonal wind (10U), meridional wind (10V), and derived 10-m wind speed magnitude. Uncertainty is quantified using standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.5.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.5.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	155,232	0.306	0.546	1.78	0.304 – 0.309	29.42 mm	96

Interpretation
The event accumulated **29.4 mm of rainfall over 96 timesteps**. The coefficient of variation (CV = 1.78) indicates **moderate-to-high variability**, typical of frontal storm systems. The 95% confidence interval is very narrow, reflecting **high statistical precision** due to the large sample size.
Uncertainty level: Moderate-to-high physical variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.5.1.2.2. Zonal Wind Component (10U)

Table 4.5.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	6.487	4.849	0.75	6.463 – 6.511	9.365

Interpretation
The positive mean indicates a **dominant eastward flow**. The CV (0.75) suggests **moderate variability relative to the mean**, consistent with sustained synoptic-scale forcing. The narrow CI confirms **robust estimation of mean wind conditions**.

4.5.1.2.3. Meridional Wind Component (10V)

Table 4.5.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	2.485	3.817	1.54	2.466 – 2.504	6.939

Interpretation
The positive mean indicates a **dominant northward component**. The higher CV (1.54) reflects **stronger directional variability** compared to u10, typical of dynamically evolving storm systems.

4.5.1.2.4. Wind Speed at 10 m (Derived Magnitude)

Table 4.5.1.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	8.288	4.203	0.51	8.267 – 8.309	11.120

Interpretation

The derived wind speed magnitude exhibits **lower variability (CV ≈ 0.51)** compared to the vector components, due to partial cancellation of directional fluctuations. The mean wind speed (~8.3 m/s) and maximum values exceeding 11 m/s indicate **strong boundary layer forcing**, consistent with a significant extratropical storm system.

Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.5.2. Flood Impact Based on Water Level Elevation




Figure 4.5.2. France 2023 Flood: Multi-Variable Analysis of Precipitation & Runoff

The total precipitation (TP@SFC) field associated with Storm Ciarán indicates spatially concentrated but intense rainfall over northern and northwestern France. ERA5 total precipitation values range from near **0 m** up to approximately **0.003–0.004 m**, reflecting short-duration yet high-intensity rainfall typical of rapidly moving Atlantic storms. Lower precipitation values, generally below **0.001 m**, dominate inland and peripheral regions, indicating limited rainfall accumulation. Intermediate values between **0.001 and 0.002 m** identify areas subjected to sustained rainfall capable of saturating surface soils and increasing hydrological stress. The highest precipitation values, reaching **0.003–0.004 m**, are concentrated near the **English Channel and the northwestern French coastline**, consistent with strong onshore flow and frontal uplift. Although the absolute rainfall totals are moderate, their occurrence over a short time interval significantly enhanced surface saturation and contributed to flood generation when combined with storm surge effects.

The Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC) response shows that the rain from Storm Ciarán was quickly turned into overland flow in the areas that were affected. Surface runoff values range from near **0 m** in unaffected inland areas to peak values of approximately **5.2×10^{-6} to 7.1×10^{-6} m**, indicating localized but meaningful runoff generation. Lower runoff values mean that the ground was still able to soak up rainwater in those areas. Intermediate runoff Values ranging from 1.9×10^{-6} to 3.8×10^{-6} m identify regions where soils approached saturation and excess water began contributing to surface flow. The highest runoff values are concentrated near **coastal zones and low-lying drainage areas**, where antecedent wet conditions, limited infiltration, and persistent rainfall promoted rapid runoff production. This runoff contribution likely made coastal and estuarine flooding worse by increasing freshwater input into already surge-elevated systems.

The precipitation and runoff fields show that the main cause of inland flooding during Storm Ciarán was the efficient conversion of rain to runoff when the ground was already wet. The combined effects of runoff, storm surge, and waves raised the level of coastal water, causing the worst effects on the other hand.

4.5.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

Heavy rains and the rising of the Liane and Aa rivers caused a lot of flooding in the Pas-de-Calais Department. Approximately 3,500 individuals experienced the impact. The disaster forced many people to evacuate an area that inundated and covered around 30 square kilometers. The event caused a lot of physical and financial damage, as well as forcing many to abandon their homes. The entire cost of reconstruction and insured losses was $1650000. Flooding that hit several places cut off numerous communities and caused a lot of damage to homes, transportation infrastructure, and crops in both cities and the countryside. In the Hauts-de-France region, it was also challenging for companies and emergency workers to execute their jobs.

4.5.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2023 flood event in France was analyzed using **5,616 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, soil moisture, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was assessed using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.5.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.5.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	5,616	0.122	0.321	2.64	0.113 – 0.130	5.84 mm	48

Interpretation

The event produced **5.84 mm of rainfall over 48 timesteps**, reflecting low-to-moderate precipitation intensity.
The CV (2.64) indicates **strong variability relative to the mean**, typical of scattered convective rainfall.
The narrow CI suggests **acceptable statistical stability** despite high dispersion.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; moderate statistical confidence.

4.5.2.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.5.2.2.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	Uncertainty level
Value	0.000422	0.001541	3.65	0.000381 – 0.000462	0.020	Very high

Interpretation

Surface runoff was **extremely low relative to rainfall totals**.
The runoff coefficient is RC=0.00347
meaning **only 0.35% of rainfall was converted into surface runoff**, confirming **infiltration-dominated hydrological behavior**.

4.5.2.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.5.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total runoff (mm)
Value	0.00506	0.57	0.243

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exceeded surface runoff by an order of magnitude, confirming that **drainage occurred primarily through infiltration and subsurface pathways** rather than overland flow.

4.5.2.2.4. Soil Moisture (SWVL1)

Table 4.5.2.2.4. Statistical summary of soil moisture (SWVL1) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	Std	CV	95% CI

Value	0.293	0.146	0.50	0.289 – 0.297

Interpretation

Soil moisture levels were **moderate and well below saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 m^3 m^{-3})**, explaining the **very low runoff efficiency**.

4.5.2.2.5. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.5.2.2.5. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.00347	0.00385	0.00315

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient shows **minimal nonlinear sensitivity**, confirming **hydrological stability**.

4.6. Republic of Korea

In **August 2020**, the Republic of Korea experienced a severe compound hydro-meteorological disaster driven by the interaction between the longest monsoon season in seven years and the remnants of **Tropical Cyclone Hagupit (Dindo)**. This interaction resulted in extreme precipitation, widespread flooding, exceptional surface runoff, and catastrophic landslides across central and southern regions of the peninsula.

4.6.1. Cyclone Influence and Atmospheric Forcing




Figure 4.6.1. Republic of Korea 2020: Tropical cyclone, HAGUPIT, North Chungchenog Province

The ERA5 near-surface zonal wind component **(10U@SFC)** over South Korea ranges from **−1.237 to 5.852 m s^{-1}**, indicating variable west–east airflow during the storm event. Positive values dominate most of the peninsula, confirming the prevalence of **eastward-directed low-level winds**, while weak negative values are spatially limited and indicate localized westward flow.

The lowest wind class (**−1.237 to 0.65 m s^{-1}**) represents weak zonal circulation with limited dynamic influence. These conditions correspond to background flow and contribute minimally to storm intensification or structural organization.

Low to moderate zonal winds (**1.238–2.206 m s^{-1}** and **2.207–3.047 m s^{-1}**) are widespread across inland regions, including central provinces. These values indicate sustained eastward transport of air masses, supporting horizontal moisture redistribution and contributing to the maintenance of precipitation systems over land.

Higher 10U values (**3.048–4.093 m s⁻¹**) concentrate along coastal and near-coastal areas, particularly along the southern and eastern coasts. At these speeds, zonal winds significantly enhance low-level wind shear and promote convergence when interacting with meridional flow, strengthening convective systems and increasing rainfall persistence.
The highest zonal wind class (**4.094–5.852 m s⁻¹**) is observed primarily offshore and along exposed coastal zones near cities such as Busan, Ulsan, and Pohang. These values indicate strong eastward wind forcing associated with the storm core, capable of generating damaging surface winds, marine hazards, and coastal impacts. Such wind intensities increase the likelihood of structural damage, power disruptions, and hazardous sea conditions.
The ERA5 near-surface meridional wind component **(10V@SFC)** over South Korea shows values ranging from **−1.684 to 10.258 m s⁻¹**, indicating strong variability in north–south airflow during the storm event. Positive values dominate most of the peninsula, confirming the prevalence of **northward-directed low-level winds**, while weaker negative values are limited and play a secondary role.
The lowest wind class (**−1.684 to 2.063 m s⁻¹**) represents weak to moderate meridional flow, indicating background atmospheric circulation with limited dynamic forcing. These conditions are associated with relatively stable environments and minor contributions to storm development.
Moderate meridional winds (**2.064–3.655 m s⁻¹** and **3.656–5.481 m s⁻¹**) cover large inland areas, including central and southern regions. These wind speeds indicate sustained north–south moisture transport, supporting low-level convergence and providing favorable conditions for organized precipitation systems.
Higher 10V values (**5.482–7.308 m s⁻¹**) are concentrated along the western and southern coastal zones. In these areas, stronger meridional flow enhances moisture advection from adjacent marine regions, increasing atmospheric instability and rainfall efficiency. Such conditions are commonly associated with intensified convective activity and prolonged precipitation episodes.
The highest wind class (**7.309–10.258 m s⁻¹**) is primarily observed offshore and along exposed coastal sectors, particularly along the western coastline. These values indicate **strong meridional wind acceleration**, likely amplified by coastal geometry and synoptic-scale pressure gradients. At this intensity, the meridional winds play a critical role in storm intensification by strengthening low-level convergence, enhancing vertical motion, and sustaining deep convective systems.

4.6.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

Tropical Cyclone "Hagupit," also called "Dindo," hit North Chungcheong Province and caused landslides and other problems that affected over 1,000 people. The tragedy killed 26 individuals and hurt 7 more. The wind speeds reached 130 kph, but the torrential rain was without a doubt the most stressful thing for the economy. It messed with the land, the transportation infrastructure, and the settlements in the mountains and countryside. The high death rate in relation to the number of affected individuals demonstrates how swiftly multiple hazards can inflict harm.

4.6.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The tropical cyclone *Hagupit* (Dindo) affecting South Korea in 2020 was analyzed using **13,104 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, zonal and meridional wind components, and derived 10-m wind speed magnitude. Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed assessment of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.6.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.6.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	13,104	0.523	1.243	2.38	0.502 – 0.544	25.11 mm	48

Interpretation
The cyclone produced **25.1 mm of rainfall over 48 timesteps**.
The high CV (≈ 2.38) highlights **strong spatial–temporal variability**, typical of convective rainbands in tropical cyclones.
Despite this variability, the CI remains relatively narrow, confirming **statistical reliability**.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; moderate statistical confidence.

4.6.1.2.2. Zonal Wind Component (10U)

Table 4.6.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	1.560	1.785	1.14	1.529 – 1.590	3.440	48

Interpretation

The positive mean indicates **eastward low-level flow**.
Variability is moderate-to-high relative to the mean, consistent with **rotating cyclonic circulation**.
Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability; statistically well constrained.

4.6.1.2.3. Meridional Wind Component (10V)

Table 4.6.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	4.420	2.477	0.56	4.378 – 4.463	5.236	48

Interpretation

The strong positive mean indicates **persistent northward flow**, suggesting an organized cyclonic structure and sustained moisture transport.
Variability is moderate relative to the mean.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.6.1.2.4. Wind Speed at 10 m (Magnitude)

Table 4.6.1.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	5.041	2.425	0.48	4.999 – 5.082	6.450	48

Interpretation

Mean wind speed of ≈ **5.0 m/s** confirms **moderate-to-strong storm conditions**.
The lower CV compared to vector components reflects **cancellation effects** when computing magnitude.
The narrow CI indicates **high statistical robustness**.

4.6.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.6.2. Republic of Korea August 2020 Compound Disaster: Flood & Landslide Analysis

Flooding was the dominant hazard during the event and was driven by extreme cumulative precipitation. ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0.001 m** to **0.01–0.023 m**, represented by a light-to-dark blue color scale. Lower classes (**0–0.001 m**) correspond to minimal rainfall, while moderate rainfall capable of generating runoff is represented by **0.002–0.005 m**.

Severe precipitation accumulation is captured by values between **0.006 and 0.009 m**, indicating widespread soil saturation and rising river levels. The highest precipitation class (**0.01–0.023 m**) identifies areas exposed to extreme rainfall intensity and persistence. These values dominate large portions of **North Chungcheong, Gyeonggi, Gangwon, and South Jeolla provinces**, marking them as primary flood impact zones.

Observed rainfall totals confirm the severity of these classes, with cumulative precipitation exceeding **500 mm** in several regions. **Cheorwon County** recorded **527.5 mm within four days**, while **Yeoncheon** and **Chungju** also experienced extreme accumulations. These precipitation conditions resulted in river overflow, levee failures along the **Seomjin River**, and widespread inundation of urban and agricultural areas, submerging over **5,751 hectares of farmland** and forcing large-scale evacuations.

The extreme rainfall rapidly translated into exceptional surface runoff due to the near-complete saturation of the soil. ERA5 surface runoff **(RO@SFC)** and subsurface runoff **(SSRO@SFC)** outputs indicate widespread runoff values in the upper classes, consistent with observed dam inflows and river discharge. At **Goesan Dam** in North Chungcheong Province, inflow exceeded **2,700 tonnes per second**, pushing the system to maximum discharge capacity. In the **Imjin River basin**, emergency dam releases further amplified runoff and compounded downstream flood impacts.

Runoff coefficients calculated for flood-control zones such as **Gunnam** reached **0.86**, indicating that **86% of precipitation was converted directly into surface runoff**. This exceptionally high conversion rate confirms that large areas of the country have fully exceeded infiltration capacity.

4.5.2.1. Associated Volumetric Soil Water Content and Landslide Triggering

ERA5 volumetric soil water content **(SWVL)** provides direct evidence of the physical mechanism leading to landslides. Soil moisture values ranged from near-zero to approximately **0.52 m^3 m^{-3}**, with the highest classes (**0.32–0.52**) dominating the most severely affected regions. These values indicate **near-complete pore saturation**, which drastically reduces soil shear strength due to elevated pore-water pressure.

Under such conditions, additional rainfall no longer infiltrates the soil but instead increases hydraulic pressure along potential slip surfaces. This loss of effective stress critically destabilizes slopes. The situation was exacerbated by South Korea's mountainous topography, where slope gradients commonly exceed **35°**, allowing saturated soils to rapidly transition into high-velocity debris flows. **Why the Landslides Occurred**

The landslides observed during the August 2020 event were the result of a **cascade of interacting variables**. Prolonged monsoonal rainfall and cyclone-enhanced moisture transport caused cumulative precipitation to exceed **500 mm**, fully saturating the soil column, as evidenced by volumetric soil water content values approaching **0.52**. Once saturation was reached, intense hourly rainfall rates exceeding **50 mm h^{-1}** acted as the immediate mechanical trigger, dislodging soil masses on steep slopes.

Extreme surface runoff made slope stability even worse by eroding the toes of the slope and concentrating the flow paths. In several fatal cases, **anthropogenic modifications**, including road-widening activities and inadequately drained embankments, altered natural drainage patterns and accelerated failure. The combination of saturated soils, steep terrain, high runoff efficiency, and intense rainfall resulted in widespread landslides and mudslides across central and southern Korea.

4.6.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The high monsoon rains and landslides caused a lot of flooding, which led to a major socioeconomic disaster that affected 6,000 people. There were 42 deaths reported as a result of the accident. The catastrophe caused a lot of damage to buildings and people, as well as moving them around. The insured losses and anticipated costs of rebuilding came to $929,056. The flooding that happened all over North Chungcheong and Gyeonggi Provinces stopped businesses, cut off many towns, and caused a lot of damage to homes, roads, and farmland in both cities and rural areas.

4.6.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 flood event in the Republic of Korea was examined using **102,816 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = RO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a comprehensive assessment of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.6.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.6.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timest
Value	102,816	0.943	1.794	1.90	0.932 – 0.954	271.62 mm	288

Interpretation

Total rainfall reached **271.6 mm over 288 timesteps**, reflecting a prolonged and intense precipitation phase.
The CV (1.90) indicates **high spatial–temporal variability**, typical of monsoon-driven rainfall systems.
Despite this variability, the narrow CI demonstrates **very high statistical confidence** due to the large sample size.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; very low statistical uncertainty.

4.6.2.3.2. Total Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.6.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	95% CI (mm)	Timesteps	Total subsurface runoff	RC
Value	0.380	109.34	0.347 – 0.413	288	52.10 mm	0.403

Approximately **40% of the rainfall was converted into runoff, indicating strong hydrological amplification and a** significant exceedance of infiltration capacity.

4.6.2.3.3. Sensitivity (TP ±10%)

Table 4.6.2.3.3. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.403	0.447	0.366

The nonlinear RC response under precipitation perturbation confirms **threshold-driven hydrological behavior**.
Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; statistically robust.

4.6.2.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.6.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	0.975	2.350	2.41	0.823 – 1.126	5.42

4.6.2.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.6.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	3.634	3.062	0.84	3.455 – 3.813	7.48

4.6.2.3.6. Wind Speed (10 m Magnitude)

Table 4.6.2.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	4.595	2.818	0.61	4.578 – 4.612	9.02

Interpretation

Wind forcing was **moderate to strong**, consistent with synoptic-scale monsoon circulation.
Vector components show higher dispersion relative to scalar wind magnitude, which exhibits reduced variability due to cancellation effects.
Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability; high statistical precision.

4.6.2.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL2)

Table 4.6.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers (SWVL1–SWVL2) during the flood event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2
Mean (m^3/m^{-3})	0.238	0.240
CV	0.85	0.84

Interpretation

Soil moisture levels were **elevated but below critical saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 m^3 m^{-3})**.

This suggests that runoff generation was driven primarily by **prolonged rainfall intensity** rather than complete soil saturation.

4.7. Brazil

4.7.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.7.1. Southern Brazil 2023: Severe Meteorological Storm & Associated Flood Hazard Event

The main hazard event happened in Southern Brazil, affecting the states of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina. Porto Alegre, Balneário Camboriú, Camboriú, and Blumenau all reported major effects. This event was characterized as a severe meteorological storm and was analyzed using ERA5 near-surface wind data, including both the **zonal (10U@SFC)** and **meridional (10V@SFC)** wind components.

The zonal wind component (**10U@SFC**) exhibited values ranging from **−11.223 to 0.304 m s⁻¹**, where increasing magnitude represents stronger storm conditions. The lowest wind class (**−11.223 to −8.42 m s⁻¹**) reflects strong peripheral storm winds capable of producing hazardous conditions such as tree stress and minor infrastructural disruption. Moderate storm conditions are represented by the **−8.419 to −5.889 m s⁻¹** and **−5.888 to −3.855 m s⁻¹** classes, indicating sustained low-level winds associated with organized convective systems and frontal activity. These wind speeds are sufficient to cause power outages, transportation disruption, and localized structural damage across urban and coastal areas. The highest storm intensity classes (**−3.854 to −2.318 m s⁻¹** and **−2.317 to 0.304 m s⁻¹**) identify the storm core and near-core regions, where zonal wind forcing was strongest and capable of generating widespread damage through falling trees, flying debris, and failure of exposed infrastructure.

The meridional wind component (**10V@SFC**) shows values ranging from **−13.556 to 10.015 m s⁻¹**, indicating strong north–south airflow during the event. Negative values (**−13.556 to −5.976 m s⁻¹**) represent intense southerly flow, which enhanced moisture transport toward southern Brazil and contributed to sustained atmospheric instability. Moderate meridional winds (**−5.975 to −0.338 m s⁻¹**) indicate persistent low-level convergence associated with frontal and convective systems. Positive values (**0.337 to 10.015 m s⁻¹**), concentrated near coastal and inland convergence zones, reflect strong northward-directed winds that intensified uplift and convective organization.

Together, the combined action of strong **zonal (10U)** and **meridional (10V)** winds produced significant low-level wind shear and moisture convergence, reinforcing storm intensity, prolonging severe weather conditions, and confirming the storm as the initiating hazard event responsible for widespread wind damage and subsequent cascading impacts across southern Brazil.

4.7.1.1. Associated Flood Hazard

Directly triggered by storm-generated rainfall, and it primarily affected river basins and low-lying areas within **Rio Grande do Sul**, including **Arroio do Meio**, **Encantado**, **Estrela**, **Lajeado**, **Muçum**, **Roca Sales**, **Santa Tereza**, and

Taquari, with additional impacts in parts of **Santa Catarina**. Flood conditions were characterized using ERA5 total precipitation at the surface **(TP@SFC**), with values classified into five categories ranging from **0 to 0.022 m**. The lowest precipitation class (**0–0.001 m**) represents negligible rainfall and minimal hydrological response. Low to moderate precipitation (**0.002–0.003 m**) may generate localized surface runoff but generally does not result in widespread flooding. Moderate rainfall intensities (**0.004–0.006 m**) indicate sustained precipitation capable of increasing runoff and river discharge. Higher precipitation classes (**0.007–0.01 m**) reflect severe rainfall accumulation leading to soil saturation and rapid river level rise. The highest precipitation class (**0.011–0.022 m**) identifies areas exposed to extreme rainfall over short accumulation periods, exceeding soil infiltration capacity and drainage system limits. These values correspond to rapid runoff generation, river overflow, and widespread inundation of residential, commercial, and agricultural areas, confirming the flood as a secondary event directly caused by the storm.

4.6.1.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The hazardous weather event, which included lightning, flooding, and storm surges, harmed about 300 individuals in Porto Alegre, Balneário Camboriú, and Blumenau. There was one death reported as a result of the incident. In addition to population displacement, the event caused insured losses and reconstruction costs totaling **476,931 USD.** There was a lot of socioeconomic and agricultural stress in the two southern Brazilian states because of the combination of high winds and localized flooding, which affected many areas at once.

4.7.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The analysis is based on ERA5 hourly reanalysis data for the Taquari Valley basin. In total: n=50,400 spatial–temporal grid-cell values were used (all grid cells × all timesteps). This large sample size ensures statistically robust estimates of mean values, variability, and confidence intervals.

4.7.1.3.1. Total Precipitation (TP)

Total precipitation (TP) is the primary atmospheric driver of runoff generation. Values were converted from meters to millimeters prior to analysis.

Table 4.7.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Metric	Sample size (n)	Mean (mm/timestep)	Total event rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	Coefficient of variation (CV)	95% CI (mm)	Uncert nty leve
Value	50,400	0.686	65.82	1.69	2.47	0.671 – 0.700	**High**

Interpretation

The high CV (2.47) indicates strong spatial variability in rainfall, which is typical of severe convective systems.

4.7.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Surface runoff represents direct overland flow contributing to the flood response.

Table 4.7.1.3.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the storm event

Metric	Sample size (n)	Mean (mm/timestep)	Total (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	Uncertainty level
Value	50,400	0.079	7.59	0.43	5.45	*Very High*

Interpretation:

The very high CV (5.45) shows extreme spatial variability in overland flow generation. This is strongly influenced by terrain slope, land cover, and soil infiltration capacity.

4.7.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Subsurface runoff reflects delayed hydrological response through soil and shallow groundwater pathways.

Table 4.7.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Metric	Sample size (n)	Mean (mm/timestep)	Total (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	Uncertainty level
Value	50,400	0.161	15.46	0.37	2.29	**High**

Interpretation:

High variability indicates heterogeneous infiltration and redistribution processes within the soil column.

4.7.1.3.4. Wind Speed and Wind Components (10U, 10V)

Wind forcing was characterized by using 10 m zonal (10U) and meridional (10V) components. Wind speed magnitude was computed as $WS=u10^2+v10^2$

Table 4.7.1.3.4. Statistical summary of wind components and wind speed during the storm event

Metric	Mean (m/s)	Maximum (m/s)	CV	Uncertainty level
u10	−0.914	—	>2	High
v10	−1.462	—	>2	High
Wind Speed	3.47	6.66	0.7	Moderate

Interpretation:

Wind direction varies substantially, but wind intensity is relatively stable (CV = 0.70), indicating moderate uncertainty in wind magnitude.

4.7.1.3.5. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–4)

Soil moisture layers describe antecedent wetness and storage capacity. Soil moisture was relatively uniform across the basin, suggesting stable antecedent wetness conditions during the event.

Table 4.7.1.3.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean	~0.34	~0.35	~0.36	~0.38
CV	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Uncertainty	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

4.7.1.3.6. Runoff Coefficient (RC)

The runoff coefficient was calculated as total surface runoff divided by total precipitation. Approximately 11.5% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff. The high CV reflects nonlinear rainfall–runoff behavior across the basin.

Table 4.7.1.3.6. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the storm event

Metric	RC	CV	Uncertainty level
Value	0.115	2.44	**High**

4.7.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.7.2. Brazil 2023: Rio Grande do Sul Flood Event (After 13 November)

The secondary flood event that developed after **13 November 2023** primarily affected several municipalities in **Rio Grande do Sul**, where ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** values indicate severe to extreme rainfall accumulation and EM-DAT records confirm extensive flood impacts. **Arroio do Meio** experienced intense precipitation predominantly

within the **0.007–0.01 m** and **0.011–0.022 m** classes, indicating extreme rainfall that led to rapid river overflow and widespread inundation of residential areas. **Colinas** was affected by sustained precipitation mainly in the **0.007–0.01 m** range, resulting in significant surface runoff, flooding of low-lying zones, and disruption of local infrastructure.
In **Cruzeiro do Sul**, ERA5 data show precipitation intensifying into the **0.011–0.022 m** class after 13 November, corresponding to severe flooding driven by rapid river level rise and overtopping of banks, as reported in EM-DAT. **Encantado** was similarly exposed to upper-class precipitation values, particularly **0.007–0.01 m** and locally **0.011–0.022 m**, leading to extensive urban flooding, damage to housing, and displacement of residents. **Estrela** experienced heavy and persistent rainfall primarily within the **0.007–0.01 m** class, producing widespread inundation and significant impacts on transport and public services.
Lajeado was one of the most severely affected municipalities, with ERA5 **TP@SFC** values frequently reaching the highest class (**0.011–0.022 m**), indicating extreme rainfall accumulation. This resulted in rapid hydrological response, extensive flooding of urban areas, and major infrastructural damage, consistent with EM-DAT impact reports. In **Muçum**, precipitation also reached the uppermost classes, reflecting extreme rainfall that triggered catastrophic flooding, structural collapse, and high human losses, making it one of the hardest-hit locations during the event.
Roca Sales experienced severe flood conditions associated with precipitation values largely within the **0.007–0.01 m** and **0.011–0.022 m** ranges, leading to river overflow, destruction of buildings, and large-scale evacuations. **Sustained high precipitation primarily in the 0.007–0.01 m class significantly flooded and damaged residential and agricultural areas in Santa Tereza.** Finally, **Taquari** recorded heavy rainfall consistent with the **0.007–0.01 m** class, resulting in riverine flooding, inundation of low-lying neighborhoods, and disruption of local economic activities.
Overall, ERA5 precipitation values show that all affected municipalities were exposed to high-to-extreme rainfall classes after November 13, confirming that the flood was a **secondary, precipitation-driven event**. The strong agreement between ERA5 **TP@SFC** intensity patterns and EM-DAT damage reports demonstrates that municipalities experiencing precipitation in the **0.007–0.022 m** range suffered the most severe flooding, population displacement, and infrastructural damage during this disaster.

4.7.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

A large hydrological flooding disaster happened because of heavy monsoon rains. It generated a serious socioeconomic crisis that affected 194,000 people. The tragedy killed four people and wounded 63 others. In the Taquari Valley, damage to infrastructure like dwellings and transportation networks was probably catastrophic. Because of the damage, it was challenging for companies to stay open and for emergency services to get to vital cities like Lajeado, Muçum, and Estrela. The disaster cut off several communities and prompted many people to move, both in towns and in the countryside.

4.7.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The uncertainty assessment relies on ERA5 reanalysis gridded fields aggregated over the Taquari Valley for the period 13–19 November 2023. The dataset includes **N = 88,200 spatiotemporal samples**, representing every grid cell within the basin across the full duration of the event.
A sample size of this magnitude substantially strengthens the statistical reliability of the analysis. With so many observations, sampling variability is greatly reduced, mean estimates become more precise, confidence intervals narrow, and overall statistical inference becomes more robust. Consequently, the estimates derived from the 88,200 samples can be considered highly stable and dependable.

4.7.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.7.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Metric	Mean precipitation	Standard deviation	Coefficient of variation (CV)	95% CI	Total rainfall
Value	0.916 mm per timestep	1.985 mm	2.166	0.903 – 0.929 mm	153.95 mm

Interpretation
The coefficient of variation for the event is **CV = 2.166**, indicating very high relative variability in precipitation. This reflects strong spatial heterogeneity, intermittent rainfall, and the influence of convective or localized storm cells. Although the rainfall field is naturally irregular, the statistical uncertainty of the mean remains extremely low. The **95% confidence interval of ±0.013 mm** shows that the mean precipitation estimate is highly precise and statistically robust.

4.7.2.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.7.2.2.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the flood event

Metric	Mean SRO	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI	Total SRO
Value	0.128 mm	0.544 mm	4.234	0.125 – 0.132 mm	21.57 mm

Interpretation

The coefficient of variation for surface runoff is **CV = 4.234**, indicating extremely high relative variability. This reflects the episodic nature of runoff generation, its concentration during peak rainfall periods, and the large number of grid–time samples with near-zero values. Despite this strong process-level variability, the confidence interval for the mean remains narrow because of the large sample size, which stabilizes the estimate. Consequently, **statistical uncertainty is low**, while **process variability is very high**, underscoring that a highly variable hydrological response does not imply an uncertain statistical mean.

4.7.2.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.7.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Metric	Mean SSRO	Standard deviation	CV	Total SSRO
Value	0.353 mm	0.926 mm	2.627	59.23 mm

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exceeds surface runoff, indicating strong infiltration capacity, a delayed hydrological response, and the dominance of storage-controlled processes within the basin. Although variability remains substantial (CV ≈ 2.6), the statistical confidence in the mean estimate is still acceptable due to the large number of samples. Overall, the process itself is highly variable, but the statistical uncertainty of the mean remains low.

4.7.2.2.4. Wind Components (u10 and v10)

Table 4.7.2.2.4. Statistical summary of wind components and wind speed during the flood event

Variable	u10	v10	Wind speed magnitude	Max wind speed
Mean (m/s)	–0.603	–1.006	3.254 m/s	5.408 m/s
95% CI	–0.793 to –0.413	–1.289 to –0.722	3.107 – 3.402	—

Interpretation

Negative mean components indicate a consistent prevailing wind direction.
Mean wind speed (~3.25 m/s) reflects **moderate synoptic forcing**.
Narrow confidence intervals indicate **low wind uncertainty**.
Wind conditions were not extreme, confirming that the event was **precipitation-driven**, not wind-driven.

4.7.2.2.5. Soil Moisture (swvl1–swvl4)

Table 4.7.2.2.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean	0.364	0.365	0.359	0.38
CV	0.557	0.556	0.555	0.552

Interpretation

Soil moisture was **moderately high** across all layers, Variability is relatively low compared to runoff.
Pre-event wetness likely enhanced runoff generation and contributed to flood severity.

Runoff Coefficient (Hydrological Efficiency)

RC=SRO/TP
Event-integrated value: RC=0.140

4.7.2.2.6. Sensitivity Test (±10% TP)

Table 4.7.2.2.6. Sensitivity analysis of runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base	TP –10%	TP +10%
RC	0.14	0.156	0.127

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient remains within: $0.127 \leq RC \leq 0.156$ This narrow range indicates the following:
Low sensitivity to precipitation uncertainty, Stable hydrological response classification and Moderate runoff efficiency (~14%)

4.8. PERU 2020

4.8.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation




Figure 4.8.1. Peru 2020: Flash Flood & Mudslide Event (February 2020): Integrated visual panel-multi-hazard

The ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the flash flood event occurring between **17–25 February 2020** in southern Peru was driven by intense seasonal rainfall affecting the regions of **Arequipa, Cusco, and Tacna**. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0 to 0.005–0.008**, visualized using a white-to-deep blue color scale, where darker shades represent increasing flood severity.

Areas within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0**) experienced negligible rainfall and maintained stable hydrological conditions. Slightly elevated precipitation values (**0.001–0.001**) indicate minor rainfall accumulation, resulting in limited surface runoff and minimal hydrological disturbance. Moderate precipitation levels (**0.002–0.002**) correspond to increased runoff generation and localized stream response, particularly within small catchments and steep Andean terrain, leading to isolated flooding and temporary disruption of local infrastructure.

Higher precipitation intensities within the **0.003–0.004** range indicate severe rainfall capable of producing rapid surface runoff, flash flooding, and channel overtopping. These conditions are consistent with reported impacts on road networks, settlements, and agricultural land. The highest precipitation class, represented by deep blue shading and corresponding to values between **0.005 and 0.008**, identifies zones exposed to extreme rainfall and severe flash flooding. These areas experienced the most destructive impacts, including widespread inundation and significant damage to infrastructure.

The spatial concentration of the highest precipitation classes confirms that flash flooding was the dominant hazard mechanism during this event.

4.8.1.1. Associated Landslide Triggering Conditions

The ERA5 volumetric soil water **(VSWL)** data indicates that the landslide in Cusco was triggered when soil moisture exceeded a critical physical threshold of approximately **0.46 m³/m³**. The temporal evolution of the data shows a clear progression through five intensity classes, ultimately reaching peak values of **0.499 m³/m³**. In geotechnical terms, a volumetric water content close to **0.50 m³/m³** typically corresponds to total soil porosity for many natural soils. This implies that the ground was not merely very wet, but effectively fully saturated, with pore spaces completely filled by water and no remaining air to contribute to shear strength or mechanical stability.

In the surface layer **(VSWL1)**, which represents the upper **0–7 cm** of soil, the data reveals a steep and progressive moisture gradient leading up to failure. Initial conditions were characterized by volumetric water contents between **0.384** and **0.409 m³/m³**, reflecting standard moisture conditions under which the soil retains cohesion and structural integrity. As values increased to the range of 0**.410–0.422 m³/m³**, the soil entered a wet state where infiltration rates began to slow. Further increases to **0.423–0.437 m³/m³** marked a warning stage, with the soil becoming highly moist and surface runoff

initiating along micro-channels. When moisture levels reached between **0.438** and **0.459 m³/m³**, the soil approached near-saturation, becoming plastic and easily deformable. The critical transition occurred once values crossed **0.460 m³/m³** and rose toward **0.499 m³/m³**. Within this range, the soil effectively lost its solid behavior and exhibited liquefaction characteristics, behaving more like a viscous fluid. This interval between **0.460** and **0.499 m³/m³** represents the failure zone in which the mudslide was initiated.
Conditions in the subsurface layer (V**SWL2**), spanning depths of **7–28 cm**, were even more critical due to sustained moisture accumulation at depth. Base saturation in this layer already ranged from **0.394 to 0.414 m³/m³**, slightly higher than surface baseline conditions. Elevated and warning stages followed similar trends, with values increasing through **0.415–0.425 m³/m³** and **0.426–0.441 m³/m³**, respectively. The pre-failure range, between **0.442** and **0.467 m³/m³**, is particularly significant because these values exceed the surface-layer average, indicating subsurface water pooling and limited drainage. Once volumetric water content surpassed **0.468 m³/m³** and approached **0.499 m³/m³**, the soil entered a critical failure state. This specific range represents the hydraulic trigger, where pore-water pressure exceeded the effective stress and frictional resistance binding the soil particles together. Under these conditions, the subsurface lost its ability to support the overlying mass, leading to slope detachment and the initiation of the landslide.

4.8.1.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The flash flood and associated landslides affected an estimated **10,000–12,120 people** across the impacted regions. Damage to infrastructure, including roads and bridges, disrupted transportation and emergency response efforts. Agricultural losses and temporary displacement further amplified socioeconomic stress in rural and mountainous communities.

4.8.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 flash flood event across Arequipa, Tacna, and Cusco was analyzed using **124,200 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a comprehensive assessment of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.8.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.8.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	124,200	0.292	0.559	1.91	0.289 – 0.295	63.15 mm	216

Interpretation
Average rainfall per timestep was **0.292 mm**, with a **CV of 1.91**, indicating moderate variability consistent with sustained convective precipitation in Andean terrain.
The narrow CI confirms **high statistical precision**.
Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.8.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.8.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.0705	0.1842	2.61	0.0695 – 0.0715	15.22 mm	216

Interpretation
Surface runoff shows **high variability (CV ≈ 2.61)**, reflecting nonlinear runoff generation in steep catchments.
The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.241
meaning **24% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff**, consistent with strong hydrological amplification and rapid runoff response.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; statistically reliable.

4.8.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.8.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.0645	1.79	13.93

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff contributes significantly and is comparable to surface runoff, indicating **combined infiltration and rapid overland flow processes typical** of flash-flood environments in mountainous terrain.

4.8.1.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.8.1.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	−0.431	1.523	−3.53	−0.439 – −0.423	0.429	216

The negative mean indicates **westward flow**, with high directional variability relative to the small mean.

4.8.1.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.8.1.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	0.958	1.980	2.07	0.947 – 0.969	2.058	216

The positive mean indicates **northward flow**, with moderate directional variability.

4.8.1.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.8.1.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	2.164	1.631	0.75	2.155 – 2.173	3.208	216

Interpretation

Wind magnitude indicates **moderate low-level atmospheric forcing**.
Variability is moderate and statistically well constrained.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.8.1.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.8.1.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.266	0.272	0.258	0.247
CV	0.69	0.65	0.66	0.66

Interpretation

Soil moisture levels are **moderately elevated**, but remain below critical saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$).
This suggests **preconditioned wet soils** that enhanced runoff efficiency without reaching landslide failure thresholds.

4.8.1.3.7. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.8.1.3.7. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.241	0.268	0.219

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **strong nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
A 10% reduction in precipitation increases RC to 0.268, confirming **threshold-like hydrological response** in steep Andean basins.

3.8.2. Soil Saturation and Mudslide Initiation Conditions




Figure 4.8.2. Peru 2020: Extreme Soil Saturation & Mudslide Event (23 Feb 2020)

The ERA5 soil moisture analysis indicates that the mudslide event on **23 February 2020** in **Santa Teresa District (La Convención Province)** and **Pisac District (Calca Province)** was primarily driven by extreme soil saturation resulting from antecedent rainfall and localized flooding. Surface soil moisture conditions were assessed using ERA5 **Volumetric soil water layer 1 (VSWL1; 0–7 cm)**, classified into five categories ranging from **0.384 – 0.409 to 0.46 – 0.499**, and visualized using a white-to-black color scale.

Lower **Volumetric Soil Water Layer (VSWL1)** values (**0.384–0.409**) represent relatively stable surface conditions with limited saturation. Slightly higher values (**0.41–0.422**) indicate increasing surface wetness, sufficient to reduce soil cohesion on steep slopes. Moderate saturation levels (**0.423–0.437**) reflect critically wet surface soils, where infiltration capacity was exceeded and slope stability significantly reduced.

Higher **VSWL1 values** within the **0.438–0.459** range indicate severely saturated surface conditions strongly associated with shallow slope failures and debris flows. The black shading in the highest saturation class (0.46–0.499) shows that the surface soil is very saturated and that these are the areas where mudslides are most likely to start. These conditions spatially correspond with observed mudslide impacts in the affected districts.

Subsurface conditions, assessed with ERA5 Volumetric soil water layer 2 (VSWL2; 7–28 cm), confirm widespread slope instability. **VSWL2** values ranged from **0.394–0.414** in the lowest class to **0.468–0.499** in the highest class. Elevated subsurface moisture increased pore-water pressure and weakened soil structure at depth, facilitating the propagation of mass movements and increasing the volume and runout distance of mudslides.

The presence of high **VSWL2** values indicates prolonged soil saturation prior to slope failure, suggesting that antecedent hydrological conditions played a critical role in triggering the event.

4.8.2.1. Associated Flooding and Hazard Interaction

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis for the Cusco region quantifies the intensity of the rainfall event that drove the secondary flooding hazards and provides a clear depiction of the spatial contrast in hydrometeorological forcing. The data reveals a distinct and aggressive precipitation gradient, with values escalating rapidly from negligible amounts to extreme accumulation levels over a short distance. In the western sectors of the region, total precipitation remained within the lowest detectable ranges, with recorded values between **0–0 m** and **0.001–0.001 m**. These figures indicate benign atmospheric conditions with minimal hydrological significance and no capacity to generate surface flooding. In contrast, the northeastern sector, corresponding to the steep Andean catchments, experienced a pronounced and abrupt surge in rainfall intensity. In this zone, total precipitation values reached the maximum classification of **0.005–0.008 m**. This increase, representing an effective **800%** rise from the lower quantifiable threshold of **0.001 m**, reflects a substantial volume of water delivered in a very short period. The clustering of precipitation values within the **0.005–0.008 m** range

confirms that rainfall rates far exceeded the natural drainage capacity of the terrain, acting as the primary driver for the rapid and hazardous river level rises observed during the event.
The hydrological response of the landscape is further evidenced by **the Surface Runoff (SRO)** data, which closely mirrors the spatial and numerical distribution of precipitation intensity. While precipitation represents the hydrological input, surface runoff captures the system's failure to absorb that input. In the most critically affected zones, runoff values reached a maximum range of **0.005–0.006 m**. When directly compared to the precipitation peak of **0.008 m**, a runoff value of **0.006 m** is highly significant, indicating that approximately **75%** of the rainfall was converted almost instantaneously into overland flow. This exceptionally high runoff-to-precipitation ratio implies that the soil's infiltration capacity was effectively null, most likely due to pre-existing saturation conditions. Rather than percolating into the subsurface, water accumulated rapidly at the surface, accelerating downslope. The transition from moderate runoff values of approximately **0.002–0.002 m** in peripheral areas to peak values of **0.006 m** in the impact zone delineates the specific geographic corridors where flash flooding was unavoidable. The resulting volumes of high-velocity surface water, defined by the **0.005–0.006 m** classification, converged into narrow valleys and channels, generating sudden and destructive hydraulic loads on downstream infrastructure and amplifying the severity of the flooding event.

4.8.2.2. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The mudslide event affected approximately **13 people**, with localized but severe impacts on housing, transportation routes, and agricultural land. Environmental consequences included soil erosion, vegetation loss, and long-term slope destabilization, increasing vulnerability to future rainfall-triggered hazards.
The **2020-0070-PER** event demonstrates how extreme soil moisture conditions, rather than peak precipitation alone, can serve as the primary driver of destructive mass movements. The strong correspondence between ERA5 soil moisture extremes and observed mudslide impacts underscores the importance of incorporating subsurface hydrological indicators into landslide early warning and risk reduction frameworks.

4.8.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 mudslide event in Santa Teresa and Pisac, Cusco, was assessed using **1,176 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed evaluation of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.8.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 3.8.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the mudslide event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	1,176	0.608	0.929	1.53	0.555 – 0.661	14.60 mm	24

Interpretation
Average rainfall per timestep was **0.608 mm**, indicating **intense short-duration precipitation**.
Moderate variability (CV ≈ 1.53) reflects convective storm activity typical of Andean terrain.
The CI remains reasonably narrow despite the smaller dataset.
Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability; moderate statistical confidence.

4.8.2.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.8.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the mudslide event

Parameter	Mean(mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.272	0.536	1.97	0.241 – 0.303	6.52 mm	24

Interpretation
Surface runoff was substantial relative to rainfall, confirming **rapid hydrological response**.
The event-scale runoff coefficient is:
RC=0.447
meaning **approximately 45% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff**, highlighting strong runoff amplification and limited infiltration.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; statistically acceptable given sample size.

4.8.2.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.8.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the mudslide event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.143	0.86	3.43

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff contributed significantly but remained lower than surface runoff.
This indicates **combined overland flow and shallow subsurface processes**, consistent with debris-flow and mudslide dynamics.

4.8.2.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.8.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the mudslide event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	0.180	0.677	3.76	0.141 – 0.219	0.383	24

Directional variability was high relative to the small mean.

4.8.2.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.8.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the mudslide event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	−0.813	0.615	−0.76	−0.848 – −0.778	−0.054	24

Moderate southward flow dominated the event period.

4.8.2.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.8.2.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the mudslide event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	1.113	0.538	0.48	1.082 – 1.144	2.005	24

Interpretation

Wind forcing was **weak to moderate**, playing a secondary role compared to hydrological drivers in slope failure.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; moderate statistical precision.

4.8.2.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.8.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the mudslide event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.423	0.425	0.413	0.398
CV	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.11

Interpretation

Soil moisture values were **very high and close to critical saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$)**.
Low variability indicates **uniformly saturated conditions across the domain**, reducing soil shear strength and promoting slope instability.

4.8.2.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.8.2.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the mudslide event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.447	0.497	0.406

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **strong nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
A 10% reduction in precipitation increases RC to nearly 0.50, confirming **threshold-like hydrological behavior** consistent with landslide initiation.

4.9. URUGUAY 2020

4.9.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.9.1. Uruguay 2020 Flash Flood & Secondary Storm Event (22–24 June)

The ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the flash flood event occurring between **22–24 June 2020** in Uruguay was driven by intense rainfall associated with a broader severe weather system. The most affected areas included the departments of **Montevideo, Canelones, Colonia, and Lavalleja**. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0.001 to 0.006–0.009**, visualized using a light-to-deep blue color scale, where darker shades represent increasing flood severity.

Areas within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0.001**) experienced minimal rainfall and limited hydrological response. Slightly higher values (**0.002–0.002**) indicate light but persistent rainfall, sufficient to initiate surface wetting and minor runoff in urban and low-lying areas. Moderate precipitation values (**0.003–0.003**) correspond to enhanced runoff generation and localized flooding, particularly in areas with limited drainage capacity.

Higher precipitation intensities within the **0.004–0.005** range indicate severe rainfall capable of producing rapid surface runoff, ponding, and drainage system exceedance. The highest precipitation class, represented by deep blue shading and corresponding to values between **0.006 and 0.009**, identifies zones exposed to extreme rainfall and significant flash flooding. These areas experienced the most pronounced impacts, including inundation of urban infrastructure and disruption of transportation networks.

Surface runoff conditions were assessed using ERA5 Surface Runoff **(SRO@SFC)**, classified into five categories ranging from **0–0** to **0.003–0.004**. The lowest runoff class (**0–0; ≤ 0.000175**) reflects negligible runoff generation and stable surface conditions. Slightly elevated runoff levels (**0.001–0.001; ≤ 0.000594**) indicate initial runoff accumulation, primarily along impervious urban surfaces.

Moderate runoff values (**0.002–0.001; ≤ 0.001205**) correspond to increasing overland flow and localized flooding. Higher runoff classes (**0.002–0.002; ≤ 0.002096**) indicate substantial surface flow capable of overwhelming drainage infrastructure. The highest runoff class (**0.003–0.004; ≤ 0.004453**) identifies areas experiencing extreme runoff accumulation, strongly associated with flash flooding and surface water inundation.

The spatial correspondence between high precipitation and elevated runoff confirms that rapid runoff generation was a key mechanism driving flood impacts during this event.

4.9.1.1. Associated Storm Wind Characteristics

The flash flood event was accompanied by a secondary storm, assessed using ERA5 near-surface wind components. The **10 m V-component wind** values ranged from **−9.492 to 10.772 m s⁻¹**, classified into five categories. Lower wind values (**−9.492 to −3.452 m s⁻¹**) reflect weaker or opposing wind flow, while moderate values (**−3.451 to −0.353 m s⁻¹** and **−0.352 to 2.587 m s⁻¹**) indicate enhanced storm circulation.

Higher wind intensities (**2.588–5.13 m s⁻¹**) identify areas exposed to strong storm conditions, with increased risk of wind-related damage. The highest wind class (**5.131–10.772 m s⁻¹**) marks zones subjected to severe winds capable of exacerbating flood impacts by damaging infrastructure, increasing debris transport, and disrupting emergency response. Zonal wind **(10U@SFC)** values ranged from **−0.142 to 5.068 m s⁻¹**, with the highest class (**3.496–5.068 m s⁻¹**) indicating strong horizontal wind flow contributing to storm severity.

4.9.1.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The flash flood affected approximately **360 people** across the impacted departments. Flooding disrupted transportation, damaged residential areas, and strained urban drainage systems, particularly in Montevideo and surrounding metropolitan zones. The interaction between intense rainfall, elevated runoff, and storm winds highlights the compound nature of this event.

4.9.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 Uruguay flash-flood event was examined using **15,048 space–time samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was assessed using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed characterization of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.9.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.9.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	Coefficient of variation (CV)	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
Value	15,048	0.649	1.265	1.95	0.629 – 0.669	46.72	72

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep reached **0.649 mm**, accompanied by a **CV of 1.95**, indicating pronounced spatial–temporal variability typical of short-duration convective systems.
Despite this physical variability, the narrow CI demonstrates **high statistical confidence** in the estimated mean.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability, low statistical uncertainty.

4.9.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.9.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	Timesteps
Value	15,048	0.086	0.308	3.58	0.081 – 0.091	6.21	72

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **very high dispersion (CV = 3.58)**, reflecting strong spatial heterogeneity and nonlinear hydrological behavior. The event-scale runoff coefficient is: RC=0.133
meaning **13.3% of rainfall was converted into immediate overland flow**, consistent with a moderately amplified flash-flood response.
Uncertainty level: Very high natural variability, statistically reliable mean.

4.9.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.9.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.034	4.34	2.43

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exhibits **extreme relative variability (CV > 4)**, indicative of highly localized infiltration processes. Its total contribution remains smaller than surface runoff, confirming the dominance of rapid overland flow during the event.

4.9.1.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.9.1.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	−1.54	2.92	−1.90	−1.59 – −1.49	3.20

The negative mean reflects a **prevailing westward flow**, with substantial directional variability.

4.9.1.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.9.1.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	0.70	3.68	5.27	0.64 – 0.76	5.20

The positive mean indicates **northward flow**, while the very large CV (>5) highlights **intense directional fluctuations** typical of unstable storm conditions.

4.9.1.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 3.9.1.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	4.61	1.91	0.41	4.58 – 4.64	5.88	72

Interpretation

Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability (CV = 0.41)**, much lower than the directional components, confirming that vector fluctuations partially cancel when computing speed.

Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability, high statistical reliability.

4.9.1.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.9.1.3.7. statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean	0.336	0.331	0.282	0.284
CV	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.58

Interpretation

Soil moisture values remain well below typical instability thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$), indicating **no near-saturation conditions**.

Variability is moderate and statistically consistent across layers.

4.9.1.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.9.1.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.133	0.148	0.121

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient responds nonlinearly to precipitation perturbations, increasing under reduced rainfall and decreasing under enhanced rainfall.

The range **0.121–0.148** indicates **moderate sensitivity** without extreme amplification.

4.9.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.9.2. Uruguay 2020 (22–26 June) Severe Storm and Flooding

The ERA5 near-surface wind analysis indicates that the severe storm event occurring between **22–26 June 2020** over Uruguay was characterized by strong and persistent atmospheric circulation affecting **Montevideo, Canelones, Colonia, and Lavalleja**. Storm intensity was assessed using ERA5 10 m wind components, classified into five intensity classes. The 10 m V-component wind values ranged from **−9.492 to 13.629 m s⁻¹**. Lower wind classes (**−9.492 to −1.966 m s⁻¹**) represent weaker storm influence, while moderate values (**−1.965 to 1.389 m s⁻¹** and **1.39 to 4.29 m s⁻¹**) indicate strengthening storm flow across much of the affected area. Higher wind intensities (**4.291–8.008 m s⁻¹**) identify zones exposed to severe storm conditions.
The highest wind class (**8.009–13.629 m s⁻¹**), represented by dark brown shading, marks areas subjected to extreme and damaging winds. These conditions are associated with a high likelihood of structural damage, fallen trees, power outages, and widespread service disruption.
Zonal wind (10U@SFC) values ranged from **−0.142 to 5.068 m s⁻¹**, with the highest class (**3.496–5.068 m s⁻¹**) indicating strong horizontal wind forcing that contributed to storm severity and persistence.

4.9.2.1. Associated Flooding Dynamics

Although the primary hazard was severe weather, intense and sustained winds were accompanied by heavy rainfall, leading to **secondary flooding** in low-lying and poorly drained areas. The storm's prolonged duration enhanced rainfall accumulation and delayed drainage, increasing flood susceptibility, particularly in urban environments.
Flooding acted as a secondary hazard by inundating roadways, damaging infrastructure, and compounding the effects of wind-related damage. The interaction between storm winds and floodwaters amplified overall **impacts** and complicated emergency response operations.

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis for **Uruguay in June 2020** quantifies a highly localized and intense rainfall event that acted as the primary driver of hydrological stress in the eastern provinces of the country. The data reveals a pronounced precipitation gradient extending from the western interior toward the eastern border with Brazil. In the western and central regions, rainfall accumulation remained minimal, with values confined to the **0–0 m** and **0.001–0.002 m** classifications, indicating generally stable atmospheric and hydrological conditions with little potential for flooding. In sharp contrast, the eastern sector experienced a rapid and substantial escalation in storm intensity. In these areas, total precipitation values surged into the highest classification range of **0.006–0.009 m**. This peak represents a major hydrological load, effectively quadrupling the rainfall intensity observed in the moderate accumulation zones around **0.002 m**. The spatial concentration of these extreme values within a relatively compact geographic area strongly suggests the presence of a stationary or slow-moving convective system, which delivered a large volume of rainfall over a short time period and directly overwhelmed the natural storage and conveyance capacity of local river catchments.

The hydrological consequences of this precipitation are clearly reflected in **the Surface Runoff (SRO)** analysis, which documents the landscape's limited capacity to absorb the sudden influx of water. Runoff values closely mirror the spatial distribution of precipitation, providing clear evidence of widespread soil saturation in the impacted zones. While western regions exhibited negligible runoff values of **0–0 m**, the eastern areas recorded runoff reaching the highest classification of **0.003–0.004 m**. When evaluated in conjunction with the precipitation peak of **0.009 m**, a runoff value of **0.004 m** is critically high, indicating that approximately **45% to 50%** of the total rainfall was converted almost immediately into overland flow. This elevated runoff-to-precipitation ratio implies that soils were either already near saturation prior to the event or that rainfall intensities exceeded the infiltration capacity of the soil profile. The transition from the warning-level runoff class of **0.002–0.002 m** to the critical range of **0.003–0.004 m** marks the point at which urban drainage systems become ineffective and river stages rise rapidly, resulting in the localized flooding documented during this event.

4.9.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The severe storm affected approximately **360 people**, with impacts including damage to housing, transportation networks, and utility infrastructure. Wind-related damage combined with secondary flooding resulted in localized but significant disruptions across multiple departments.

4.9.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 Uruguay severe storm event was examined using **25,080 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was assessed through the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed characterization of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.9.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.9.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	Coefficient of variation (CV)	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
Value	25,080	0.403	1.029	2.55	0.390 – 0.416	48.39	120

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep reached **0.403 mm**, accompanied by a **CV of 2.55**, indicating pronounced spatial–temporal variability typical of convective storm systems.

Despite this physical dispersion, the narrow CI demonstrates **high statistical confidence** in the estimated mean.

Uncertainty level: High physical variability, low statistical uncertainty.

4.9.2.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.9.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	Timesteps
Value	25,080	0.052	0.243	4.64	0.049 – 0.055	6.27	120

Interpretation

Surface runoff displays **very high variability (CV = 4.64)**, reflecting nonlinear hydrological behavior and strong spatial heterogeneity. The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.130

meaning **13% of rainfall was converted into direct overland flow**, consistent with a moderately amplified storm-driven hydrological response.

4.9.2.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.9.2.3.3. Statistical summary of total subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.021	5.44	2.53

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exhibits **extreme relative variability (CV > 5)**, indicating highly localized infiltration processes.

Its total contribution remains secondary compared to surface runoff, confirming the dominance of rapid overland flow during the event.

4.9.2.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.9.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	0.778	3.989	5.13	0.729 – 0.827	6.996

The positive mean indicates a **prevailing eastward flow**, with extremely high directional variability characteristic of unstable storm conditions.

4.9.2.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.9.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	1.771	3.732	2.11	1.724 – 1.817	7.433

The positive mean reflects **northward flow**, while the high CV indicates substantial directional fluctuations typical of severe convective systems.

4.9.2.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.9.2.3.6. statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	5.230	2.494	0.48	5.200 – 5.261	8.313	120

Interpretation

Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability (CV = 0.48)** and remains statistically stable.
Peak wind speeds above 8 m/s confirm the presence of a strong storm system.

4.9.2.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.9.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean	0.332	0.330	0.290	0.285
CV	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.58

Interpretation

Soil moisture values remain well below typical instability thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$), indicating **no saturation-driven slope failure risk**.
Variability is moderate and statistically consistent across layers.

4.9.2.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.9.2.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.130	0.144	0.118

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient responds nonlinearly to rainfall perturbations.
A 10% decrease in precipitation increases RC to 0.144, while a 10% increase reduces it to 0.118.
This range indicates **moderate hydrological sensitivity** without extreme amplification.

4.10. SRI LANKA 2021

4.10.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.10.1. Srilanka (2021) Precipitation and Surface Runoff

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the widespread flood event occurring between **13 May and 1 June 2021** in Sri Lanka was driven by prolonged heavy rainfall affecting **Colombo, Gampaha, Kalutara, Ratnapura, Puttalam, Kegalle, Nuwara Eliya, Galle, Matara, Kurunegala, and Kandy** districts. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0 to 0.005–0.009 and** visualized using a white-to-deep blue color scale, where darker shades represent increasing flood severity.

Areas within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0**) experienced minimal rainfall and limited hydrological response. Slightly elevated values (**0.001–0.001**) indicate light but persistent rainfall, contributing to surface wetting and minor increases in runoff. Moderate precipitation levels (**0.002–0.002**) correspond to enhanced runoff generation and rising river levels, particularly in floodplains and low-lying urban areas.

Higher precipitation intensities within the **0.003–0.004** range indicate severe rainfall capable of producing widespread river flooding, overbank flow, and inundation of agricultural land. The highest precipitation class, represented by deep blue shading and corresponding to values between **0.005 and 0.009**, identifies areas exposed to extreme rainfall and extensive flooding. These zones experienced the most significant impacts, including prolonged inundation, damage to housing and infrastructure, and disruption of transportation networks.

Surface hydrological response was assessed using ERA5 **Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC)**, classified into five categories ranging from **0–0** to **0.003–0.004**. The lowest runoff class (**0–0**) reflects stable surface conditions with negligible overland flow. Slightly higher runoff values (**0.001–0.001**) indicate the onset of surface water accumulation, particularly in urban and poorly drained areas.

Moderate runoff levels (**0.002–0.001**) represent increasing overland flow and localized flooding, while higher runoff classes (**0.002–0.002**) indicate substantial surface flow capable of exceeding drainage capacity. The highest runoff class (**0.003–0.004**) marks zones of extreme runoff accumulation, strongly associated with widespread flood impacts and prolonged waterlogging.

The strong spatial correspondence between high precipitation and elevated runoff confirms that excessive rainfall was the primary driver of flooding during this event.

4.10.1.1. Associated Landslide Triggering Conditions

In addition to flooding, saturated soil conditions contributed to widespread slope instability, triggering secondary landslides in upland and mountainous regions. Surface soil moisture conditions were assessed using ERA5 **Volumetric**

soil water layer 1 (VSWL1), classified into five categories ranging from **−0.000014–0.091558** to **0.413079–0.518895**.
Lower SWVL1 values represent relatively stable surface soils, while moderate saturation levels (**0.21976–0.315401**) indicate critically wet conditions that reduced soil cohesion. Higher saturation classes (**0.315402–0.413078**) reflect severely saturated surface soils, strongly associated with shallow landslides and debris flows. The highest **VSWL1** class (**0.413079–0.518895**) identifies areas with extreme surface saturation and the greatest likelihood of slope failure. Subsurface conditions, assessed using ERA5 **Volumetric soil water layer2** (**VSWL2**), ranged from **−0.000015–0.087582** in the lowest class to **0.413525–0.519454** in the highest class. Elevated subsurface moisture increased pore-water pressure and weakened slope stability at depth, facilitating the initiation and propagation of landslides.

4.10.1.2. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The flood event affected approximately **43,700 people** across multiple districts. Flooding damaged homes, agricultural land, and transportation infrastructure, while secondary landslides further compounded impacts by blocking roads and isolating communities. Environmental consequences included soil erosion, sediment deposition, and long-term degradation of slope stability.

4.10.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2021 flood event affecting southwestern and central Sri Lanka was assessed using **45,144 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, runoff components, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was characterized using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed assessment of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.10.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.10.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	45,144	0.258	0.640	2.48	0.252 – 0.264	117.71 mm	456

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep was **0.258 mm**, with a **CV of 2.48**, indicating moderate-to-high spatial–temporal variability typical of sustained monsoonal precipitation.
The narrow CI demonstrates **high statistical stability**, despite the physical variability inherent to the event.
Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; high statistical confidence.

4.10.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.10.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.0183	0.1269	6.92	0.0172 – 0.0195	8.36 mm	456

Interpretation

Surface runoff displays **very high variability (CV ≈ 6.92)**, reflecting strong spatial contrasts in runoff generation.
The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.071
meaning **7.1% of rainfall was converted into direct overland flow**, consistent with a moderate hydrological response rather than extreme amplification.
Uncertainty level: Very high variability; statistically robust.

4.10.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.10.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.0238	3.13	10.84

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff contributes substantially to total hydrological output, exceeding surface runoff in cumulative volume. This pattern indicates **strong infiltration and delayed flow pathways**, characteristic of humid tropical catchments.

4.10.1.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.10.1.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	4.376	3.122	0.71	4.347 – 4.405	8.554	456

The positive mean indicates **persistent eastward low-level flow**, consistent with monsoonal circulation patterns. Variability is moderate.

4.10.1.3.5. Meridional Wind (v10)

Table 4.10.1.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	1.608	2.065	1.28	1.589 – 1.627	4.563	456

The positive mean reflects **northward flow**, with moderate directional variability typical of monsoon-influenced environments.

4.10.1.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.10.1.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	5.140	3.055	0.59	5.111 – 5.168	8.948	456

Interpretation

Wind magnitude indicates **persistent low-level atmospheric forcing**, with moderate variability.
Peak speeds approaching 9 m/s confirm a significant atmospheric contribution to rainfall persistence.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.10.1.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.10.1.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.243	0.243	0.223	0.245
CV	0.70	0.70	0.73	0.68

Interpretation

Soil moisture values remain below typical saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$), though moderately elevated levels reflect **pre-wetted monsoonal conditions**.
Variability is moderate and spatially heterogeneous.

4.10.1.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.10.1.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.071	0.079	0.065

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
Even under ±10% precipitation changes, RC remains below 0.08, indicating **moderate hydrological amplification** without extreme escalation.

4.10.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.10.2. Sri Lanka 2021 Storm Analysis: May 16–17 & 20–21 Event

Zonal Wind Analysis (10U@SFC) The ERA5 near-surface zonal wind **(10U@SFC**) analysis captures the intensification of westerly winds during the event period **(May 16–17, 2021)**, coinciding with the impacts of the onset of the Southwest Monsoon and the peripheral influence of Cyclone Tauktae. The wind values were classified into five intensity categories, ranging from **-1.159 to 7.699 m s⁻¹**, and visualized using a yellow-to-deep red color scale.

The lower wind classes, represented by yellow and gold shades (values between **-1.159 and 1.724 m s⁻¹**), indicate areas of weak or variable zonal flow, largely observed in the sheltered interior or leeward sides of the island. Moderate wind conditions, classified within the **1.725–3.496 m s⁻¹** range (orange), reflect the strengthening of the monsoonal flow across the central landmass.

The highest wind intensities are visualized in deep red-orange and dark red, corresponding to values between **3.497 and 7.699 m s⁻¹**. These peak values are spatially concentrated along the western and southwestern coastal belts, including the Colombo region. This indicates a strong "westerly burst," where high-velocity onshore winds drove moisture and wave activity directly against the coast, likely exacerbating coastal erosion and localized structural damage.

Meridional Wind Analysis (10V@SFC) The meridional wind component **(10V@SFC)**, analyzed for the period of **May 20–21, 2021**, highlights the southerly vector of the storm system. Values were classified into five categories ranging from **-2.394 to 6.799 m s⁻¹**.

Negative and near-neutral values (**-2.394 to 0.742 m s⁻¹**) represent areas with weak northerly or negligible meridional flow. However, the upper classes, represented by darker shades with values reaching **3.663–6.799 m s⁻¹**, indicate a significant southerly wind component.

Synthesis of Wind Impacts The combination of positive U (westerly) and positive V (southerly) values confirms a dominant **South-Westerly storm flow**. The alignment of the highest **10U** values **(up to ~7.7 m s⁻¹)** with the highest **10V** values **(up to ~6.8 m s⁻¹)** suggests that the western coast of Sri Lanka was subjected to compound wind stress. This vector alignment typically maximizes rainfall efficiency through orographic lifting against the central highlands and increases the severity of storm surges along the western seaboard.

4.10.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The cyclone affected approximately **879 people**, with impacts including damage to housing, transportation networks, and public utilities. Coastal and low-lying communities experienced heightened vulnerability due to the combined effects of strong winds, heavy rainfall, and secondary flooding.

The **2021-0252-LKA** event highlights the role of tropical cyclones as compound hazards, where storm winds act as the primary driver and hydrological impacts emerge as significant secondary consequences. The consistency between ERA5-derived storm indicators and reported impacts underscores the importance of integrated cyclone-flood risk assessment and early warning systems in Sri Lanka.

4.10.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2021 Tropical Cyclone *Tauktae* over Sri Lanka was analyzed using **4,752 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, runoff components, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a comprehensive assessment of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.10.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.10.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	4,752	0.0517	0.1196	2.31	0.0483 – 0.0551	2.483 mm	48

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep was **0.052 mm**, with a **CV of 2.31**, indicating moderate-to-high variability typical of short-duration cyclonic rainbands.

Despite the smaller sample size compared to other events, the CI remains narrow, confirming **statistical reliability of the mean estimate**.

Uncertainty level: Moderate physical variability; statistically robust.

4.10.2.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.10.2.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.00264	0.02261	8.55	0.00200 – 0.00329	0.127 mm	48

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **very high variability (CV ≈ 8.55)**, reflecting localized hydrological response and nonlinear runoff generation.

The event-scale runoff coefficient is: RC=0.051

meaning **5.1% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff**, consistent with infiltration-dominated basin behavior during this cyclone phase.

Uncertainty level: Very high variability; statistically stable mean.

4.10.2.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.10.2.2.3. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.0201	2.41	0.966

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff contributes substantially more than surface runoff, indicating **dominant infiltration and delayed flow processes**, rather than rapid flash-type runoff generation.

4.1.2.2.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.10.2.2.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	2.148	1.943	0.91	2.093 – 2.203	3.975	48

The positive mean indicates **eastward low-level flow**, consistent with cyclonic circulation.

4.10.2.2.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.10.2.2.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	0.883	1.515	1.72	0.840 – 0.927	1.483	48

The positive mean reflects **northward flow**, with moderate-to-high directional variability typical of cyclone periphery dynamics.

4.10.2.2.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.10.2.2.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	2.882	1.778	0.62	2.831 – 2.932	4.361	48

Interpretation
Wind magnitude indicates **sustained moderate low-level forcing** during the cyclone.
Variability is moderate and statistically well constrained, with peak speeds exceeding 4 m/s.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.10.2.2.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.10.2.2.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.251	0.254	0.224	0.244
CV	0.68	0.68	0.73	0.68

Interpretation
Soil moisture values indicate **moderately wet antecedent conditions but** remain well below landslide-triggering thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$).
This suggests limited slope instability risk during the cyclone period.

4.10.2.2.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.10.2.2.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.051	0.0568	0.0465

Interpretation
Runoff efficiency shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
Even under ±10% precipitation changes, RC remains below 0.06, confirming **limited hydrological amplification**.

4.11. SPAIN 2023

4.11.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.11.1. Storm Ciarán: Intense and Widespread Wind Circulation (Spain, 2–3 November 2023)

The ERA5 near-surface wind analysis indicates that **Storm Ciaran**, which affected Spain between **2–3 November 2023**, was characterized by intense and widespread atmospheric circulation across much of the country. The regions most directly impacted included **Galicia and the Cantabrian coast**, with secondary impacts extending to **Asturias, Cantabria, the Basque Country, Castilla y León, Madrid, Catalonia, the Valencian Community, the Balearic Islands, Andalucía, Aragón, Extremadura, La Rioja, Navarra, and Murcia**.
Storm intensity was assessed using ERA5 **10 m zonal (10U@SFC)** and meridional **(10V@SFC)** wind components. Zonal wind values ranged from **−5.478 to 19.972 m s^{-1}**, classified into five intensity classes. The lowest class (**−5.478 to 1.109**

m s⁻¹) represents weak or variable wind flow with limited storm impact. Moderate wind conditions (**1.11–4.802 m s⁻¹** and **4.803–8.095 m s⁻¹**) indicate strengthening storm circulation capable of generating gusty conditions and minor damage. Higher wind intensities within the **8.096–12.786 m s⁻¹** range identify areas exposed to severe storm conditions, where strong winds increased the likelihood of tree fall, transportation disruption, and infrastructure damage. The highest zonal wind class, represented by deep red shading and corresponding to values between **12.787 and 19.972 m s⁻¹**, marks zones subjected to extreme and damaging winds. These conditions are associated with widespread structural damage, power outages, and coastal impacts.

Meridional wind (10V@SFC) values ranged from **−14.138 to 14.972 m s⁻¹**. Lower classes (**−14.138 to −4.777 m s⁻¹**) reflect strong directional flow associated with large-scale storm circulation, while moderate values (**−4.776 to −1.01 m s⁻¹** and **−1.009 to 2.073 m s⁻¹**) indicate sustained storm influence across inland regions. Higher classes (**2.074–6.182 m s⁻¹**) and the highest class (**6.183–14.972 m s⁻¹**) identify areas subjected to extreme meridional wind forcing, reinforcing the severity and spatial extent of Storm Ciaran.

The spatial concentration of the highest wind classes along coastal and exposed regions confirms that strong winds were the dominant hazard during this event.

4.11.1.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

Storm "Ciarán" hit many independent communities in Spain. Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria, the Basque Country, Madrid, and Valencia are some of these. A storm outside the tropics produced winds and waves strong enough to qualify as a hurricane. The weather killed **one** person. The very high gusts of more than **150 kph** in the mountains and along the northwestern coast made it challenging for people and businesses to get things done.

When trees and electricity wires fell, they broke many roads and buildings. This led to big power disruptions, especially in Galicia. The storm made it hard for transportation networks to run; therefore, many flights were canceled at big airports, including Madrid-Barajas, Bilbao, and Santander. It also stopped a lot of conventional and high-speed train routes in the northwest from running. People in cities were greatly scared of anything that flew and then fell, like cranes in Gijón and scaffolding in other towns. It was much worse because parks and other public places were shuttered all around the country.

4.11.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2023 extra-tropical storm *Ciaran* impacting Spain was assessed using **143,664 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, zonal and meridional wind components, and derived 10-m wind speed magnitude. Variability was quantified through the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed evaluation of both physical variability and statistical reliability.

4.11.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.11.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	143,664	0.276	0.648	2.35	0.272 – 0.279	13.23 mm	48

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep was **0.276 mm**, with a **CV of 2.35**, indicating moderate-to-high variability typical of frontal precipitation linked to extratropical systems.

The narrow CI demonstrates **high statistical precision**, supported by the large sample size.

Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.11.1.2.2. Zonal Wind Component (10U)

Table 4.11.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	8.211	4.499	0.55	8.187 – 8.234	9.255	48

Interpretation

The positive mean indicates **eastward low-level flow**. With mean speeds above 8 m/s and moderate variability (CV ≈ 0.55), the event was clearly **wind-dominated**.

The narrow CI confirms **very high statistical stability**.

Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; statistically robust.

4.11.1.2.3. Meridional Wind Component (10V)

Table 4.11.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	0.200	4.306	21.53	0.178 – 0.222	3.704	48

Interpretation

The small mean relative to its standard deviation produces an **extremely high CV (≈ 21.5)**, highlighting strong directional variability.
This reflects fluctuating north–south wind components typical of extra-tropical frontal systems.
Despite the dispersion, the CI remains narrow due to the large sample size.
Uncertainty level: Extremely high directional variability; statistically reliable.

4.11.1.2.4. Wind Speed at 10 m (Magnitude)

Table 4.11.1.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	9.274	4.497	0.48	9.251 – 9.297	10.480	48

Interpretation

Wind magnitude indicates **sustained strong low-level forcing**, with mean speeds near 9.3 m/s and peaks exceeding 10.4 m/s, confirming high storm intensity.
Variability is moderate (CV ≈ 0.48), much lower than the individual vector components due to cancellation effects.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; extremely high statistical confidence.

4.11.2. Meteorological and Environmental Conditions Contributing to Wildfire Risk




Figure 4.11.2. Spain: Meteorological & Environmental Drivers of 2–3 November 2023 Montitxelvo Wildfire (Valencia)

The ERA5 analysis indicates that the wildfire event affecting the **Montitxelvo municipality (Valencia)** between **2–3 November 2023** occurred under meteorological and environmental conditions conducive to fire ignition and spread. Although the wildfire was classified as a climatological hazard, atmospheric conditions associated with regional storm dynamics contributed to elevated wildfire risk.
Wind conditions were assessed using ERA5 **near-surface zonal (10U@SFC)** and **meridional (10V@SFC)** components. Zonal wind values ranged from **3.076 to 9.336 m s⁻¹**, with lower classes (**3.076–3.64 m s⁻¹**) indicating moderate airflow and higher classes (**6.023–7.348 m s⁻¹**) reflecting strong winds capable of accelerating fire spread. The highest wind class (**7.349–9.336 m s⁻¹**) marks zones with significant wind-driven fire propagation potential.

Meridional wind values ranged from **−6.022 to 12.95 m s⁻¹**. Moderate values (**−1.705 to 0.823 m s⁻¹** and **0.824 to 3.427 m s⁻¹**) indicate sustained airflow, while higher classes (**3.428–6.775 m s⁻¹** and **6.776–12.95 m s⁻¹**) identify conditions favorable for rapid fire spread and erratic fire behavior.
Near-surface air temperature, assessed using ERA5 **2 m temperature**, ranged from **280.71 to 301.036 K**. Lower temperature classes (**280.71–285.014 K**) indicate relatively mild conditions, while moderate classes (**288.284–291.391 K**) reflect warming sufficient to enhance fuel drying. Higher temperature values (**291.392–294.819 K**) and the highest class (**294.82–301.036 K**), represented by dark green shading, identify zones experiencing elevated thermal stress, increasing flammability and ignition potential.
Surface soil moisture conditions, assessed using ERA5 **Volumetric soil water layer1** (V**SWL1**), ranged from **−8.598 × 10⁻⁶ to 0.2244**. Lower V**SWL1** values (**≤ 0.04135**) indicate extremely dry surface soils, strongly associated with high fuel availability. Moderate classes (**0.1110–0.1540**) reflect partially depleted moisture levels, while higher classes (**0.1541–0.1830**) indicate limited residual moisture.
Subsurface soil moisture (V**SWL2**) values ranged from **−0.000012 to 0.246251**, with lower classes indicating prolonged dry conditions and higher classes reflecting limited subsurface moisture retention. Overall, soil moisture conditions were insufficient to inhibit fire ignition or spread.
Total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** values ranged from **0–0.000029** in the lowest class to **0.000426–0.000926** in the highest class. The dominance of the lowest precipitation classes indicates minimal rainfall, reinforcing dry fuel conditions and elevated wildfire susceptibility.

4.11.2.1. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The wildfire affected approximately **800 people** and caused localized damage to land, vegetation, and infrastructure in the Montitxelvo municipality. The concurrence of strong winds, elevated temperatures, low soil moisture, and minimal precipitation created a highly favorable environment for wildfire development and spread.

4.11.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The Montitxelvo wildfire in Valencia (2023) was assessed using **2,160 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, zonal and meridional wind components, derived 10-m wind speed magnitude, and shallow soil moisture layers (swvl1–swvl2). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed characterization of both atmospheric and surface conditions.

4.11.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.11.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the wildfire event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	2,160	0.00972	0.05093	5.24	0.00757 – 0.01187	0.467 mm	48

Interpretation

Mean rainfall per timestep was **extremely low (0.0097 mm)**, confirming near-dry atmospheric conditions.
The very high CV (≈ 5.24) reflects sporadic minor rainfall relative to the negligible mean.
Despite this, the narrow CI indicates **statistically reliable estimation**.
Uncertainty level: Very high physical variability; moderate-to-high statistical confidence.

4.11.2.2.2. Zonal Wind Component (10U)

Table 4.11.2.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	8.050	2.300	0.29	7.926 – 8.147	10.234	48

Interpretation

The positive mean indicates **eastward low-level flow**.
Sustained winds above 8 m/s, with peaks exceeding 10 m/s, confirm **strong atmospheric forcing conducive to wildfire spread**.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; statistically stable.

4.11.2.2.3. Meridional Wind Component (10V)

Table 4.11.2.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	0.800	3.202	4.01	0.664 – 0.935	6.094	48

Interpretation

The relatively small mean compared to the large standard deviation produces a **high CV (≈ 4.0)**, indicating strong directional variability.

Such fluctuations enhance **fire behavior unpredictability and lateral spread potential**.

Uncertainty level: High directional variability; statistically reliable.

4.11.2.2.4. Wind Speed at 10 m (Magnitude)

Table 4.11.2.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	8.713	2.251	0.26	8.618 – 8.807	10.930	48

Interpretation

Wind magnitude indicates **sustained strong low-level forcing**, with mean speeds near 9 m/s and peaks above 10.9 m/s. Variability is moderate and statistically well constrained.

Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.11.2.2.5. Soil Moisture (swvl1–swvl2)

Table 4.11.2.2.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the wildfire event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.0989	0.1136
CV	0.78	0.70

Interpretation

Surface soil moisture values are **critically low (<0.12 $m^3\ m^{-3}$)**, confirming **dry antecedent conditions**.

Moderate variability indicates spatial heterogeneity in fuel dryness, but values remain far below saturation thresholds, consistent with **wildfire-prone drought conditions**.

4.12. CHINA 2021

4.12.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.12.1. Northern China Flash Flood Event: 2–7 October 2021 (Shanxi & Hebei) (Multi-Hazard)

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the flash flood event occurring between **2–7 October 2021** in northern China was driven by persistent and intense rainfall affecting **Shanxi and Hebei Provinces**, with particularly severe impacts near **Datong and Taiyuan**. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0.000408 to 0.004493–0.014876**, visualized using a light-to-deep blue color scale, where darker shades represent increasing flood severity.

Areas within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0.000408**) experienced background moisture conditions with limited hydrological response. Slightly higher values (**0.000409–0.001225**) indicate light but sustained rainfall, contributing to progressive soil wetting and rising river levels. Moderate precipitation values (**0.001226–0.002392**) correspond to enhanced runoff generation and localized flooding, particularly in low-lying and agricultural areas.

Higher precipitation intensities within the **0.002393–0.004492** range indicate severe rainfall capable of rapidly increasing river discharge and overwhelming local drainage systems. The highest precipitation class, represented by deep blue shading and corresponding to values between **0.004493 and 0.014876**, identifies zones exposed to extreme rainfall accumulation. These areas experienced the most severe flooding, including widespread inundation, river overtopping, and extensive damage to settlements and farmland.

The spatial concentration of the upper precipitation classes confirms that extreme rainfall was the dominant driver of the flash flood hazard.

The hydrological response to intense rainfall was assessed using ERA5 **Surface Runoff (RO@SFC),** classified into five categories ranging from **0–0.000189 to 0.004381–0.00965**. The lowest runoff class reflects stable surface conditions with minimal overland flow. Slightly elevated runoff values (**0.00019–0.000718**) indicate the onset of surface water accumulation.

Moderate runoff classes (**0.000719–0.001624**) correspond to increasing overland flow and localized inundation. Higher runoff values (**0.001625–0.00438**) indicate substantial runoff capable of overwhelming riverbanks and drainage infrastructure. The highest runoff class (**0.004381–0.00965**) marks zones of extreme surface runoff, confirming that soil infiltration capacity was exceeded and that overland flow was the primary mechanism driving rapid flood expansion.

4.12.1.1. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The flash flood affected a population of approximately **1.76–2.08 million people**, with extensive impacts on housing, transportation networks, agricultural land, and critical infrastructure. Floodwaters inundated large areas, disrupted livelihoods, and caused long-term environmental degradation through soil erosion and sediment deposition.

4.12.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The hydrometeorological characteristics of the April 2022 Southern Manitoba flood event were evaluated using **137,808 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind components, wind speed magnitude, and the event-scale runoff coefficient (RC = RO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (SD), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), enabling a rigorous assessment of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.12.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.12.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	137,808	0.466	0.838	1.80	0.462 – 0.471	67.13 mm	144

Interpretation

Mean rainfall per timestep was **0.466 mm**, with a **CV of 1.80**, indicating moderate-to-high spatial–temporal variability typical of flood-producing synoptic systems.

The narrow CI (±0.0045 mm) demonstrates **high statistical stability** despite substantial physical variability.

Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; high statistical confidence.

4.12.1.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.12.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.0857	0.292	3.41	0.0841 – 0.0872	12.34 mm	144

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **very high variability** (CV ≈ 3.41), reflecting strong spatial contrasts in runoff generation across the basin.

The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.184

meaning **18.4%** of rainfall was converted into direct runoff, consistent with a **moderately efficient hydrological response** rather than an extreme flash-flood regime.

Uncertainty level: Very high variability; statistically robust.

4.12.1.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.12.1.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.0107	0.0455	4.25	1.54

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exhibits **very high dispersion** (CV ≈ 4.25), indicating localized infiltration and redistribution processes.

SSRO contributes only a small fraction of the total runoff, consistent with partial soil saturation but not with full exceedance of storage capacity.

4.12.1.2.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.12.1.2.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U)

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	-0.913	1.48	-1.62	-0.920 – -0.906	144

Interpretation

The negative mean indicates **persistent westerly flow**, consistent with the synoptic-scale circulation driving the storm.

Variability is moderate.

4.12.1.2.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.12.1.2.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V)

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	-1.031	2.71	-2.63	-1.045 – -1.017	144

Interpretation

The negative mean reflects **southward flow**, with moderate variability typical of storm-driven low-level circulation.

4.12.1.2.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.12.1.2.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	2.865	1.797	0.63	2.856 – 2.874	4.62	144

Interpretation

Wind magnitude indicates **modest but persistent atmospheric forcing**, with moderate variability.
Peak speeds near **4.6 m/s** confirm that the event was **primarily precipitation-driven**, not wind-driven.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; high statistical confidence.

4.12.1.2.7. Runoff Coefficient (RC = RO/TP)

Table 4.12.1.2.7. Event-scale runoff coefficient

Parameter	RC	n
Value	0.1838	137,808

Interpretation

The RC value indicates a **moderately efficient hydrological response**, consistent with saturated but not fully overwhelmed catchment conditions.

4.12.1.2.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.12.1.2.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.184	0.204	0.167

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
Even under ±10% precipitation changes, RC remains within **0.167–0.204**, confirming that the hydrological interpretation is **robust to reasonable rainfall uncertainty**.

4.12.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.12.2. Severe Weather Event: Shaanxi & Shanxi, China (2–5 October 2021)

The ERA5 near-surface wind analysis indicates that the severe weather event occurring between **2–5 October 2021** affected **Shaanxi and Shanxi Provinces**, including **Puxian County and Lyuliang City**. Storm intensity was assessed using ERA5 10 m meridional **(10V@SFC)** and zonal **(10U@SFC)** wind components, classified into five intensity categories.

For the **main storm phase**, meridional wind values ranged from **−8.677 to 8.016 m s⁻¹**. Lower classes (**−8.677 to −4.095 m s⁻¹**) represent strong directional flow associated with large-scale storm circulation. Moderate classes (**−4.094 to −1.673 m s⁻¹** and **−1.672 to 0.356 m s⁻¹**) indicate sustained storm influence across the region. Higher values (**0.357–2.909 m s⁻¹**) and the highest class (**2.91–8.016 m s⁻¹**) identify areas exposed to strong meridional wind forcing, reflecting the north–south elongation of the storm system.

Zonal wind values during the main storm ranged from **−3.163 to 3.607 m s⁻¹**, with the highest class (**1.697–3.607 m s⁻¹**) indicating moderate horizontal wind forcing. The comparatively weaker zonal winds suggest that storm dynamics were dominated by meridional flow.

4.12.2.1. Associated Storm Phase

During the secondary storm phase, meridional wind intensity increased, with values ranging from **−10.701 to 8.567 m s⁻¹**. Strong northerly winds (**−10.701 to −4.505 m s⁻¹**) and southerly winds (**2.145–8.567 m s⁻¹**) indicate intensified atmospheric circulation capable of sustaining convective activity and moisture convergence.

Zonal wind values during this phase ranged from **−3.751 to 2.089 m s⁻¹**, remaining moderate but sufficient to enhance storm persistence and spatial coverage.

The severe storm produced intense and prolonged rainfall, leading to **secondary flooding**, particularly in low-lying and riverine areas. Storm-driven rainfall saturated soils and elevated runoff, amplifying flood impacts and contributing to infrastructure damage and agricultural losses.

4.1.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The storm affected approximately **459 people**, causing damage to housing, transportation systems, and public utilities. Wind-related impacts combined with secondary flooding disrupted daily activities and emergency response operations.

4.12.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The analysis of the China 2021 storm incorporates **50,400 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation and near-surface wind fields. Variability was assessed using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed characterization of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.12.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.12.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
Value	50,400	0.828	1.081	1.30	0.818 – 0.838	79.51	96

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep reached **0.828 mm**, with a **CV of 1.30**, indicating **notable spatial–temporal variability**.

Despite this physical variability, the confidence interval is extremely narrow, reflecting **high statistical precision** due to the large number of samples.
Overall, precipitation shows **low statistical uncertainty** but **moderate physical dispersion** across the domain.

4.12.2.3.2. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.12.2.3.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	50,400	−0.819	1.592	−1.94	−0.833 – −0.805	0.725	96

Interpretation
The negative mean indicates a **prevailing westward flow**.
The magnitude of the CV (|1.94|) highlights **substantial directional variability**, which is typical for storm-scale wind fields.
Nevertheless, the CI remains tight, confirming **high confidence in the estimated mean**.
Uncertainty classification: **High directional variability, statistically stable estimate**.

4.12.2.3.3. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.12.2.3.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	50,400	−0.556	2.582	−4.65	−0.578 – −0.533	3.810	96

Interpretation
The negative mean reflects a **dominant southward component**.
The very large CV (|4.65|) indicates **extreme directional variability**, consistent with turbulent storm conditions.
Despite this, the CI remains narrow, showing that the mean is **statistically well constrained**.
Uncertainty classification: **Very high physical variability, high statistical confidence**.

4.12.2.3.4. 10-m Wind Speed (Scalar Magnitude)

Table 4.12.2.3.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	50,400	2.778	1.569	0.565	2.764 – 2.792	4.431	96

Interpretation
As a scalar quantity, wind speed smooths out directional fluctuations present in u10 and v10.
The CV of **0.565** indicates **moderate variability**, substantially lower than the vector components.
The narrow CI confirms a **highly reliable mean estimate**.
Uncertainty classification: **Moderate variability, statistically robust**.

4.13. USA 2021

4.13.1. Wildfire (Bootleg Fire and Western U.S. Wildfire Conditions)




Figure 4.13.1. USA 2021: Bootleg Fire & Western U.S. Wildfire Conditions (6–31 July)

The primary hazard was a large-scale climatological wildfire event, the **Bootleg Fire**, which affected **Oregon, California, and Arizona** between **6 and 31 July 2021**. This event was driven by a combination of extreme thermal stress, prolonged drought, and strong near-surface winds, creating highly favorable conditions for ignition and rapid fire spread.

Extreme Thermal Stress (2m Temperature)

The ERA5 **2-m air temperature (2T@SFC)** analysis indicates that the **July 2021** event in the western United States was dominated by extreme and spatially extensive thermal stress, affecting multiple states in a coherent west–east and south–north progression. The highest temperature class, ranging from **306.293 to 321.588 K** (approximately **33°C to 48°C**), was concentrated over **California, Nevada, Arizona, and parts of southern Oregon**, identifying these states as the core of the heat event. California experienced widespread exposure to temperatures exceeding **306 K**, particularly across the Central Valley and southern regions, where sustained extreme heat sharply reduced vegetation moisture and intensified wildfire susceptibility. Nevada and Arizona were similarly affected, with large areas reaching the uppermost temperature classes, reflecting persistent atmospheric subsidence and limited nocturnal cooling that maintained continuous thermal stress over desert and semi-arid landscapes. Southern Oregon was exposed to slightly lower but still critical temperatures, primarily within the **300.557–306.292 K** range, sufficient to sustain severe drying of fuels and soils. Moving eastward, **Utah and parts of Idaho** experienced elevated temperatures predominantly within the **295.204–300.556 K** class, indicating strong heat exposure but with somewhat reduced extremity relative to the core region. Peripheral states, including **northern Oregon and higher-elevation areas of Idaho**, were characterized by temperatures between **289.849 and 295.203 K**, reflecting moderated conditions associated with elevation and coastal influence. The lowest class, **272.833–289.849 K**, was limited to coastal margins and mountainous zones and represents areas largely outside the primary thermal hazard footprint. Overall, the spatial distribution of temperature values demonstrates a contiguous, multi-state heat event in which the most severe thermal stress was concentrated in California, Nevada, and Arizona, progressively weakening toward the northern and eastern margins of the domain. This thermal structure explains the widespread ecological stress, elevated wildfire risk, and prolonged environmental impacts observed across the western United States during this period.

Surface Pressure Gradients (SP)

The ERA5 **surface pressure (SP@SFC)** analysis reveals a pronounced pressure gradient across the western United States during the July 2021 event, reflecting the presence of a large-scale anomalous atmospheric circulation over complex terrain. Surface pressure values ranged from approximately **71,372 Pa to 102,719 Pa**, with the lowest pressures primarily

associated with **elevated terrain and interior basins** and the highest pressures concentrated along **lower-elevation coastal and desert regions**. The lowest pressure classes, below **80,346 Pa**, were most evident over **high-elevation areas of Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and eastern Nevada**, where reduced atmospheric mass and thermal expansion contributed to enhanced atmospheric instability. Moving southward and westward, intermediate pressure values between **80,346 and 90,058 Pa** dominated much of **Nevada, inland California, and Utah**, indicating strong horizontal pressure gradients across the Great Basin. The highest surface pressure values, exceeding **96,942 Pa** and reaching up to **102,719 Pa**, were concentrated over **southern California, Arizona, and parts of western Nevada**, particularly around urban centers such as **Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, and Tucson**. These high-pressure zones reflect intense subsidence and thermal compression associated with persistent atmospheric blocking. The sharp spatial contrast between low-pressure interior regions and high-pressure desert and coastal zones intensified near-surface pressure gradients, promoting sustained wind acceleration and reduced atmospheric mixing. This pressure configuration reinforced extreme thermal conditions, suppressed cloud formation, and contributed to the persistence of hazardous environmental conditions across California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and Oregon during the event.

The **Volumetric soil water layer1** (**VSWL1-0–7 cm)** is classified into five distinct ranges, spanning from **−0.007 to 0.519 m^3 m^{-3}**, and shows strong spatial contrasts across the western United States. The lowest class (**−0.007 to 0.048 m^3 m^{-3}**) dominates large portions of **California, Nevada, Arizona, and southern Oregon**, indicating extremely dry surface conditions with negligible plant-available water. The second class (**0.049 to 0.116 m^3 m^{-3}**) is widespread across **Utah, inland Oregon, and parts of Idaho**, reflecting low but non-zero moisture availability that remains insufficient to significantly moderate surface heating or fuel dryness. Intermediate moisture conditions (**0.117 to 0.191 m^3 m^{-3}**) occur in localized regions of **northern California and higher-elevation terrain**, indicating partial moisture retention without full hydrological buffering. Higher surface moisture values (**0.192 to 0.288 m^3 m^{-3}**) appear sporadically in mountainous and irrigated zones, while the highest class (**0.289 to 0.519 m^3 m^{-3}**) is spatially limited and confined to isolated areas, exerting minimal influence on the regional-scale event. Overall, V**SWL1** reflects a predominance of low-moisture classes across the affected states.

The (**VSWL2- 7–28 cm)**layer exhibits values ranging from **−0.002 to 0.511 m^3 m^{-3}**, again structured into five classes. The driest class (**−0.002 to 0.049 m^3 m^{-3}**) covers extensive areas of **California, Nevada, Arizona, and southern Utah**, demonstrating that moisture deficits extended below the surface layer. The second class (**0.050 to 0.123 m^3 m^{-3}**) is dominant across **Oregon, Idaho, and Utah**, indicating limited water storage in the shallow root zone. Moderate moisture conditions (**0.124 to 0.189 m^3 m^{-3}**) appear intermittently in **northern California and higher elevations**, while higher values (**0.190 to 0.258 m^3 m^{-3}**) are spatially fragmented and restricted to localized topographic features. The highest class (**0.259 to 0.511 m^3 m^{-3}**) occurs only in isolated regions and does not alter the overall pattern of widespread shallow subsurface dryness.

Intermediate-depth soil moisture (**VSWL3-28–100 cm**) values range from **−0.0004 to 0.421 m^3 m^{-3}**, with class distributions showing persistent dryness at depth. The lowest class (**−0.0004 to 0.052 m^3 m^{-3}**) is extensive across **California, Nevada, Arizona, and southern Oregon**, indicating severe depletion of intermediate soil moisture. The next class (**0.052 to 0.130 m^3 m^{-3}**) dominates much of **Utah, Idaho, and inland Oregon**, reflecting limited moisture retention at depths typically associated with seasonal buffering. Moderate values (**0.130 to 0.199 m^3 m^{-3}**) occur locally in **mountainous regions**, while higher classes (**0.199 to 0.273 m^3 m^{-3}** and **0.273 to 0.421 m^3 m^{-3}**) are spatially sparse and confined to specific high-elevation zones. The dominance of lower **VSWL3** classes confirms that drought conditions extended well into the soil profile.

The deep soil moisture layer (**VSWL4-100–289 cm**) ranges from **0 to 0.474 m^3 m^{-3}** and provides evidence of long-term hydrological conditions. The lowest class (**0 to 0.086 m^3 m^{-3}**) is prevalent across **California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and parts of Oregon**, indicating depleted deep soil reservoirs. The second class (**0.087 to 0.197 m^3 m^{-3}**) is widespread in **Idaho and northern Utah**, reflecting limited but persistent subsurface moisture. Moderate deep moisture (**0.198 to 0.262 m^3 m^{-3}**) appears in localized mountainous regions, while higher classes (**0.263 to 0.338 m^3 m^{-3}** and **0.339 to 0.474 m^3 m^{-3}**) are restricted and spatially discontinuous. The class structure of **VSWL4** indicates that deep moisture availability was generally low across the affected states, consistent with prolonged drought rather than short-term drying.

Wind-Driven Fire Intensification

The ERA5 zonal wind component at 10 m height **(10U@SFC)** over the United States exhibits a wide range of values, spanning from **−8.044 to 3.541 m s^{-1}**, indicating pronounced spatial variability in near-surface wind forcing during the event. The lowest class **(−8.044 to −4.546 m s^{-1})** represents strong easterly flow and is concentrated over parts of the central and southern United States, indicating persistent wind forcing directed toward the west. The second class **(−4.545 to −2.819 m s^{-1})** remains widespread and reflects moderate easterly winds affecting large portions of the affected U.S.

domain. Transitional wind conditions are captured by the third class **(−2.818 to −1.365 m s⁻¹)**, which marks zones of weaker easterly flow and reduced zonal momentum. The fourth class **(−1.364 to 0.134 m s⁻¹)** represents near-neutral zonal wind conditions and appears across intermediate regions where directional wind forcing was limited. The highest class **(0.135 to 3.541 m s⁻¹)** indicates westerly flow and is spatially confined to specific areas, reflecting localized reversal of the zonal wind direction. Overall, the **10U@SFC** classification demonstrates that easterly-to-weakly variable zonal winds dominated across the United States during the event, contributing to sustained atmospheric transport and boundary-layer forcing.

The meridional wind component at 10 m height **(10V@SFC)** over the United States ranges from **−14.573 to 10.868 m s⁻¹**, revealing strong north–south wind variability associated with the synoptic-scale circulation. The lowest class **(−14.573 to −6.392 m s⁻¹)** represents intense southerly-directed flow (negative meridional component) and is present in localized regions, indicating strong northward transport of air masses. The second class **(−6.391 to −2.701 m s⁻¹)** reflects moderate southerly winds and covers broader areas of the affected U.S. domain. The third class **(−2.700 to −0.306 m s⁻¹)** indicates weak southerly flow and marks transitional zones with reduced meridional momentum. Near-neutral meridional wind conditions are captured by the fourth class **(−0.305 to 1.689 m s⁻¹)**, representing areas where north–south wind forcing was minimal. The highest class **(1.690 to 10.868 m s⁻¹)** corresponds to strong northerly flow and is spatially limited, indicating localized zones of enhanced southward air transport. The full 10V@SFC class structure confirms that meridional wind forcing varied substantially across the United States, supporting sustained atmospheric circulation patterns during the event.

4.13.1.1. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The wildfire resulted in substantial socioeconomic and environmental impacts across the affected regions, with approximately **325,000 to 376,237 people** exposed to direct and indirect consequences. Extensive vegetation loss led to severe ecosystem degradation, habitat destruction, and long-term soil instability. Smoke emissions significantly ухудened air quality over large areas, increasing public health risks and disrupting daily activities. Infrastructure damage, including impacts on transportation networks, utilities, and residential areas, caused economic losses and necessitated prolonged evacuations and displacement. Together, these effects highlight the far-reaching environmental degradation and socioeconomic disruption associated with large-scale wildfire events under extreme climatic conditions.

4.13.1.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 Uruguay severe storm event was examined using **25,080 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was assessed through the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a detailed characterization of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.13.1.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.13.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the wildfire event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	Coefficient of variation (CV)	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
Value	25,080	0.403	1.029	2.55	0.390 – 0.416	48.39	120

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep reached **0.403 mm**, accompanied by a **CV of 2.55**, indicating pronounced spatial–temporal variability typical of convective storm systems.

Despite this physical dispersion, the narrow CI demonstrates **high statistical confidence** in the estimated mean.

Uncertainty level: High physical variability, low statistical uncertainty.

4.13.1.2.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.13.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the wildfire event

Parameter	n	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	Timesteps
Value	25,080	0.052	0.243	4.64	0.049 – 0.055	6.27	120

Interpretation

Surface runoff displays **very high variability (CV = 4.64)**, reflecting nonlinear hydrological behavior and strong spatial heterogeneity.

The event-scale runoff coefficient is:
RC=0.130
Meaning **13% of rainfall was converted into direct overland flow**, consistent with a moderately amplified storm-driven hydrological response.

4.13.1.2.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.13.1.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.021	5.44	2.53

Interpretation
Subsurface runoff exhibits **extreme relative variability (CV > 5)**, indicating highly localized infiltration processes.
Its total contribution remains secondary compared to surface runoff, confirming the dominance of rapid overland flow during the event.

4.13.1.2.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.13.1.2.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	0.778	3.989	5.13	0.729 – 0.827	6.996

The positive mean indicates a **prevailing eastward flow**, with extremely high directional variability characteristic of unstable storm conditions.

4.13.1.2.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.13.1.2.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)
Value	1.771	3.732	2.11	1.724 – 1.817	7.433

The positive mean reflects **northward flow**, while the high CV indicates substantial directional fluctuations typical of severe convective systems.

4.13.1.2.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.13.1.2.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the wildfire event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	5.230	2.494	0.48	5.200 – 5.261	8.313	120

Interpretation
Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability (CV = 0.48)** and remains statistically stable.
Peak wind speeds above 8 m/s confirm the presence of a strong storm system.

4.13.1.2.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.13.1.2.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the wildfire event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean	0.332	0.330	0.290	0.285
CV	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.58

Interpretation
Soil moisture values remain well below typical instability thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$), indicating **no saturation-driven slope failure risk**.
Variability is moderate and statistically consistent across layers.

4.13.1.2.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.13.1.2.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the wildfire event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.130	0.144	0.118

Interpretation
The runoff coefficient responds nonlinearly to rainfall perturbations.
A 10% decrease in precipitation increases RC to 0.144, while a 10% increase reduces it to 0.118.
This range indicates **moderate hydrological sensitivity** without extreme amplification.

4.13.2. Flood Impacts Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.13.2. USA Southwest Compound Flood & Landslide Event: 16–21 July 2021

A major hydrological event occurred between **16 and 21 July 2021**, affecting **Arizona, New Mexico, and Larimer County (Colorado)**. The flood was triggered by intense monsoonal rainfall impacting arid and semi-arid catchments.
Hydrological trigger total Precipitation and runoff
ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** over the **United States** during the event spans a range from **0 to 0.009 m**, reflecting strong spatial variability in rainfall intensity. The lowest class (**0–0.00026 m**) represents areas that received negligible or no precipitation and therefore did not contribute directly to flood generation. Slightly higher precipitation amounts are captured by the second class (**0.001–0.00103 m**), indicating light rainfall with limited hydrological significance under normal infiltration conditions. Moderate precipitation is represented by the third class (**0.002–0.00219 m**), corresponding to rainfall sufficient to initiate surface wetting and localized runoff in vulnerable terrain. The fourth class (**0.003–0.00413 m**) identifies zones of heavy rainfall where infiltration capacity was exceeded, promoting rapid surface water accumulation. The highest precipitation class (**0.005–0.00948 m**) delineates the storm core and represents short-duration, high-intensity rainfall capable of triggering immediate hydrological responses. In arid and semi-arid regions of the United States, precipitation within this upper range is particularly impactful, as it rapidly translates into surface runoff and flash flooding due to limited soil moisture storage and low infiltration capacity.

ERA5 **surface runoff (SRO@SFC)** across the **United States** ranges from **0 to 0.00277 m**, indicating substantial spatial variability in hydrological response during the event. The lowest class (**0–0.000054 m**) represents areas where infiltration dominated and runoff generation was negligible. Slightly elevated runoff values are captured by the second class (**0.000055–0.000249 m**), reflecting minor surface flow with limited hydrological impact. The third class (**0.00025–0.000672 m**) indicates the onset of measurable runoff, marking zones where soil saturation began to restrict infiltration. Moderate runoff is represented by the fourth class (**0.000673–0.00143 m**), corresponding to sustained overland flow capable of feeding local drainage networks. The highest runoff class (**0.002–0.00277 m**) defines the most critical areas, where rainfall was rapidly converted into surface flow, overwhelming natural channels and engineered drainage systems. In these zones, the runoff response confirms flash-flood conditions, particularly in arid and semi-arid regions of the United States where soil storage capacity is limited.

4.13.2.1. Associated Hazard: Landslide / Mudslide

The flood event directly triggered secondary mass movement processes. **Soil Saturation (SWVL1 and SWVL2)**
ERA5 surface soil water volume (**SWVL1**) across the United States, with the strongest impacts observed in California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and western Colorado, ranges from **−0.003 to 0.471 m³ m⁻³**, indicating strong spatial variability in near-surface soil moisture conditions during the event. The lowest class **(−0.003–0.067 m³ m⁻³)** dominates extensive areas of southern California, Nevada, and western Arizona, representing extremely dry surface soils

where pore spaces contained minimal water and infiltration capacity remained high. The second class **(0.068–0.138 m^3 m^{-3})** extends across parts of central California, southern Nevada, and northern Arizona, indicating low but increasing surface moisture as soils began to wet. Moderate surface moisture conditions are captured by the third class **(0.139–0.209 m^3 m^{-3})**, which occurs in localized regions of eastern California, Utah, and western New Mexico, reflecting soils approaching field capacity. The fourth class **(0.210–0.288 m^3 m^{-3})** identifies areas of high surface moisture primarily in northern Arizona, New Mexico, and western Colorado, indicating near-saturated conditions where additional rainfall increasingly contributed to surface runoff. The highest class **(0.289–0.471 m^3 m^{-3})** is concentrated in limited zones of eastern New Mexico and eastern Colorado, where surface soils reached near-complete pore saturation. In these states, infiltration capacity was effectively exhausted, promoting rapid overland flow and amplifying flood and runoff responses across the affected regions of the United States**.**

ERA5 shallow subsurface soil water volume (**VSWL2**) across the **United States**, particularly affecting **California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado**, ranges from **−0.000015 to 0.399 m^3 m^{-3}**, indicating pronounced spatial variability in moisture conditions within the shallow root zone. The lowest class (**−0.000015–0.076683 m^3 m^{-3}**) dominates large portions of **southern California, Nevada, and western Arizona**, representing very dry subsurface soils with minimal moisture storage and limited buffering capacity. The second class (**0.076684–0.158076 m^3 m^{-3}**) extends across parts of **central California, southern Utah, and northern Arizona**, indicating low but increasing subsurface moisture that remains below field capacity. Moderate moisture conditions, represented by the third class (**0.158077–0.220686 m^3 m^{-3}**), occur in localized areas of **eastern California, western Colorado, and northern New Mexico**, where infiltration had progressed into the shallow subsurface. The fourth class (**0.220687–0.286426 m^3 m^{-3}**) identifies zones of high subsurface moisture primarily in **eastern Colorado and parts of northern New Mexico**, indicating near-saturated conditions that reduce vertical drainage efficiency. The highest class (**0.286427–0.399124 m^3 m^{-3}**) is concentrated in limited areas of **eastern Colorado and northeastern New Mexico**, where shallow subsurface soils approached saturation. In these states, elevated subsurface moisture enhanced upward moisture redistribution and lateral flow, reinforcing surface runoff generation and contributing to the severity of hydrological impacts observed during the event.

4.13.2.2. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The flood and associated landslides affected approximately **50,000–57,883 people**, resulting in significant damage to transportation corridors, residential areas, and public infrastructure. Floodwaters and subsequent slope failures disrupted road networks, impeded emergency access, and caused the temporary isolation of several communities. Environmental impacts included soil erosion, sediment deposition, and localized ecosystem disturbance, while secondary mass movements further amplified physical damage and prolonged recovery efforts.

4.13.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2021 flash-flood and mudslide event in the United States was assessed using **297,648 space–time samples**, covering precipitation, runoff components, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), enabling a detailed evaluation of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.13.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.13.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	297,648	0.0577	0.2946	5.10	0.0567 – 0.0588	8.32 mm	144

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep was **0.058 mm**, accompanied by a **CV of 5.10**, indicating extremely intermittent and spatially concentrated precipitation—typical of localized convective flash-flood environments.
Despite this strong physical variability, the narrow CI reflects **high statistical precision**.
Uncertainty level: Very high physical variability; low statistical uncertainty.

4.13.2.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.13.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.00239	0.02853	11.95	0.00228 – 0.00249	0.344 mm	144

Interpretation
Surface runoff shows **extreme variability (CV ≈ 12)**, highlighting strong spatial concentration and nonlinear runoff generation.
The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.041
meaning **only 4.1% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff**, consistent with infiltration-dominated hydrological behavior and localized amplification.
Uncertainty level: Extremely high natural variability; statistically stable mean.

4.13.2.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.13.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.00055	5.14	0.079

Interpretation
Subsurface runoff is minimal relative to rainfall totals, though its high CV indicates episodic and spatially uneven infiltration. This confirms that runoff production was **localized rather than basin-wide**.

4.13.2.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.13.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	−0.224	1.821	−8.12	−0.231 – −0.218	1.115	144

The negative mean indicates **westward flow**, while the extremely large |CV| reflects strong directional variability relative to the small mean magnitude.

4.13.2.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 3.13.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	1.008	1.746	1.73	0.949 – 1.068	2.117	144

The positive mean indicates **northward flow**, with moderate directional dispersion typical of convective storm systems.

4.13.2.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 3.13.2.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	2.345	1.388	0.59	2.340 – 2.350	3.577	144

Interpretation
Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability (CV ≈ 0.59)**, substantially lower than the vector components due to directional cancellation. The narrow CI indicates **high statistical reliability**.

4.13.2.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 3.13.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.130	0.160	0.168	0.197
CV	0.74	0.55	0.42	0.29

Interpretation
Soil moisture values remain well below typical instability thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$). Variability decreases with depth, and no layer approaches saturation conditions associated with widespread landslide triggering.

4.13.2.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 3.13.2.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.041	0.046	0.038

Interpretation
Runoff efficiency shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.
Even under ±10% precipitation changes, RC remains below 0.05, confirming **limited basin-scale hydrological amplification**.

4.13.3. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.13.3. Primary Driver - Severe Weather Storm (8–11 July 2021)

A widespread severe weather event affected the **Central United States**, including **Nebraska, Missouri, Iowa, the Dakotas, Texas, and New Mexico**, between **8 and 11 July 2021**.
The ERA5 zonal wind component at 10 m height **(10U@SFC)** during the severe weather event exhibited values ranging from **−8.044 to 3.541 m s⁻¹** across the **central United States**, indicating pronounced west–east wind variability. Strong negative values (**−8.044 to −4.546 m s⁻¹**) represent intense easterly flow and were prevalent across parts of **Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Iowa**, contributing to enhanced low-level wind convergence and storm inflow. Moderate easterly winds (**−4.545 to −2.819 m s⁻¹**) extended over **Missouri and eastern Nebraska**, supporting sustained convective development and increasing the risk of damaging straight-line winds. Transitional zonal flow (**−2.818 to −1.365 m s⁻¹**) marked regions of reduced wind dominance, while near-neutral values (**−1.364 to 0.134 m s⁻¹**) indicated zones of weak zonal forcing where storm motion became more vertically driven. Positive 10U values (**0.135 to 3.541 m s⁻¹**), corresponding to westerly flow, were observed primarily over **Texas and New Mexico**, enhancing vertical wind shear when interacting with strong meridional winds. This zonal wind configuration contributed to storm organization, prolonged convective lifetimes, and the development of severe weather impacts, including widespread wind damage, hail, and heavy rainfall across the affected states.

The component at 10 m height **(10V@SFC)** during the severe weather event reached values between **4.58 and 13.233 m s⁻¹** across the **central United States**, indicating exceptionally strong north–south near-surface airflow. Moderate meridional winds in the range of **4.58–6.0 m s⁻¹** were widespread across **Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri**, enhancing low-level moisture transport and supporting sustained convective initiation. Stronger values between **6.0 and 9.0 m s⁻¹** were concentrated over **the Dakotas and eastern Nebraska**, reflecting intensified meridional flow that increased storm inflow and updraft strength. The highest class (**9.0–13.233 m s⁻¹**) occurred primarily across **Texas and New Mexico**, where vigorous north–south air mass exchange significantly enhanced atmospheric instability and vertical wind shear. These elevated 10V values facilitated rapid storm intensification, long-lived convective systems, and efficient moisture convergence, directly contributing to widespread severe weather impacts, including damaging straight-line winds, large hail, and episodes of intense rainfall across the affected states.

4.13.3.1. Associated Hazard: Flooding Following Severe Weather

ERA5 total precipitation **(TP@SFC)** associated with the secondary flood event over the United States spans values from **0 to 0.028 m**, indicating strong spatial contrasts in rainfall intensity during the event. The lowest precipitation class **(0–0.001 m)** dominates large portions of the central Plains, including parts of Colorado, Wyoming, and western Nebraska,

representing areas that received negligible rainfall and contributed minimally to runoff generation. Light precipitation amounts in the second class **(0.002–0.00209 m)** occur sporadically across Kansas and Oklahoma, indicating isolated rainfall with limited hydrological impact. Moderate precipitation values **(0.003–0.005 m)** are concentrated across Texas and parts of the southern Plains, reflecting rainfall sufficient to initiate surface wetting and localized runoff. Higher precipitation intensities in the range of **0.006–0.009 m** define zones of heavy rainfall primarily affecting southern Texas, where infiltration capacity was exceeded and runoff generation increased. The highest precipitation class **(0.010–0.028 m)** delineates localized storm cores along the Texas–Mexico border, representing short-duration but intense rainfall capable of triggering rapid surface runoff and flash flooding. Although spatially limited, precipitation in this upper range played a critical role in activating the secondary flood response by supplying concentrated rainfall over already vulnerable catchments within the United States.

ERA5 surface runoff **(SRO@SFC)** associated with the secondary flood event over the United States ranges from **0 to 0.012 m**, indicating a spatially variable runoff response following the storm. The lowest runoff class **(0–0.000277 m)** dominates large portions of the central Plains, including Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Kansas, representing areas where rainfall was insufficient to generate measurable overland flow. Slightly higher runoff values **(0.001–0.001107 m)** appear locally across Oklahoma and northern Texas, indicating limited surface response under partially infiltrating conditions. Moderate runoff depths **(0.002–0.003 m)** are observed across southern Texas and parts of the Gulf-adjacent regions, reflecting effective conversion of rainfall into shallow overland flow. Elevated runoff values in the **0.004–0.005 m** range delineate zones of intensified hydrological response across southern Texas, where soil saturation and reduced infiltration promoted sustained surface flow. The highest runoff class **(0.006–0.012 m)** defines localized runoff cores along the Texas–Mexico border, indicating substantial and rapid overland flow capable of producing secondary flooding in river basins, drainage networks, and low-lying areas. These peak runoff values confirm that rainfall during the severe weather episode exceeded local infiltration capacity, triggering a focused but hydrologically significant secondary flood response within the affected U.S. states.

4.13.3.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The severe weather event produced widespread socioeconomic and infrastructural impacts across the affected region, illustrating the compound nature of convective storm hazards. The combination of intense winds, hail, and secondary flooding resulted in **total economic losses of approximately USD 1.2 billion** and affected an estimated **1.2–1.39 million people**. Extensive damage was reported to **housing, agricultural lands, transportation corridors, and utility networks**, with flooding further amplifying disruptions initiated by wind- and hail-related destruction. These cascading impacts highlight how atmospheric dynamics functioned as the **primary hazard**, while hydrological flooding emerged as a **secondary but highly consequential process**, significantly intensifying overall losses during the event.

4.13.3.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2021 severe weather outbreak in the United States was analyzed using **633,888 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, runoff components, near-surface wind fields, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was assessed through the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), providing a comprehensive view of both physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.13.3.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.13.3.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	633,888	0.182	0.776	4.26	0.180 – 0.183	17.47 mm	96

Interpretation

Average rainfall per timestep was **0.182 mm**, with a **CV of 4.26**, indicating highly intermittent and spatially uneven precipitation—typical of convective severe weather environments.

Despite this strong physical variability, the narrow CI demonstrates **excellent statistical precision** due to the large sample size.

Uncertainty level: High physical variability; low statistical uncertainty.

4.13.3.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.13.3.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total surface runoff	Timesteps
Value	0.0107	0.133	12.45	0.0103 – 0.0110	1.024 mm	96

Interpretation

Surface runoff displays **extreme variability (CV ≈ 12.45)**, reflecting strong spatial concentration and nonlinear hydrological behavior.

The event-scale runoff coefficient is RC=0.0586.

meaning **5.9% of rainfall was converted into direct surface runoff**, consistent with infiltration-dominated hydrology and limited basin-wide amplification.

Uncertainty level: Extremely high natural variability; statistically stable mean.

4.13.3.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.13.3.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	CV	Total (mm)
Value	0.00729	4.26	0.700

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff contributes modestly relative to surface runoff.

The high CV indicates spatial heterogeneity, but the overall magnitude remains small, suggesting **no major subsurface-driven amplification**.

4.13.3.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.13.3.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	−0.738	2.169	−2.94	−0.744 – −0.733	0.203	96

The negative mean indicates **dominant westward flow**, while the large |CV| reflects substantial directional variability typical of severe storm outbreaks.

4.13.3.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.13.3.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	1.032	3.003	2.91	0.913 – 1.153	2.062	96

The positive mean indicates **northward flow**, with high variability consistent with unstable atmospheric circulation during severe weather events.

4.13.3.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude).

Table 4.13.3.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Std (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Max (m/s)	Timesteps
Value	3.429	1.891	0.55	3.424 – 3.433	4.057	96

Interpretation

Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability (CV ≈ 0.55)**, with sustained mean speeds above 3 m/s.

Directional fluctuations in u10 and v10 are reduced when computing magnitude, resulting in a more stable metric.

Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; very high statistical confidence.

4.13.3.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.13.3.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	swvl1	swvl2	swvl3	swvl4
Mean (m^3/ m^{-3})	0.244	0.240	0.227	0.254
CV	0.52	0.47	0.46	0.46

Interpretation

Soil moisture values remain well below typical landslide-triggering thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$).

Variability is moderate and consistent across layers, indicating **no widespread saturation conditions**.

4.13.3.3.8. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.13.3.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient during the storm event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.0586	0.0652	0.0533

Interpretation

Runoff efficiency exhibits **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to rainfall perturbations.

Even under ±10% precipitation changes, RC remains below 0.07, confirming **limited hydrological amplification**.

4.14. CHILE 2024

4.14.1. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.14.1. Chile 2024 Flood Event: 4–14 June (Multi-Hazard)

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis identifies a severe hydrological event occurring between **4 and 14 June 2024**, affecting large portions of **central and southern Chile**, including **Ñuble, Biobío, Araucanía, Maule, Los Ríos, O'Higgins, and the Santiago Metropolitan Region**. The flood was the primary hazard and was driven by intense frontal rainfall, consistent with the reported event origin of heavy rains.

Total precipitation values were classified into five categories ranging from **0–0 to 0.005–0.011**, visualized using a light-to-deep blue color scale. Areas within the lowest precipitation class (**0–0**) experienced minimal rainfall and limited hydrological response. Slightly higher values (**0.001–0.001**) indicate light but persistent precipitation, contributing to progressive soil wetting across river basins.

Moderate precipitation values (**0.002–0.002**) correspond to enhanced runoff generation and rising river levels, particularly in valley floors and low-lying urban areas. Higher precipitation intensities within the **0.003–0.004** range indicate severe rainfall capable of producing widespread overbank flooding. The highest precipitation class, represented by deep blue shading and corresponding to values between **0.005 and 0.011**, identifies zones exposed to extreme rainfall accumulation. These areas experienced the most severe flooding, where river systems were overwhelmed and extensive inundation occurred.

The hydrological response to intense rainfall was assessed using ERA5 **Surface Runoff (SRO@SFC)**, classified into five categories ranging from **0–0** to **0.003–0.004**. The lowest runoff class indicates stable surface conditions with negligible overland flow. Slightly elevated runoff levels (**0–0.001**) reflect the onset of surface water accumulation.

Moderate runoff values (**0.001–0.001**) indicate increasing overland flow and localized flooding, while higher runoff classes (**0.002–0.002**) reflect substantial runoff capable of exceeding drainage capacity. The highest runoff class (**0.003–0.004**), represented by dark blue shading, marks zones of extreme overland flow, confirming that soil saturation was widespread and that runoff generation was the primary mechanism driving flood impacts.

4.14.1.1. Associated Storm Conditions

Although flooding was the dominant hazard, the event was accompanied by secondary storm conditions. Wind analysis during this phase shows moderate to strong atmospheric forcing. The meridional wind **(10V@SFC)** ranged from **−17.445 to 9.703 m s⁻¹**, indicating highly variable and turbulent frontal passage. Zonal wind **(10U@SFC)** values reached the **2.642–5.1 m s⁻¹** range, driving moist air masses inland toward the Andes and sustaining precipitation intensity.

4.14.1.2. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

The flood event affected approximately **6,392–6,393 people**, causing damage to housing, transportation networks, and agricultural land. Floodwaters disrupted livelihoods across multiple regions and resulted in at least one reported fatality. Environmental impacts included soil erosion, sediment transport, and prolonged waterlogging of floodplains.

4.14.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The 2024 Chile flood event was evaluated using **212,520 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, surface and subsurface runoff, near-surface wind components, wind speed magnitude, soil moisture layers, and the runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV = σ/μ), and 95% confidence intervals (CI95), providing a comprehensive assessment of physical dispersion and statistical reliability.

4.14.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.14.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty level
Value	212,520	0.597	1.029	1.723	0.593 – 0.602	Moderate–High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **1.72** indicates notable spatial–temporal variability, consistent with **convective and orographic precipitation** typical of central Chile.

The narrow CI (±0.0045 mm) demonstrates **high statistical confidence** despite strong physical variability.

Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; high statistical stability.

4.14.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.14.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty level
Value	0.074	0.224	3.030	0.073 – 0.075	High

Interpretation

Surface runoff shows **very high variability** (CV ≈ 3.03), reflecting strong spatial contrasts in runoff generation across steep Andean terrain.

The narrow CI indicates **statistically reliable mean estimates** despite hydrological dispersion.

Uncertainty level: High physical variability; statistically robust.

4.14.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.14.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty level
Value	0.080	0.321	4.004	0.079 – 0.082	Very High

Interpretation

Subsurface runoff exhibits **extreme dispersion** (CV ≈ 4.00), indicating highly variable infiltration and lateral flow processes. This reflects **heterogeneous soil and slope conditions** typical of Chilean basins.

Uncertainty level: Very high variability; statistically stable mean.

4.14.1.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.14.1.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty level
Value	0.251	2.326	9.263	0.241 – 0.261	Very High

Interpretation

The extremely high CV (≈ 9.26) is driven by **sign changes** around zero, typical of fluctuating westerly–easterly flow during frontal passages.

Uncertainty level: Extremely high variability; CI remains narrow.

4.14.1.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.14.1.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty level
Value	-4.489	4.057	0.904	-4.506 – -4.472	Moderate

Interpretation

The negative mean indicates **persistent southward flow**, consistent with synoptic-scale storm dynamics.
Variability is moderate relative to the mean.

4.14.1.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.14.1.3.6. Statistical summary of wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Maximum Wind Speed	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty level
Value	5.251	8.58 m/s	3.810	0.726	5.235 – 5.267	Low–Moderate

Interpretation

Wind magnitude shows **moderate variability** (CV ≈ 0.73) with a relatively stable mean. This suggests a **coherent large-scale circulation** rather than highly erratic convective gusts.
Uncertainty level: Low–moderate.

4.14.1.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVLl1–SWVL4)

Table 4.14.1.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean (m^3/m^3)	~0.20	~0.20	~0.19	~0.19
CV	~0.88	~0.89	~0.90	~0.91
CI95	Narrow	Narrow	Narrow	Narrow
Uncertainty Level	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Interpretation

Soil moisture shows **moderate variability** with **tight confidence intervals**, indicating consistent antecedent wetness conditions.
Values remain below saturation, supporting **infiltration-driven runoff contributions**.

4.14.1.3.8. Runoff Coefficient (RC = SRO/TP)

Table 4.14.1.3.8. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event

Parameter	Mean RC	Std	CV	Uncertainty level
Value	1.63×10^{-6}	1.96×10^{-7}	11.99	Extremely High

Interpretation

The extremely high CV (~12) reflects **instability at the grid scale, due to** small precipitation denominators.
RC is therefore **more meaningful when aggregated** to the event scale rather than the grid scale.

4.14.1.3.9. Event-Scale Basin Summary

Table 4.14.1.3.9. Event Hydrological Summary

Metric	Total Rainfall	Mean Rainfall per timestep	Rainfall 95% CI	Total Surface Runoff	Mean Surface Runoff	Total Subsurface Runoff	Runoff Coefficient (SRO/TP)	Timesteps
Value	157.70 mm	0.597 mm	0.546 – 0.648 mm	19.54 mm	0.074 mm	21.16 mm	0.1239	264

Hydrological Interpretation

Roughly **12.4%** of rainfall became surface runoff, indicating a **moderate hydrological response**.
Subsurface runoff is comparable to surface runoff, showing **strong infiltration and delayed flow pathways**.
The rainfall CI is narrow at event scale, indicating **low temporal uncertainty**.

4.14.1.3.10. Sensitivity to Precipitation (±10%)

Table 4.14.1.3.10. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient during the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	TP −10%	TP +10%
RC	0.1239	0.1377	0.1126

Interpretation

RC varies between **0.113 and 0.138**, showing **moderate sensitivity** to rainfall uncertainty.
The hydrological response remains **largely proportional**, with no extreme amplification.

4.14.2. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.14.2. Chile from 10-16 in 2024 multi-hazard event showing storm intensity and flood hazard

A severe meteorological storm affected Chile between **10 and 16 June 2024**, impacting a broad latitudinal corridor from **Coquimbo and Valparaíso** in the north to **Los Lagos** in the south. This event was characterized by intense atmospheric forcing and was classified as severe weather.
Storm intensity was assessed using ERA5 near-surface wind components. **The meridional wind (10V@SFC)** ranged from **−17.714 to 9.857 m s⁻¹**, classified into five intensity classes. Strong northerly winds (**−17.714 to −10.145 m s⁻¹**) indicate the leading edge of a vigorous cold frontal system, while southerly values (**1.641–9.857 m s⁻¹**) reflect post-frontal flow. These extreme meridional wind values identify the primary destructive force of the storm.
Zonal wind (10U@SFC) values ranged from **−4.007 to 3.795 m s⁻¹**, with the highest class (**1.532–3.795 m s⁻¹**) indicating moderate west–east flow. The dominance of the meridional component confirms that north–south circulation was the principal driver of storm severity.

4.14.2.1. Associated Flooding During the Storm

The storm produced renewed precipitation, acting as a secondary flood hazard on already saturated catchments. Total precipitation values during this storm phase ranged from **0–0** to **0.005–0.009**, with the highest class identifying areas exposed to significant rainfall accumulation.
Surface runoff during the storm ranged from 0–0 to **0.002–0.004**. The highest runoff class confirms that additional rainfall exceeded infiltration capacity, generating renewed overland flow and exacerbating flood impacts in river basins and urban areas.

4.14.2.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The severe weather and associated secondary flooding affected approximately **26,820 people**, including **24,480 injured and 2,340 homeless**. Infrastructure damage was widespread, affecting housing, transportation systems, and public services across multiple regions. The event resulted in at least one reported fatality and contributed to significant economic losses.
The **2024-0398-CHL** event highlights the compound nature of severe storms in Chile, where intense wind forcing acts as the primary hazard and flooding emerges as a consequential secondary impact. The strong correspondence between

ERA5-derived wind, precipitation, and runoff indicators and observed impacts underscores the importance of integrated storm–flood risk management.

4.14.2.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

The storm-scale statistical evaluation was conducted using **204,792 spatial–temporal samples per variable**, covering the full spatial domain and the complete temporal duration of the event. Metrics include the mean, standard deviation (SD), coefficient of variation (CV = SD/μ), and 95% confidence intervals (CI95), providing a rigorous assessment of variability and statistical reliability.

4.14.2.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.14.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	204,792	0.469	0.903	1.925	0.465 – 0.473	Moderate–High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **1.93** indicates substantial spatial–temporal variability, consistent with **intense convective rainfall**.
The narrow CI reflects a **well-constrained mean**, supported by the large sample size.
Uncertainty level: Moderate–high physical variability; high statistical confidence.

4.14.2.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 4.14.2.3.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.053	0.177	3.322	0.053 – 0.054	High

Interpretation

CV > 3 indicates **pronounced hydrological variability**, reflecting strong spatial contrasts in runoff generation.
Despite high dispersion, the CI is narrow, confirming **statistical robustness**.
Uncertainty level: High.

4.14.2.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.14.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (mm)	Standard deviation (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.088	0.328	3.740	0.086 – 0.089	Very High

Interpretation

SSRO shows **very high dispersion** (CV ≈ 3.74), indicating heterogeneous infiltration and lateral flow processes.
This reflects **variable soil and slope conditions** across the basin.
Uncertainty level: Very high.

4.14.2.3.4. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.14.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind (10U) during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	0.517	2.263	4.377	0.507 – 0.527	Very High

Interpretation

Large SD relative to the mean indicates **strong directional fluctuations**, typical of dynamic storm systems.
Uncertainty level: Very high.

4.14.2.3.5. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.14.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind during the storm event

Parameter	Mean (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	-3.696	4.531	1.226	-3.716 – -3.676	Moderate

Interpretation

The negative mean indicates **persistent southward flow**, with moderate variability.
Uncertainty level: Moderate.

4.14.2.3.6. 10-m Wind Speed (Magnitude)

Table 4.14.2.3.6. Statistical summary of wind speed magnitude during the storm event

Parameter	Mean wind speed (m/s)	Standard deviation (m/s)	CV	95% CI (m/s)	Uncertainty Level
Value	4.982	3.842	0.771	4.966 – 4.999	Moderate

Interpretation

CV ≈ **0.77** indicates **moderate variability**, suggesting wind intensity is more stable than rainfall or runoff.
Uncertainty level: Moderate.

4.14.2.3.7. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.14.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean (m^3/m^3)	0.193	0.190	0.183	0.176
SD	0.191	0.190	0.183	0.176
CV	0.989	0.998	1.005	0.989
95% CI	0.192 – 0.194	0.189 – 0.191	0.182 – 0.183	0.176 – 0.178
Uncertainty Level	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Interpretation

CV values near 1 indicate **moderate spatial variability**, suggesting relatively consistent antecedent moisture conditions.
Tight CIs confirm **stable soil moisture fields**.

4.14.2.3.8. Runoff Coefficient (RC = SRO/TP)

Table 4.14.2.3.8. Statistical summary of runoff coefficient during the storm event

Parameter	Mean RC	SD	CV	95% CI	Uncertainty Level
Value	211,423	5.51×10^6	26.06	187,564 – 235,283	Extremely High

Interpretation

CV ≈ **26** indicates **extreme instability** at the grid scale, driven by very small precipitation denominators.
RC is therefore **not meaningful at the grid scale** and should be interpreted **only at the event scale**.

4.14.2.3.9. Event-Integrated Hydrometeorological Summary

Event totals and timestep-averaged values were derived from basin-mean time series spanning 168 time steps.

Table 4.14.2.3.9. Event Summary Metrics

Metric	Total Rainfall	Mean Rainfall per Timestep	Rainfall 95% CI	Total Surface Runoff	Total Subsurface Runoff	Mean Wind Speed (10m)	Wind Speed 95% CI	Maximum Wind Speed	Runoff Coefficient (SRO/TP)	Timesteps
Value	78.86 mm	0.469 mm	0.413 – 0.526 mm	8.97 mm	14.74 mm	4.98 m/s	4.73 – 5.24 m/s	8.51 m/s	0.1137	168

Hydrological Interpretation

The storm delivered **moderate cumulative rainfall** (~79 mm).
Surface runoff represented **11.4%** of precipitation, indicating **intermediate infiltration capacity** and a **non-extreme surface flow response**.
Subsurface runoff exceeded surface runoff, reflecting **strong infiltration and delayed hydrological contributions**.
Wind speeds averaged ~5 m/s with gusts >8.5 m/s, confirming a **combined wind–rain severe weather event**.

4.14.2.3.10. Sensitivity Analysis (±10% Precipitation)

Table 4.14.2.3.10. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event

Scenario	Base RC	TP −10%	TP +10%
RC	0.1137	0.1264	0.1034

Interpretation

A ±10% change in rainfall modifies RC by roughly **±0.01**, indicating **moderate hydrological sensitivity**.
The runoff response remains **largely proportional**, with no evidence of strong nonlinear amplification.

4.15. INDIA 2025

The June–July 2025 disaster in India represents a **classic compound monsoonal hazard**, where a severe meteorological storm intensified monsoonal moisture transport, triggering catastrophic flash flooding and widespread landslides. The consistency between ERA5-derived wind, precipitation, runoff, soil moisture, and snow variables and observed impacts confirms the robustness of the hazard interpretation.

4.15.1. Meteorological Storm Characteristics and Severity Classification




Figure 4.15.1. Western and Central India (Rajasthan, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh), 20–26 June 2025

The ERA5 near-surface wind analysis confirms the presence of a strong meteorological storm system affecting western and central India, particularly Rajasthan, Gujarat, and Madhya Pradesh, during **20–26 June 2025**.
Zonal wind (10U@SFC) values reached the highest classified intensity range of **7.403–15.414 m s⁻¹**, indicating strong east–west atmospheric forcing**. Meridional wind (10V@SFC)** values similarly reached **4.724–10.998 m s⁻¹**, reflecting robust north–south moisture transport**.** The spatial coherence of these high-wind classes confirms a well-organized storm circulation capable of sustaining large-scale moisture advection inland.
These wind intensities fall within the highest hazard class and represent conditions conducive to severe storm impacts, including enhanced precipitation efficiency and dynamic forcing of monsoonal systems.

4.15.1.1. Associated Flood Trigger

Storm-related precipitation, which illustrates ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** for the secondary flood event associated with the storm. Precipitation values reached **0.01–0.034 m**, placing large areas within the highest precipitation class.
This rainfall occurred over regions already experiencing monsoonal conditions, resulting in rapid runoff generation. Corresponding runoff values reached **0.004–0.005 m**, confirming that storm-induced rainfall directly contributed to secondary flooding. The alignment between strong wind fields and elevated precipitation demonstrates that the storm acted as a critical atmospheric driver amplifying hydrological stress.

4.15.1.2. Associated Landslide During the Storm

The surface soil moisture layer (SWVL1) exhibits values ranging from **−0.004 to 0.525 m³ m⁻³**, classified into five distinct saturation classes. The lowest class (**−0.004–0.083 m³ m⁻³**) represents relatively dry surface conditions and is limited to isolated arid or well-drained regions. Slightly elevated moisture levels (**0.084–0.228 m³ m⁻³**) indicate early wetting of the soil surface, where infiltration capacity is still largely preserved.
Moderate saturation conditions (**0.229–0.355 m³ m⁻³**) dominate extensive portions of central India, reflecting soils approaching field capacity. These conditions significantly reduce infiltration rates and mark the transition toward runoff-dominated hydrological behavior. Higher surface moisture values (**0.356–0.442 m³ m⁻³**) indicate near-saturated soils, where additional rainfall is rapidly converted into surface runoff. The highest SWVL1 class (**0.443–0.525 m³ m⁻³**)

identifies areas of extreme surface saturation, where pore spaces are almost entirely filled with water. In these zones, surface soils effectively lose structural strength, promoting overland flow, erosion, and shallow slope failures.
The spatial dominance of the upper SWVL1 classes across large regions confirms that surface soils were already critically wet before peak rainfall occurred, creating ideal conditions for rapid flood initiation and slope destabilization.
The shallow subsurface soil moisture layer (SWVL2) reveals even more critical conditions, with values ranging from **−0.000015 to 0.527 m^3 m^{-3}**. The lowest moisture class (**−0.000015–0.076 m^3 m^{-3}**) is confined to limited dry zones and plays a negligible role in hazard development. Slightly wetter conditions (**0.076–0.215 m^3 m^{-3}**) indicate partial subsurface wetting but still allow some vertical drainage.
Moderate subsurface saturation (**0.215–0.335 m^3 m^{-3}**) is widespread and reflects soils approaching full storage capacity at depth. Higher classes (**0.335–0.432 m^3 m^{-3}**) indicate near-complete saturation of the shallow root zone, where vertical percolation becomes highly restricted. The highest SWVL2 class (**0.432–0.527 m^3 m^{-3}**) marks zones of extreme subsurface saturation, where pore-water pressure is elevated, and effective stress within the soil matrix is substantially reduced.
These conditions are particularly critical from a geotechnical perspective. When SWVL2 values exceed approximately **0.43 m^3 m^{-3}**, soils approach their porosity limit, and shear strength declines sharply. Under such conditions, additional rainfall no longer infiltrates but instead increases hydraulic pressure along potential slip surfaces, creating ideal conditions for deep-seated landslides and debris flows.
The combined SWVL1 and SWVL2 patterns demonstrate that both surface and subsurface soils across much of the affected region were already saturated prior to and during peak monsoonal rainfall. This vertical continuity of saturation indicates that infiltration capacity was effectively exhausted throughout the soil profile. As a result, precipitation was rapidly transformed into surface runoff, intensifying flooding, while elevated pore-water pressure at depth critically destabilized slopes.
The strong spatial overlap between the highest soil moisture classes, extreme precipitation zones, and observed flood and landslide impacts confirms soil saturation as a key preconditioning factor in the June–July 2025 disaster. Rather than precipitation intensity alone, it was the interaction between prolonged moisture accumulation, full soil saturation, and subsequent intense rainfall that drove the catastrophic hydrological and geomorphological response observed during this event.

4.15.1.3. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts (Storm Event)

The severe meteorological event and associated secondary hazards, including flooding and landslides, affected about 33,583 individuals across Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. They were affected by the extreme weather event and its secondary dangers, such as flooding and landslides. The disaster killed 27 people and hurt one person. It also affected the lives of 33,584 people who had to move or lost their jobs. The storm covered a large area, so it probably caused a lot of damage to infrastructure, which affected transportation and housing in the region. The event shows how likely it is for many hazards to happen at the same time in India, where extreme weather often causes a chain reaction of hydrological and geological failures.

4.15.1.4. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2025 severe weather event in India was analyzed using **783,048 spatial–temporal samples**, covering precipitation, zonal and meridional wind components, derived 10-m wind speed magnitude, and volumetric soil moisture layers (swvl1–swvl4). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI), ensuring robust characterization of atmospheric and hydrological conditions.

4.15.1.4.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.15.1.4.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	783,048	0.400	1.033	2.58	0.398 – 0.403	67.25 mm	168

Interpretation

The event accumulated **67.25 mm of rainfall across 168 timesteps**.
The CV (2.58) indicates **substantial spatiotemporal variability**, consistent with convective storm activity.
Despite this variability, the extremely narrow CI reflects **very high statistical confidence** due to the large sample size.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; negligible statistical uncertainty.

4.15.1.4.2. Zonal Wind (10U)

Table 4.15.1.4.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean	Std	CV	95% CI	Max
Values m/s	1.952	3.699	1.9	1.944 – 1.960	3.015

4.15.1.4.3. Meridional Wind (10V)

Table 4.15.1.4.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event

Parameter	Mean	Std	CV	95% CI	Max
Values m/s	1.694	1.947	1.15	1.689 –1.698	2.265

4.15.1.4.4. Wind Speed Magnitude (10 m)

Table 4.15.1.4.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event

Parameter	Mean	Std	CV	95% CI	Max
Values m/s	3.997	2.859	0.72	3.991 – 4.003	5.275

Interpretation

Both the 10U and 10V wind components show high relative variability (CV > 1), which is characteristic of dynamically unstable atmospheric conditions. In contrast, the derived wind-speed magnitude exhibits lower variability (CV ≈ 0.72), reflecting the partial cancellation of directional fluctuations when the vector components are combined into a scalar value. The mean wind speed of roughly 4.0 m/s, together with peak values exceeding 5.2 m/s, indicates moderate-to-strong boundary-layer forcing consistent with severe convective activity. Overall, the system displays high directional variability but only moderate variability in wind magnitude, while the statistical confidence of the estimates remains very high due to the large sample size.

4.15.1.4.5. Soil Moisture Conditions

Table 4.15.1.4.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.280	0.278	0.243	0.268
CV	0.61	0.55	0.52	0.46

Interpretation

Soil moisture values indicate **moderate antecedent wetness**, but remain well below saturation thresholds (~0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$).

The relatively low CV values (0.46–0.61) suggest **stable soil moisture distribution** compared to precipitation and wind variability.

This confirms that the event was **primarily atmospheric in nature rather than hydrologically amplified**.

4.15.2. Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.15.2. Critical Hydro-Geological Disaster: June–July Event (Himachal Pradesh & Uttarakhand)

The primary hydrological disaster was driven by extreme monsoonal precipitation affecting Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand. ERA5 total precipitation for the main flood event **(June and July).**
During June, precipitation values reached the highest class of **0.017–0.032 m,** indicating extreme rainfall accumulation over mountainous catchments. In July, precipitation remained elevated, reaching **0.009–0.019 m,** demonstrating sustained monsoonal forcing.
Lower precipitation classes **(≤0.001 m)** correspond to minimal hydrological response, while intermediate classes **(0.004–0.007 m)** indicate increasing runoff generation. The dominance of the highest precipitation classes confirms that flooding was the primary hazard during this event.
Surface runoff patterns for the flood event are shown in **(June and July)**. Runoff values during June reached extreme levels of **0.013–0.024 m**, while July runoff remained critically high at **0.008–0.015 m**.
These values indicate that rainfall intensity exceeded infiltration capacity across much of the affected terrain. The spatial coincidence of high runoff with extreme precipitation confirms rapid overland flow, channel overtopping, and destructive flash flood dynamics.
The flood event affected **more than 80,000 people**, underscoring the magnitude of hydrological disruption.

4.15.2.1. Associated Hazard: Landslides and Wet Mass Movement

Landslide susceptibility was driven by extreme soil saturation, illustrated by ERA5 soil moisture variables. **SWVL1** for June and July respectively, while **SWVL2** for the same periods.
Surface soil moisture (**SWVL1**) reached **0.445–0.522 m³/m³** in June and **0.41–0.524 m³/m³** in July. Subsurface moisture (**SWVL2**) reached **0.442–0.521 m³/m³**, indicating near-complete saturation of soil profiles. These values reflect critically unstable slope conditions.

4.15.2.2. Associated Snowfall and Snowmelt Contributions

Additional hydrological loading is evident in snow-related variables. Snowfall for July landslide conditions, with values reaching **0.003–0.004 m**, while June snowmelt reaching **0.002 m**.
The interaction of rain-on-snow processes, snowmelt input, and saturated soils significantly reduced slope stability. This compound triggering mechanism played a key role in the widespread landslides observed during the event.

4.15.2.3. Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts

Flash floods in Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand were caused by heavy monsoon rainfall and landslides. They triggered a massive social disaster that affected 80,000 people. The event resulted in a significant number of deaths: 140 people died and 74 sustained injuries. Heavy rain and flooding in the Himalayas produced many problems for local infrastructure. It may have shut off mountain settlements and damaged critical transportation networks. The incident highlights how

quickly monsoonal changes can influence northern alpine areas. Flash floods are the main reason for many deaths and moving many people.

4.15.2.4. Statistical and Uncertainty Assessment

A total of **n = 214,200** grid–time observations were analyzed for the June and July 2025 flash flood events in northern India. The statistical assessment includes precipitation (TP), surface runoff (SRO), subsurface runoff (SSRO), soil moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4), wind components (U10, V10), and derived runoff coefficient (RC = SRO/TP). Uncertainty was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.15.2.4.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.15.2.4.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall (mm)	Timesteps
June 2025	94,248	0.393	1.216	3.09	0.385 – 0.401	103.79	264
July 2025	119,952	0.165	0.613	3.71	0.162 – 0.169	55.60	336
Combined	214,200	—	—	Very High	Narrow	**159.39**	600

Interpretation

The combined sequence produced **≈159 mm of rainfall over 600 timesteps**. June contributed ~65% of total rainfall, while July sustained hydrological stress with prolonged but weaker precipitation. Both events show **very high variability** typical of convective–orographic rainfall, yet confidence intervals remain narrow due to large sample sizes.
Uncertainty level: Very high physical variability with very high statistical confidence.

4.15.2.4.2. Surface and Subsurface Runoff

Table 4.15.2.4.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Total surface runoff	Subsurface runoff	Runoff Coefficient
June 2025	0.150	39.70	6.08	0.382
July 2025	0.0613	20.59	5.24	0.370
Combined	—	**60.29 mm**	**11.32 mm**	**≈0.378**

Interpretation

Both events converted ~37–38% of rainfall into surface runoff, confirming **threshold exceedance and rapid overland flow**. June's higher rainfall volume produced stronger hydrological amplification, while July's runoff efficiency remained comparable.

4.15.2.4.3. Soil Moisture (SWVL1–SWVL4)

Table 4.15.2.4.3. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event

Layer	SWVL1	SWVL2	SWVL3	SWVL4
June Mean (m^3/m^3)	0.246	0.294	0.300	0.327
July Mean (m^3/m^3)	0.230	0.282	0.307	0.330
Combined Profile	Elevated shallow	Consistently wet	Stable mid-depth	Deep saturation

Interpretation

Soil moisture remained elevated across both months, with deeper layers stabilizing near 0.33 m^3/m^3. This continuity indicates **cumulative saturation effects**, reducing infiltration and enhancing runoff efficiency.

4.15.2.4.4. Wind Forcing

Table 4.15.2.4.4. Wind forcing statistics for June–July 2025

Variable	10U (m/s)	10V (m/s)	Wind speed
June 2025	0.065 (CV 21.9)	0.463 (CV 2.09)	1.51 (CV 0.63)
July 2025	0.218 (CV 6.42)	0.155 (CV 8.16)	1.61 (CV 0.63)
Combined	Highly variable	Moderate	~1.56 m/s

Interpretation

Wind forcing remained **moderate**, with variability expected for vector components. Both events were **hydrologically dominated rather than wind-driven**.

4.16. INDIA 2020

4.16.1 Flood Impact Based on Total Precipitation and Surface Runoff




Figure 4.16.1. Precipitation and surface runoff showing monsoon intensity and hazard response

The ERA5 **total precipitation (TP@SFC)** analysis indicates that the **2020 Monsoon season (June–August)** produced extreme and prolonged rainfall across the Indian subcontinent. The primary hazard was a massive hydrological event that **affected 13 states**, with the most severe impacts concentrated in Assam, Bihar, Maharashtra, and Kerala. Total precipitation values were classified into five categories, ranging from **0–0 to 0.005–0.008 m**, and visualized using a white-to-deep blue color scale, where darker shades represent increasing flood severity.

Areas within the lower precipitation classes **(0–0.002 m)** experienced typical monsoonal variability with manageable hydrological conditions. However, the analysis highlights a progressive increase in intensity. Moderate precipitation values, classified around the mid-range of **0.002–0.002 m**, correspond to sustained rainfall that saturated catchment areas and initiated rising river levels.

The highest precipitation class, represented by the deepest blue color and corresponding to values between **0.005 and 0.008 m**, identifies areas exposed to hyper-intense rainfall. These values mark the most critically impacted zones, particularly within the Brahmaputra and Ganges basins. This sustained extreme precipitation overwhelmed natural drainage systems, leading to catastrophic river overflows and widespread inundation. The spatial concentration of these upper precipitation classes confirms that the monsoon intensity was the primary driver of this event, directly correlating with reported large-scale flooding.

The extreme precipitation triggered a large-scale hydrological response, analyzed using ERA5 **Surface Runoff (SRO)** data. Surface runoff values consistently reached the highest classification of **0.003–0.004 m.**

This level of runoff indicates that vast rural and urban landscapes exceeded their infiltration capacity. The soil's inability to absorb excess water directly contributed to flash floods and the rapid accumulation of water in low-lying areas. This hydrological response resulted in the displacement of populations and extensive damage to agricultural sectors.

4.16.1.1. Associated Landslide During the Flood

ERA5 surface soil moisture (SWVL1@SFC) gives important proof of hydrological saturation that happened before the flood and worsened it. The SWVL1 values were between −0.000015 and 0.537017 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ and were divided into five groups: −0.000015–0.084225 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, 0.084226–0.231646 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, 0.231647–0.349582 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, 0.349583–0.442246 $m^3\ m^{-3}$, and 0.442247–0.537017 $m^3\ m^{-3}$. The lowest class shows that the soil is relatively dry and can hold a lot of water. The second class shows that the soil is getting wetter and the infiltration rate is going down. The third class shows soils that are getting close to field capacity, where runoff starts to take over. The fourth class indicates nearly saturated conditions, significantly hindering infiltration. The highest class (0.442247–0.537017 $m^3\ m^{-3}$) shows that the soil is very saturated, meaning that the pore spaces are almost completely filled with water. In these conditions, more rain quickly turns into surface runoff instead of being soaked up. The common occurrence of the upper SWVL1 classes in northern, eastern, and

northeastern India indicates that the soils were already saturated before the peak monsoonal rainfall. This made runoff more efficient, sped up the spread of the flood, and made the overall severity of the flood event worse.

4.16.1.2. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

The massive scale of the flooding resulted in catastrophic socioeconomic and infrastructural impacts across the affected regions. Reported losses for this specific event include approximately **USD 7.5 billion** in total damages. The flooding affected over 1.3 million people, resulting in widespread displacement and the destruction of homes and critical infrastructure. The human cost was profound, with a total of **1,922** deaths attributed to the flooding and associated incidents during the season.

4.16.1.3. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The 2020 flood event in India was analyzed using **15,765,816 spatial–temporal samples**, ensuring **very high statistical robustness**.

4.16.1.3.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.16.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	15,765,816	0.403	0.924	2.29	0.402 – 0.403	589.56 mm	1,464

Interpretation

The flood event accumulated **589.6 mm of rainfall**, reflecting prolonged monsoonal forcing.
The CV (2.29) indicates **strong spatial–temporal variability**, typical of monsoon systems.
The extremely narrow CI demonstrates **negligible statistical uncertainty**.
Uncertainty level: High physical variability; extremely low statistical uncertainty.

4.16.1.3.2. Surface Runoff (SRO)

Table 3.15.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Mean runoff (mm)	Total runoff (mm)	95% CI (mm)
Value	0.0577	84.49	0.0561 – 0.0593

4.16.1.3.3. Subsurface Runoff (SSRO)

Table 4.16.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event

Parameter	Total subsurface runoff
Value	58.50 mm

Runoff Coefficient

RC=0.143

Approximately **14.3% of rainfall was converted into surface runoff**, indicating **moderate hydrological efficiency**.

4.16.1.3.4. Sensitivity Analysis (TP ±10%)

Table 4.16.1.3.4. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event

Scenario	Base RC	RC if TP −10%	RC if TP +10%
RC Value	0.143	0.159	0.130

Interpretation

The runoff coefficient shows **moderate nonlinear sensitivity** to precipitation perturbations.

4.16.2 Soil Saturation and Mass Movement (Wet)




Figure 4.16.2. Soil Saturation & Mass Movement Analysis: 7 August 2020 Idukki Landslide, Kerala

The extreme monsoonal rainfall acted as a direct mechanical trigger for a severe secondary mass movement event—specifically, the landslide in the Idukki district of Kerala on August 7, 2020. Volumetric Soil Water Layer (VSWL) data is used to look at this event. It shows important saturation levels in both the surface and subsurface layers.
Analysis of the topsoil layer **(VSWL1, 0–7 cm)** reveals extreme moisture levels, classified within the **0.460–0.499 m³/m³** range. This identifies near-complete surface saturation, which promoted rapid debris mobilization on the steep slopes of the Western Ghats. Lower classes **(0.384–0.409 m³/m³)** indicate wet but stable conditions, while the mid-range values **(0.423–0.437 m³/m³)** reflect increasing instability. The highest values confirm that the surface soil had lost its cohesive structure due to excessive water intake.
The subsoil layer **(VSWL2, 7–28 cm)** showed even more critical saturation, reaching values of **0.468–0.499 m³/m³**. This deep saturation indicates that the water had penetrated well below the surface, creating a failure plane deep within the soil profile. The combination of extreme surface and deep soil saturation drastically reduced the shear strength of the terrain. Under these conditions, the added weight of the heavy rains caused the soil to transition into a high-velocity mudslide.

4.16.2.1. Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Impacts

This specific landslide event resulted in at least **70 fatalities**, marking it as one of the deadliest localized mass movement events during the **2020 monsoon season**. The destruction was concentrated in the Pettimudi area of Idukki, where the landslide buried workers' settlements, highlighting the extreme vulnerability of communities residing in high-risk zones of the Western Ghats. The event underscores the lethality of compound hazards where hydrological extremes trigger geological failures.

4.16.2.2. Statistical and Uncertainty Evaluation

The Idukki landslide event was analyzed using **4,056 spatial–temporal samples**, focusing on precipitation and upper soil moisture layers (swvl1, swvl2). Variability was quantified using the standard deviation (σ), coefficient of variation (CV), and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

4.16.2.2.1. Precipitation (TP)

Table 4.16.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the landslide event

Parameter	n	Mean rainfall (mm)	Std (mm)	CV	95% CI (mm)	Total rainfall	Timesteps
Value	4,056	1.284	1.123	0.875	1.249 – 1.318	30.81 mm	24

Interpretation

The event produced **30.8 mm of rainfall across 24 timesteps**, reflecting intense short-duration precipitation.

The CV (0.87) indicates **moderate variability**, while the relatively narrow CI confirms **acceptable statistical reliability** despite the modest sample size.
Uncertainty level: Moderate variability; moderate statistical confidence.

4.16.2.2.2. Soil Moisture Conditions

Table 4.16.2.2.2. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the landslide event

Variable	SWVL1	SWVL2
Mean ($m^3\ m^{-3}$)	0.204	0.186
CV	1.04	1.10
95% CI	0.197 – 0.210	0.180 – 0.193

Interpretation
Soil moisture values were **elevated but not fully saturated**.
In steep terrain such as Idukki, even moderate saturation combined with intense rainfall can significantly reduce slope stability.
High CV values reflect **spatial heterogeneity in soil wetness**.
Hydrological implication: Rainfall intensity acted as the primary trigger, with antecedent soil moisture enhancing slope failure susceptibility.

Concluding Statement—Landslide
The Idukki 2020 landslide was driven by **short-duration, high-intensity rainfall acting on moderately moist soils**.
Although soil saturation did not reach extreme thresholds, rapid infiltration and localized instability likely initiated debris movement.
Statistical uncertainty is moderate but sufficient for hazard reconstruction.

5. Conclusion

This thesis shows that compound hydro-meteorological disasters don't happen because of single extreme weather or water events. They occur due to the nonlinear interplay of precipitation, runoff generation, soil saturation, and low-level wind dynamics. The study demonstrates that the intensity of floods, landslides, and storm-related hazards is influenced by the simultaneous interaction of various physical processes at the land-atmosphere interface, as evidenced by the integration of ERA5 reanalysis with EM-DAT disaster records from ten significant events occurring between 2020 and 2024. In all of the case studies, we could not explain the observed effects using rainfall alone. Instead, we measured runoff efficiency using event-scale runoff coefficients, and it turned out to be the most important factor in how severe a flood would be. When the RC values were high (0.75–0.86), the infiltration capacity was almost completely exceeded, and extra rain quickly turned into overland flow. On the other hand, low-RC systems like Cuba showed that even heavy rain can cause only a small amount of flooding when the soil is dry and the infiltration capacity is still high. These results confirm that the process of generating floods is fundamentally driven by thresholds that are affected by the interaction of rainfall intensity, soil storage, and basin hydrodynamics. The analysis also shows how important soil saturation and moisture below the surface are in starting landslides. Several occurrences demonstrated that volumetric soil water content nearing 0.46–0.50 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ is indicative of diminished effective stress and increased slope instability. This threshold behavior is in line with geotechnical theory and shows why soil moisture monitoring should be part of operational landslide early warning systems. Wind-field diagnostics show that low-level convergence, horizontal wind shear, and sustained near-surface flow all make it much easier for moisture to move and for rain to fall. In multiple storm-flood incidents, the spatial correlation of significant 10U/10V anomalies with elevated precipitation and runoff categories validated that atmospheric circulation patterns directly influence hydrological responses. This connection between wind forcing and rainfall organization is what makes compound storm systems unique and what makes hazards worse. One of the most important things about this thesis is that it uses a consistent spatial classification and statistical uncertainty assessment across different climatic and geomorphological settings. Even though the terrain, climate, and storm type are completely unique in each case study, they all show the same physical processes: Runoff amplification as the primary factor influencing flood severity Soil moisture levels that lead to landslides Wind-driven moisture convergence as a trigger for heavy rain Nonlinear interactions that amplify socioeconomic effects beyond the consequences of individual hazards. The statistical analyses, utilizing hundreds of thousands of spatial-temporal samples per event, validate that even highly variable hydrological processes can produce reliable mean estimates and constrained confidence intervals when assessed at an adequate scale. Sensitivity tests demonstrate that certain systems respond proportionally to rainfall perturbations, whereas others display abrupt nonlinear transitions upon exceeding hydrological thresholds. Overall, the results of this thesis improve our scientific understanding of compound hydro-meteorological hazards by showing that the severity of a disaster is determined by the interaction of atmospheric forcing and land-surface saturation states, rather than by any one variable on its own. This comprehensive viewpoint immediately affects early-warning systems, risk modeling, and climate-resilience planning. Adding runoff efficiency, previous soil moisture, and wind-driven moisture transport to operational frameworks will make it much easier to predict and lessen the effects of hydro-climatic extremes that happen more often and with more force.

6. References

https://www.emdat.be/

https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/datasets/reanalysis-era5-single-levels?tab=download

7. Appendices

https://github.com/jabjabhaider-ui/database-files1#database-files1

List of Figures

Figure 4.1.1. Italy: Emilia-Romagna Catastrophic Flood & Associated Landslides (MAY 2-3, 2023) 14
Figure 4.1.2. Italy: Emilia-Romagna Catastrophic Flood & Associated Landslides (May 16-17, 2023) 17
Figure 4.2.1. Analysis of Southern Manitoba Flood, 21-22 April 2022 (TP@SFC & RO@SFC) 20
Figure 4.2.2. Compound Hydro-Meteorological Disaster Central Canada (Manitoba & Ontario), 21-25 April 2022 23
Figure 4.3.1. Tropical Cyclone (Storm), Near-Surface Zonal Wind (10U@SFC & 10V@SFC) 26
Figure 4.3.2. Cuba, June 2022: Flood Analysis & Extreme Precipitation 28
Figure 4.4.1. Costa rica 2024 Tropical Cyclone (storm) (10U@SFC & 10V@SFC) 31
Figure 4.4.2. Costa Rica 2024 Flood: Multi-Variable Analysis of Precipitation & Runoff 33
Figure 4.5.1. France 2023, Extra-tropical Storm, Near-Surface Zonal Wind 36
Figure 4.5.2. France 2023 Flood: Multi-Variable Analysis of Precipitation & Runoff 38
Figure 4.6.1. Republic of Korea 2020: Tropical cyclone, HAGUPIT, North Chungchenog Province 40
Figure 4.6.2. Republic of Korea August 2020 Compound Disaster: Flood & Landslide Analysis 42
Figure 4.7.1. Southern Brazil 2023: Severe Meteorological Storm & Associated Flood Hazard Event 45
Figure 4.7.2. Brazil 2023: Rio Grande do Sul Flood Event (After 13 November) 47
Figure 4.8.1. Peru 2020: Flash Flood & Mudslide Event (February 2020): Integrated visual panel-multi-hazard 50
Figure 4.8.2. Peru 2020: Extreme Soil Saturation & Mudslide Event (23 Feb 2020) 53
Figure 4.9.1. Uruguay 2020 Flash Flood & Secondary Storm Event (22–24 June) 56
Figure 4.9.2. Uruguay 2020 (22–26 June) Severe Storm and Flooding 59
Figure 4.10.1. Srilanka (2021) Precipitation and Surface Runoff 62
Figure 4.10.2. Sri Lanka 2021 Storm Analysis: May 16–17 & 20–21 Event 65
Figure 4.12.1. Northern China Flash Flood Event: 2–7 October 2021 (Shanxi & Hebei) (Multi-Hazard) 72
Figure 4.12.2. Severe Weather Event: Shaanxi & Shanxi, China (2–5 October 2021) 75
Figure 4.13.2. USA Southwest Compound Flood & Landslide Event: 16–21 July 2021 81
Figure 4.13.3. Primary Driver - Severe Weather Storm (8–11 July 2021) 84
Figure 4.14.1. Chile 2024 Flood Event: 4–14 June (Multi-Hazard) 87
Figure 4.14.2. Chile from 10-16 in 2024 multi-hazard event showing storm intensity and flood hazard 90
Figure 4.15.1. Western and Central India (Rajasthan, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh), 20–26 June 2025 93
Figure 4.15.2. Critical Hydro-Geological Disaster: June–July Event (Himachal Pradesh & Uttarakhand) 96
Figure 4.16.1. Precipitation and surface runoff showing monsoon intensity and hazard response 98
Figure 4.16.2. Soil Saturation & Mass Movement Analysis: 7 August 2020 Idukki Landslide, Kerala 100

List of Tables

Table 4.1.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 16
Table 4.1.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 16
Table4.1.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 16
Table 4.1.1.3.4. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 16
Table 4.1.1.3.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event 16
Table 3.1.1.3.6. Event-scale runoff coefficient 16
Table 4.1.1.3.7. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient 17
Table 4.1.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 19
Table 4.1.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 19
Table 4.1.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 19
Table 4.1.2.3.4. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 19
Table 4.1.2.3.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event 19
Table 4.1.2.3.6. Event-scale runoff coefficient 20
Table 4.1.2.3.7. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient 20
Table 4.2.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 21
Table 4.2.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 21
Table 4.2.1.2.3. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event 22
Table 4.2.1.2.4. Event Summary Metrics 22
Table 4.2.1.2.5. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event 22
Table 4.2.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event 24
Table 4.2.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event 24
Table 4.2.2.3.3. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event 24
Table 4.2.2.3.4. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event 24
Table 4.2.2.3.5. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event 25
Table 4.2.2.3.6. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the storm event 25
Table 4.2.2.4. Event Summary Statistics 25
Table 4.2.2.5. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event 25
Table 4.3.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event 27
Table 4.3.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event 27
Table 4.3.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event 27
Table 4.3.1.2.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event 28
Table 4.3.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 29
Table 4.3.2.2.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the flood event 30
Table 4.3.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event 30
Table 4.3.2.2.4. Statistical summary of soil moisture (swvl1) during the flood event 30
Table 4.3.2.2.5. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event 30
Table 4.3.2.2.6. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event 30
Table 4.4.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event 32
Table 4.4.1.2.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event 32
Table 4.4.1.2.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event 32
Table 4.4.1.2.3. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event 32
Table 4.4.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 34
Table 4.4.2.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 34
Table 4.4.2.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 35
Table 4.4.2.2.4. Soil Moisture Uncertainty Metrics 35
Table 4.4.2.2.5. Statistical summary of the runoff coefficient during the flood event 35
Table 4.4.2.2.6. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event 35
Table 4.4.2.2.7. Flood Event Data Reliability Summary 35
Table 4.12.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the event 73
Table 4.12.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the event 73
Table 4.12.1.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the event 73
Table 4.12.1.2.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) 73
Table 4.12.1.2.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) 74
Table 4.12.1.2.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude 74
Table 4.12.1.2.7. Event-scale runoff coefficient 74
Table 4.12.1.2.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient 74

Table 4.13.1.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the wildfire event 79
Table 4.13.1.2.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the wildfire event 79
Table 4.13.1.2.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.1.2.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.1.2.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.1.2.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.1.2.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.1.2.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the wildfire event 80
Table 4.13.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 82
Table 4.13.2.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 82
Table 4.13.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event 83
Table 4.13.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event 83
Table 3.13.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event 83
Table 3.13.2.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event 83
Table 3.13.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event 83
Table 3.13.2.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event 83
Table 4.13.3.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event 85
Table 4.13.3.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.6. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event 86
Table 4.13.3.3.8. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient during the storm event 87
Table 4.14.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 88
Table 4.14.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 88
Table 4.14.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event 88
Table 4.14.1.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event 88
Table 4.14.1.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind (10V) during the flood event 89
Table 4.14.1.3.6. Statistical summary of wind speed magnitude during the flood event 89
Table 4.14.1.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event 89
Table 4.14.1.3.8. Statistical summary of runoff coefficient during the flood event 89
Table 4.14.1.3.9. Event Hydrological Summary 89
Table 4.14.1.3.10. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient during the flood event 90
Table 4.14.2.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the storm event 91
Table 4.14.2.3.2. Statistical summary of surface runoff during the storm event 91
Table 4.14.2.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the storm event 91
Table 4.14.2.3.4. Statistical summary of zonal wind (10U) during the storm event 91
Table 4.14.2.3.5. Statistical summary of meridional wind during the storm event 91
Table 4.14.2.3.6. Statistical summary of wind speed magnitude during the storm event 92
Table 4.14.2.3.7. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event 92
Table 4.14.2.3.8. Statistical summary of runoff coefficient during the storm event 92
Table 4.14.2.3.9. Event Summary Metrics 92
Table 4.14.2.3.10. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the storm event 92
Table 4.15.1.4.2. Statistical summary of zonal wind component (10U) during the flood event 95
Table 4.15.1.4.3. Statistical summary of meridional wind component (10V) during the flood event 95
Table 4.15.1.4.4. Statistical summary of 10 m wind speed magnitude during the flood event 95
Table 4.15.1.4.5. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the storm event 95
Table 4.15.2.4.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 97
Table 4.15.2.4.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 97
Table 4.15.2.4.3. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the flood event 97
Table 4.15.2.4.4. Wind forcing statistics for June–July 2025 97
Table 4.16.1.3.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the flood event 99
Table 3.15.1.3.2. Statistical summary of total runoff during the flood event 99

Table 4.16.1.3.3. Statistical summary of subsurface runoff during the flood event 99
Table 4.16.1.3.4. Sensitivity analysis of the runoff coefficient for the flood event 99
Table 4.16.2.2.1. Statistical summary of precipitation during the landslide event 100
Table 4.16.2.2.2. Statistical summary of soil moisture layers during the landslide event 101