

Evolving Approaches to Understanding Natural Hazards

Evolving Approaches to Understanding Natural Hazards

Edited by

Graham A. Tobin and Burrell E. Montz

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Evolving Approaches to Understanding Natural Hazards

Edited by Graham A. Tobin and Burrell E. Montz

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Graham A. Tobin, Burrell E. Montz and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7609-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7609-4

CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	xi
List of Tables.....	xv
Acknowledgments	xviii
Chapter One.....	1
Natural Hazards: Evolving Approaches <i>Burrell E. Montz and Graham A. Tobin</i>	
Part I: Risk and Vulnerability	
Introductory Comments.....	8
<i>Graham A. Tobin and Burrell E. Montz</i>	
Chapter Two	11
The Magnitude, Frequency and Spatial Distribution of Tornadoes in Texas: An Assessment of Tornado Risk <i>Kevin R. Mulligan, Lucia S. Barbato and Stephen Weinbeck</i>	
Chapter Three	23
Disaster Warnings in San Marcos, Texas: Communicating in Ethnically Diverse Places <i>Carolyn E. Springer and R. Denise Blanchard Boehm</i>	
Chapter Four.....	36
Hazardousness of the Tampa Bay Region: Evaluating Physical Risk and Socio-Economic Vulnerability <i>Burrell E. Montz and Graham A. Tobin</i>	
Chapter Five	47
Classifying Heat Stress Events in the Central United States <i>Erik H. Bowles</i>	

Chapter Six	57
Vulnerability to Flooding in Columbia County, PA: The Role of Perception and Experience among the Elderly <i>Jennifer Webb</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	68
Framing Flood Risk: Comparing Perceptions of the “100 Year Flood” and Two Alternate Descriptions <i>Heather M. Bell</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	82
International Students Vulnerability to Emergency Events: Does Tenure of Residence Make a Difference? <i>Xueqin (Elaine) He</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	96
Chronic Hazard: Weighing the Risk against the Effects of Emergency Evacuation from Popocatepetl, Mexico <i>Graham A. Tobin, Linda M. Whiteford, Eric C. Jones and Arthur D. Murphy</i>	
Chapter Ten	110
Assessing the Impact of Variable Weighting Strategies on the Spatial Pattern of Hazard Vulnerability <i>Lyndsey E. Abel and James K. Lein</i>	
Chapter Eleven	124
Assessing Vulnerability to Hurricanes in Harris County, Texas <i>Chunling Liu and Gang Gong</i>	
Chapter Twelve	137
Refining the Spatial Prediction of Frequency and Probability of Hurricane Strikes in South Carolina <i>Shuang Kang Wu and Shou Lu</i>	
Part II: Technology	
Introductory Comments.....	154
<i>Burrell E. Montz and Graham A. Tobin</i>	

Chapter Thirteen	157
Drought Assessment through Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer Satellite Data <i>Stephen J. Walsh</i>	
Chapter Fourteen	169
Graphic Narratives for Emergency Mapping <i>Mark Monmonier</i>	
Chapter Fifteen	178
The Application of Remote Sensing and GIS for Mapping Flood Prone Agricultural Land <i>Randall S. Pearson and Stephen A. Kay</i>	
Chapter Sixteen	189
Mapping Landslide Susceptibility: A Travis County, Texas, Case Study <i>David J. Wachal</i>	
Chapter Seventeen	204
The Hazardousness of Place: Risk from Multiple Natural Hazards <i>Burrell E. Montz</i>	
Chapter Eighteen	217
Monitoring Weather Hazards on Rural Roads Using Remote Sensing and GIS <i>Richard P. Watson, Karl K. Benedict and Theresa R. Watson (Kuntz)</i>	
Chapter Nineteen	230
The Use of GIS, Remote Sensing and Virtual Reality in Flood Hazard Modeling, Assessment and Visualization <i>Shunfu Hu</i>	
Chapter Twenty	240
Sinkhole Mapping in Pinellas County, Florida: Problems and Solutions <i>Robert Brinkmann, Don L. Seale, Kelly Wilson and H. Len Vacher</i>	
Chapter Twenty-One	252
A GIS-Based Approach to Analyzing Warning Siren Networks: An Analysis of Riley and Wabaunsee Counties, Kansas <i>Mitchel J. Stimers</i>	

Chapter Twenty-Two.....	267
Flash Floods, Low Water Crossings and Swift Water Rescues in Texas <i>Pamela S. Showalter and Yongmei Lu</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Three.....	277
Using GIS to Examine Evacuation Need and Shelter Locations in Broward County, Florida <i>Shivangi Prasad</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Four	290
Flood Damage Assessment Using Remote Sensing, GIS and GPS Technologies: A Case Study in Golestan Province, Northeastern Iran <i>Parviz Zeaiean Firouzabadi, Saeed Saroei and Esmat Madaniyan</i>	
Part III: Impacts and Mitigation	
Introductory Comments.....	302
<i>Graham A. Tobin and Burrell E. Montz</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Five.....	305
Land Use Policy and Flood Hazard Mitigation in the Development of Eastern New Orleans <i>Merrill L. Johnson and Robert A. Sauder</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Six.....	318
Earthquake Insurance Reform in New Zealand <i>Iain Hay</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Seven	331
The Floodplain as a Housing Submarket: A Preliminary Analysis <i>Burrell E. Montz</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Eight	339
Impacts of a Second “Once in a Lifetime” Flood on Property Values: Linda and Olivehurst, California Revisited <i>Graham A. Tobin and Burrell E. Montz</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Nine	349
To Stay or Leave: Residents’ Evaluation of Hurricane Evacuation Warnings <i>Kirsten Dow, Patrice Burns and Susan L. Cutter</i>	

Chapter Thirty	360
The 1986 Edmonton, Alberta Canada Tornado: Perception, Experience, and Response Then and Now <i>R. Denise Blanchard-Boehm and M. Jeffrey Cook</i>	
Chapter Thirty-One	373
Chronic Hazards: Health Impacts Associated with On-Going Ash-Falls around Mt. Tungurahua in Ecuador <i>Graham A. Tobin and Linda M. Whiteford</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Two.....	387
Predictors for Public Response to Tornado Warnings: The May 4, 2003 Tornadoes in Kansas, Missouri, and Tennessee <i>Bimal Kanti Paul and Biqing Huang</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Three.....	396
The Role of Tourism in Post-Disaster Recovery: A Case Study of Patong Beach, Phuket <i>Jacqueline Salmond</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Four.....	411
Developing a County-Level Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan with GIS: Practices, Problems, and Challenges <i>Yu Zhou</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Five	420
Coping with the Flood Hazard in the Nyando River Basin, Kenya <i>Charles G. Manyara</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Six.....	431
The Locations of Temporary Shelters after Hurricane Katrina <i>R. Stacy Brown, Jonathan C. Comer, and Thomas A. Wikle</i>	
Chapter Thirty-Seven	444
Managing Response and Recovery to Mississippi River Flooding: Applying Spatial Analysis in Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee <i>Brian Waldron, Arleen Hill and Bob Nations Jr.</i>	

Chapter Thirty-Eight 458
Site, Situation, and Property Owner Decision- Making after the 2002
Guadalupe River Flood
Elyse M. Zavar, Ronald R. Hagelman III and William M. Rugely II

Contributors..... 471

Index..... 484

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Magnitude and frequency of tornadoes in Texas	14
Figure 2-2. Area struck by tornadoes by magnitude.....	15
Figure 2-3. Spatial distribution of tornadoes in Texas.....	16
Figure 2-4. Spatial distribution of strong and violent tornadoes.....	17
Figure 2-5. Population density of Texas counties.....	19
Figure 2-6. Tornado density in Texas counties	19
Figure 2-7. Relative tornado risk in Texas	20
Figure 3-1. Study area, San Marcos, Texas	25
Figure 3-2. Revised general risk communication model	34
Figure 4-1 Geo-physical risk of the Tampa Bay region	41
Figure 4-2. Social vulnerability of the Tampa Bay region	42
Figure 4-3. Hazardousness of the Tampa Bay region.....	43
Figure 5-1. Moisture gradient decreases from east to west across Nebraska and Kansas	49
Figure 5-2. Geographic variation of heat stress events across the moisture gradient and by latitude	53
Figure 6-1. Columbia County, Pennsylvania.....	60
Figure 8-1. International student population in the USA by academic level with selected academic year	83
Figure 8-2. International students and emergency events.....	88
Figure 9-1. Cascade of Impacts	97
Figure 9-2. Villages around Popocatépetl	100
Figure 9-3. Age distribution of respondents' households	102
Figure 10-1. Study area and regional setting.....	112
Figure 10-2. Storm-event impact of A) hurricane, B) flooding, C) total storm	116
Figure 10-3. Surfaces depicting A) predicted vulnerability, B) 1-year actual storm impact, C) 2.5- year actual storm impact	117
Figure 10-4. Deviation from A) predicted vulnerability and 1-year storm impact, and B) predicted vulnerability and 2.5-year storm impact.....	119
Figure 10-5. Vulnerability based on multiple weighting: A) age, race, gender, wealth; B) non-white, poor children; C) non-white, poor female, non-vehicle.....	120
Figure 11-1 Harris County, Texas	128
Figure 11-2 Spatial distribution of geophysical vulnerability	131
Figure 11-3 Social vulnerability by census block group based on population and structure.....	131
Figure 11-4. Social vulnerability by census block group based on differential access to resources	132

Figure 11-5. Social vulnerability by census block group based on population with special evacuation needs	132
Figure 11-6. Social vulnerability by census block group based on all three evacuation needs	133
Figure 11-7. Social vulnerability by census block group based on geophysical vulnerability and all three evacuation dimensions	133
Figure 12-1. Tracks of hurricanes that affected South Carolina, 1906-2005	145
Figure 12-2. Frequency of hurricanes that affected South Carolina, 1906-2005	146
Figure 12-3. Cumulative frequencies of hurricane strikes in South Carolina between 1906 and 2005.....	147
Figure 12-4. Expected probabilities of hurricane strikes once per year in South Carolina	148
Figure 13-1. Location of Oklahoma cooperative weather stations	162
Figure 13-2. Oklahoma climatic divisions	163
Figure 13-3. Crop moisture index – June 22-28, 1980	164
Figure 13-4. Crop moisture index – July 13-19, 1980.....	164
Figure 13-5. Crop moisture index – July 20-26, 1980.....	165
Figure 13-6. Crop moisture index – August 17-23, 1980.....	166
Figure 15-1. Study area	180
Figure 15-2. Fifteen consecutive day flood recurrence interval for the Yalobusha River at Whaley, Mississippi	184
Figure 15-3. Fifteen consecutive day flood recurrence interval for the Yazoo River at Greenwood, Mississippi	185
Figure 16-1. Travis County, Texas.....	193
Figure 16-2. Landslide susceptibility index.....	194
Figure 16-3. Travis County slope.....	195
Figure 16-4. Travis County geology	196
Figure 16-5. Travis County faults and fault buffers	197
Figure 16-6. Travis County vegetation.....	199
Figure 16-7. Travis County landslide susceptibility index	199
Figure 17-1. Combined probability of occurrence.....	213
Figure 17-2. Impact index map	215
Figure 18-1. McKinley County, New Mexico showing WRRHAMS interface and road network.....	219
Figure 18-2. WRRHAMS client interface: 24-hour precipitation total data	222
Figure 18-3. WRRHAMS client interface with a close-up view of the flow accumulation raster and analysis basins	224
Figure 18-4. WRRHAMS client interface with a close-up view of the flow accumulation raster and TIGER road network	225
Figure 18-5. Road/stream intersections ranked by probability of Erosion	226
Figure 19-1. Location of the Piasa Creek watershed	232
Figure 19-2. 3D representation of the Piasa Creek watershed: (A) 3D scene displayed in ArcView 3d scene Viewer; (B) DOQ superimposed on the 3D scene; (C) 100-year flood zone superimposed on the DOQ	235
Figure 19-3. A close-up view of a portion of the Piasa Creek watershed showing locations of single-family houses inside the 100-year flood zone.....	236

Figure 19-4. 3D representation of the same portion of the Piasa Creek watershed as shown in Figure 19-3	236
Figure 19-5. VRML 3D scene played back using Microsoft Internet Explorer.....	237
Figure 20-1. Pinellas County, Florida	243
Figure 20-2. An area of Pinellas County, Florida mapped using ALSM techniques	246
Figure 20-3. Air-photographs showing changes in sinkhole landscape from 1926 to 2002.....	248
Figure 21-1. Riley and Wabaunsee Counties, Kansas	254
Figure 21-2. Population analysis of Riley County, Kansas	255
Figure 21-3. Population analysis of Wabaunsee County, Kansas.....	256
Figure 21-4 Potential warning siren locations for Wabaunsee County Kansas	260
Figure 21-5. Potential siren locations for Lake Wabaunsee siren.....	261
Figure 21-6. Siren location analysis, Riley County, Kansas.....	263
Figure 21-7. Siren location analysis, City of Manhattan, Riley County, Kansas.....	264
Figure 22-1. Study area: the flash flood alley consisting of 44 counties	269
Figure 22-2. Swift water rescues in study area: 2007.....	272
Figure 22-3. LWCs and SWRs with FEMA floodplain, Hays County, Texas.....	272
Figure 22-4. LWCs, 2007 SWRs, FEMA Floodplain, East Hays County, Texas.....	273
Figure 23-1. Distribution of evacuation need	283
Figure 23-2. High evacuation need clusters	284
Figure 23-3. Distribution and direction trend of mobile homes and RV parks.....	286
Figure 23-4. Potential shelter sites	287
Figure 24-1. Location of Golestan province in Iran	292
Figure 24-2. ETM acquired in Oct. 2001, IRS 1D acquired in Oct. 2002 and photo mosaic of pictures taken from starting point of floods	293
Figure 24-3. Fuzzy change map between 2000 and 2001. Light tones show severe changes	294
Figure 24-4. Fuzzy change map between 2000 and 2002. Light tones show severe changes	294
Figure 24-5. Scatterplot of fuzzy change maps of 2001 and 2002.....	295
Figure 24-6. Fuzzy change map between 2001 and 2002. Dark tones show less change	295
Figure 24-7. Areas of more than 50 percent changes; darker tones along river	296
Figure 24-8. Flood boundary and land use/ land cover map in 2001.....	296
Figure 24-9. Flood boundary and land use/ land cover map in 2002.....	297
Figure 25-1. New Orleans and vicinity	308
Figure 25-2. Expansion of built-up area in eastern New Orleans, 1951 to 1980 ..	309
Figure 25-3. Approximate flood zone after rain of May 3, 1978	314
Figure 28-1. Extent of the 1997 floods in Linda and Olivehurst, California	341
Figure 31-1. Outpatient consultation rates: 1995-2001	379
Figure 31-2. Outpatient consultation rates: Acute respiratory infections	379
Figure 32-1. The study area	391
Figure 33-1. Location of Phuket, Thailand	397

Figure 33-2. Tourism promotion	407
Figure 34-1. Location of five Ohio counties	412
Figure 34-2. Reference map: Streams and 100-year floodplain in Preble County, Ohio	415
Figure 34-3. Impacts of the Maumee River 100-year flood on Grand Rapids, Wood County, Ohio	416
Figure 35-1. The Study Area	422
Figure 35-2. Rainfall Patterns	423
Figure 36-1. Locations of formal and informal shelters in Louisiana	435
Figure 36-2. Locations and types of shelters in Louisiana	436
Figure 36-3. Distances of formal and informal shelters from the Superdome	438
Figure 37-1. Shelby County, Tennessee	446
Figure 37-2 Mississippi River flood event	449
Figure 37-3. The planning tool	453
Figure 37-4. Example of public map released for impacted zip codes	454
Figure 38-1. Study area within Comal County, Texas	460

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Weighting factors based upon tornado density.....	18
Table 3-1. Ethnic composition of study area population in 2000	25
Table 3-2. Variables significant at the 0.05 level or below	30
Table 4-1. Return periods and probabilities of occurrence	38
Table 4-2. Variables used in determining social vulnerability	39
Table 5-1. Previous heat stress classification method using heat index.....	50
Table 5-2. Heat stress classification model	52
Table 5-3. Heat stress classification results.....	54
Table 6-1. Age and total perception score	62
Table 6-2. Age and ever evacuated home due to flooding	63
Table 6-3. Flood experience and perception.....	64
Table 6-4. Evacuation and perception	64
Table 6-5. Damage and perception.....	65
Table 7-1. Variation in possibility of occurring more than once per year: Cochran's Q	72
Table 7-2. Participant comments on multiple floods per year	72
Table 7-3. Participant comments on change in size over time.....	74
Table 7-4. Participant comments on concern	75
Table 7-5. Variations in most concerning flood: Cochran's Q.....	76
Table 7-6. Variations in least concerning flood: Cochran's Q	76
Table 7-7. Variation in relative concern: Friedman test	78
Table 7-8. Variation in combined effectiveness: Friedman test	78
Table 8-1. Length of residence vs. environmental familiarity	90
Table 8-2. Length of residence vs. knowledge of hurricanes	90
Table 8-3. Length of residence vs. Hurricane Rita evacuation behavior	91
Table 8-4. Length of residence vs. expected evacuations.....	91
Table 8-5. The top 4 identified evacuation determinants	92
Table 9-1. Summary demographic statistics by age	102
Table 9-2. Number of times evacuated	104
Table 9-3. Evacuation by age	105
Table 9-4. Evacuation and occupation	106
Table 9-5. Evacuation and education	107
Table 9-6. Evacuation by village area	108
Table 10-1. Variables employed in the analysis	114
Table 11-1. Variables used to determine social vulnerability.....	129
Table 12-1. Hurricanes making landfall in South Carolina, 1906-2005	144
Table 13-1. Twelve step multiple regression model of CM and remotely sensed variables for Oklahoma regions.....	166
Table 15-1. Flood recurrence intervals.....	182

Table 15-2. Stage to discharge conversion	183
Table 15-3. River stages from March 8, 1989 through March 10, 1989.....	185
Table 15-4. Images selected for this study	185
Table 16-1. Travis County slope, fault buffers, and land cover.....	196
Table 16-2. Travis County geology.....	198
Table 17-1. Indices for determination of hazardousness	207
Table 17-2. Return periods and probabilities of occurrence for different storm intensities	209
Table 19-1. Project data	232
Table 22-1. Incidents by year	270
Table 23-1 Variables used to determine evacuation need	280
Table 23-2. Mean variable values for clusters and entire county	285
Table 24-1. Area damage statistics.....	297
Table 27-1. Variation in price as influenced by variables	335
Table 27-2. Floodplain location and price	335
Table 27-3. Floodplain location and age of housing	336
Table 27-4. Floodplain location and number of days on the market	337
Table 28-1. House sizes - 1986 and 1997 flood area	344
Table 28-2. House list prices - 1986 and 1997 flood areas	344
Table 28-3. House sold prices – 1986 and 1997 flood areas	344
Table 28-4. Median house sold prices as a function of flood area.....	345
Table 29-1. Survey responses of Myrtle Beach residents.....	352
Table 29-2. Evacuation rates reported by Myrtle Beach respondents for hurricanes over the last three years.....	353
Table 29-3. What convinced you to leave the area?.....	354
Table 29-4. Reasons for non-evacuation for hurricanes	355
Table 29-5. What makes a source reliable?	357
Table 30-1. Statistically significant study variables	366
Table 30-2. Levels of experience: Respondents in the path as compared to those out of the path during the tornado	367
Table 30-3. Levels of experience: Respondents in the path of the tornado as compared to those not in Edmonton at the time	368
Table 30-4. Preparedness (response) toward future tornado occurrence: All respondents	369
Table 31-1. Questionnaire sample and survey statistics	377
Table 31-2. Reported exposure to ash	380
Table 31-3. Reported frequency of exposure to ash	380
Table 31-4. Perceived effect of ash on respondent and family	380
Table 31-5. Perceived risk of ash to family health	381
Table 31-6. Activities undertaken to counter effects of ash	381
Table 31-7. Reported illnesses of respondents over preceding six months	382
Table 32-1. Factors for public response to tornado warnings	393
Table 33-1. Tourism data 1995-2003	399
Table 33-2. Phuket hotel occupancy rates 2004-2005	402
Table 34-1. Impacts of the 100-year flood on Preble County, Ohio	416

Table 34-2. Impacts of the 100-year flood of the Maumee River on Wood County	417
Table 34-3. Community profile: Incorporated areas of Wood County affected by Maumee River flood	417
Table 35-1. Number of people per household	425
Table 35-2. Roofing material	425
Table 36-1. Correlation matrix for all shelters	441
Table 37-1. Select demographic characteristics of Shelby County	448
Table 37-2. Parcels inundated at specific predicted Mississippi River flood stages	448
Table 37-3. GIS data sets and sources	450
Table 38-1. Building permits for single family homes from 2000-2005 for Comal County and Central Texas region	461
Table 38-2. Descriptive statistics of spatial characteristics	464
Table 38-3. Land values	465
Table 38-4. Multinomial logistic regression results	466

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editors would like to thank all those who have participated in the Applied Geography Conferences over the years. The conference began in 1978 established thanks to the efforts of John Frazier and Bart Epstein who saw the need for applied research that focused on societal problems and their solutions. The conference has published 36 volumes (1978 and 2013) edited by a number of scholars: Tom Bell, Dawna Cerney, Bart Epstein, John Frazier, Ed Hillsman, John Harrington, Lisa Harrington, Ken Jones, Jay Lee, Dennis Lord, Burrell Montz, Henry Moon, Andy Schoolmaster, and Graham Tobin. In addition, we are grateful to the many reviewers who have spent time going through articles and of course the paper presenters, all of whom have added to the quality of the Applied Geography Conferences.

Burrell E. Montz
Graham A. Tobin

CHAPTER ONE

NATURAL HAZARDS: EVOLVING APPROACHES

BURRELL E. MONTZ AND GRAHAM A. TOBIN

Introduction

The 21st century presents many challenges to the hazard manager; dynamic climatic conditions, with many possible outcomes, combined with seemingly unlimited population growth, rapid urbanization and changing socio-economic relationships are reshaping disaster impacts, community responses, and social safety mechanisms. Indeed, the many facets of human vulnerability are being constantly restructured with the ongoing interplay of the physical environment and social, economic and political forces (Montz and Tobin, 2012; Tobin and Montz, 2009). At the same time, reducing vulnerability and enhancing community resilience require policies aimed at mitigating the consequences of disasters as they affect different locations and different groups. As a result, sound scientifically-based research of an interdisciplinary nature is required to further our understanding of the forces at play, and to devise appropriate means to counter them (Montz and Tobin, 2012).

There is a kaleidoscope of realities to confront and one set of strategies will not fit every geographic location, social, political, and economic context. Our models must be flexible to address such moving targets and at the same time provide an understanding of the interactions between people, natural hazards, and disaster events. These are issues that have been addressed for some time, and we have made progress – but there is much more to be done. It is in this context that we look at evolving approaches to natural hazards.

Evolving Traditions

Research into natural hazards has had a long tradition beginning with a focus on physical processes and gradually evolving into a full-blown interdisciplinary agenda with the recognition of the interactions between the physical and human environments. It was Gilbert White's pioneering work (see White, 1945; 1961; 1964; White et al., 1958) that demonstrated unambiguously the fundamental significance of the human element in determining disaster settings and outcomes. As a result, the hazard agenda now embraces initiatives ranging from the physical, to the socio-economic, to the political, and incorporates a broad array of methodological approaches and technological advances, and employing both quantitative and qualitative procedures.

For much of the second half of the twentieth century, hazards research adopted two foci: 1) furthering knowledge of the physical and spatial dimensions of natural events and 2) understanding individual decision-making and responses to natural hazards and disasters (Montz and Tobin, 2012). Much of this research was applied, seeking to solve societal problems -- a laudable goal but for many academics it lacked a sound theoretical foundation (Alexander, 1997; Hewitt, 1997) and tended to overlook the systemic causes of disasters (Pidgeon et al., 2003). As the twentieth century progressed, these criticisms were addressed and increasingly research was directed at understanding differences in human vulnerability and community resilience (Cutter et al., 2003; Smith and Petley, 2009; Tobin and Montz, 1997).

These concepts, firmly established by Blaikie et al. (1994) (see also Wisner et al., 2004), have now become the *modus operandi* for much hazard research. Montz et al. (2004) demonstrated that hazards research had evolved from looking at individual risks and one-off, extreme events, to understanding complex events that include political, social, and economic forces that impact the vulnerability of individuals and communities, to a range of hazards at different geographic scales and at various governmental levels. Disasters, therefore, are now understood to have systemic root causes embodied in socio-economic and political systems that place people, often marginalized groups, in hazardous locations, in unsafe structures, and with few resources available for them to respond with security to events. There has indeed been a paradigm shift, turning attention to more general principles of hazardousness, risk, vulnerability, and resilience. Part I of this book reflects this shift, with papers that illustrate the changing approaches to the study of risk and vulnerability.

At the same time as concepts of hazards, vulnerability and risk were evolving, so too were new technologies coming to the fore which vastly increased the arsenal of tools available to the researcher and practitioner. The development and expansion of geographical information systems (GIS) have provided new ways to explore multiple aspects of hazards and disasters. Investigations of dynamic forces, whether they are geophysical, social, economic or political, can now be visually represented over time and space. In addition, improvements in statistical techniques that examine spatial patterns and correlations have brought a scientific rigor to many studies. Along with GIS, the refinement of remote sensing, such as LiDAR, now promote more sophisticated models of landforms and human activities. Furthermore, others have utilized web-based resources and sophisticated statistical modeling to further academic and practical advances in hazards research. In Part II of the book, the reader will find examples of articles that incorporate these technologies as they have been applied to hazards research over several decades.

The combination of these new hazard concepts and frameworks and the incorporation of innovative technologies and analytical techniques has encouraged a more systematic approach to problem solving. Applied research has taken a prominent place in the academy as hazard researchers have sought to explain and ultimately reduce the impacts of disasters. Questions regarding appropriate mitigation practices that account for both the geophysical event and the human landscape have been addressed. For example, consider the nature of hazards, both those which have long been the subject of geographic research, such as floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, and tornadoes, and those which have more recently been recognized to be of increasing significance. These include slow-onset, pervasive hazards such as drought, chronic hazards associated with continued exposure to, for example, repeated ash-fall from relatively frequent volcanic eruptions, and changing hazardousness due to climate change. How do we mitigate these impacts? In a way, we have come full circle; White's arguments are just as pertinent today as they were in the mid-twentieth century. The advantage we have now, however, is superior technology and a better grasp of those root causes and conditions that exacerbate or ameliorate disaster impacts, risk, vulnerability and resilience. In Part III of the book, therefore, we provide some articles to illustrate how impacts and mitigation have been examined by geographic scholars.

The collection of papers included in this book offers the reader insight into the development of applied hazards research, as it has built on previous work, evolving technologies, improved understanding of the factors involved, and increased awareness of the needs of those who make

decisions with respect to hazard management. The interplay of factors contributing to disaster losses has become ever more complex, as too has our ability to incorporate those complexities into a coherent response strategy, as we strive to reduce losses and increase resilience. It is hoped that this volume provides not only an appreciation for the foundation that has been set (as illustrated by the examples here), but also inspires future researchers as they look to address these very pressing issues.

Editors' Note: Because the papers included in this volume cover more than three decades of hazards research, tools, techniques, and even office software have changed significantly. As a result, the figures included in the chapters are of the best quality possible. Tables could be recreated but figures could not, explaining the variable quality of figures found in this volume.

References

- Alexander, D. 1997. The Study of Natural Disasters, 1977-1997: Some Reflections on a Changing Field of Knowledge. *Disasters* 21, 284-304.
- Blaikie, P., T. Cannon, I. Davis, and B. Wisner. 1994. *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability, and Disasters*. London: Routledge.
- Cutter, S.L., B.J. Boruff, and W.L. Shirley. 2003. Social Vulnerability to Environmental Hazards. *Social Science Quarterly* 84, 242-261.
- Hewitt, K. 1997. *Regions of Risk: A Geographical Introduction to Disasters*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Montz, B.E. 2009. Emerging Issues and Challenges: Natural Hazards. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research and Education* 141, 1-4.
- Montz, B.E., J. Cross, S. Cutter. 2004. Hazards. In *Geography in America at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, G.L. Gaile, and C.J. Wilmott, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 479-491.
- Montz, B.E. and G.A. Tobin. 2007. Three Decades of Applied Geography: Themes from the Applied Geography Conferences since 1978. *Papers of the Applied Geography Conferences* 30:1-9.
- Montz, B.E. and G.A. Tobin. 2011. Natural Hazards: An Evolving Tradition in Applied Geography. *Journal of Applied Geography* 31(1):1-4.
- Montz, B.E. and G.A. Tobin. 2012. Natural Hazards and Natural Disasters. In *21st Century Geography: A Reference Handbook*, J.P. Stoltman ed. London: Sage Publications Volume 2, Chapter 46, pp. 509-518.

- Montz, B.E. and G.A. Tobin. 2013. Vulnerability, Risks, and Hazards. In *Oxford Bibliographies in Geography*, B. Warf ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pidgeon, N., R. Kaspersen, and P. Slovic 2003. *The Social Amplification of Risk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, K. and D. Petley. 2009. *Environmental Hazards: Assessing Risk and Reducing Disaster*. 5th edition. London: Routledge.
- Tobin, G.A. and B.E. Montz. 1997. *Natural Hazards: Explanation and Integration*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tobin, G.A. and B.E. Montz. 2004. Natural Hazards and Technology: Vulnerability, Risk and Community Response in Hazardous Environments. In *Geography and Technology*, S.D. Brunn, S.L. Cutter, and J.W. Harrington eds. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Chapter 23, pp. 547-570.
- Tobin, G.A. and B.E. Montz. 2009. Environmental Hazards. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, R. Kitchin and N. Thrift eds. Oxford: Elsevier. Volume 3, pp. 521-527.
- White, G.F. 1945. *Human Adjustments to Floods*. Department of Geography Research Paper 29. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, G.F. ed. 1961. *Papers on Flood Problems*. Department of Geography Research Paper 70. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, G.F. 1964. *Choice of Adjustments to Floods*. Department of Geography Research Paper 93. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, G.F., W.C. Calef, J.W. Hudson, H.W. Mayer, J.R. Sheaffer, and D.J. Volk. 1958. *Changes in Urban Occupance of Flood Plains in the United States*. Department of Geography Research Paper No. 57. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wisner, B., P. Blaikie, T. Cannon, and I. Davis. 2004. *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

PART I

RISK AND VULNERABILITY

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

GRAHAM A. TOBIN AND BURRELL E. MONTZ

As hazards research has evolved, both risk and vulnerability have evolved into key themes that now dominate the literature. In this regard, much attention has been paid to establishing and further developing a sound conceptual foundation for understanding, differentiating, characterizing, and measuring risk and vulnerability. At the same time, recognition of the significance of addressing both risk and vulnerability, separately and in combination, in emergency management, hazard mitigation, and loss reduction has captured the attention of applied geographers. The collection of papers in this section illustrates the varying concerns, methodologies, and approaches through which both risk and vulnerability have been studied.

The first two papers in this section, originally published in 2001 and 2002 respectively, set the stage by focusing on risk as created by the interplay of forces of the geophysical environment and human vulnerability as defined by the locations of populations. Mulligan and Barbato mapped frequency and spatial distribution of tornadoes in the state of Texas to evaluate patterns of risk while Springer and Blanchard-Boehm evaluated differing perceptions of risk to flooding in one Texas city, San Marcos. This article is centered on risk communication, arguing that only through understanding of the risk perceptions of different ethnic groups can the risk be successfully communicated. A year later, we incorporated both geo-physical risk and socio-economic vulnerability and found that, at least in the Tampa, Florida region, vulnerable populations do not live in the most hazardous locations – contrary to what had often been assumed. Together, the case studies in these three papers reflect important aspects of understanding risk and vulnerability: what is likely to happen where, to whom, and how might that influence emergency management.

The next set of papers in this section was originally published in 2006 and 2007 and focuses on how we might characterize risk and how people understand the risk to which they are exposed. Erik Bowles makes the case for a classification scheme for heat stress, as a means of communicating the potential risk. He also undertook an analysis of the frequency and

probability of heat stress occurrences for the study area – again with an eye to communicating risk. This theme is followed later in Bell’s work that evaluates how different ways of describing or defining the 100-year flood influences perceptions of risk. Communicating risk is based on understanding both the nature of the hazard and the characteristics and perceptions of the populations who are at risk. Webb focused on the elderly in Columbia County, Pennsylvania, an area that has a long flood history. One would probably assume, then, that the elderly understand the risks to which they are exposed, given their longevity in the county – however, this proves not to be the case. These findings have important applications to emergency management and planning. In her contribution, He evaluates the risk perceptions and vulnerability of international students – an often overlooked segment of the population. Knowing that both local knowledge and social networks can be important to understanding one’s risk and preparation options, she presents and tests a model to explain the evacuation decisions of international students. The theme of local knowledge, social networks and evacuation decisions is continued in the research that Tobin and his colleagues undertook in Mexico, in this case with respect to risk from a chronic hazard, a volcano.

Published between 2009 and 2012, the final set of papers in this section, all of which are GIS-based, addresses measurement questions in evaluating both risk and vulnerability, each based on the argument that differing emphases on one or another of the relevant variables contributing to risk or vulnerability will lead to different results. Together, these papers make the case that significant thought and care must be used in selecting and measuring variables. Abel and Lein evaluated the extent to which anticipated patterns of losses, as determined by vulnerability maps developed using varying weighting strategies, compared to actual losses following Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans. Similarly, using one county in Texas, Liu and Gong illustrate how focusing on different socio-economic characteristics leads to very different spatial patterns of vulnerability. Finally, Wu and Lu sought to refine the spatial prediction of frequencies and probabilities of hurricane strikes in South Carolina in order to assist emergency managers, planners, and insurance companies with detailed spatial information that has direct application to their responsibilities. Their results clearly illustrate the spatial dimensions of risk to hurricanes.

Taken together, the papers in this section cover spatial and perceptual aspects of risk and vulnerability to a range of hazards, with various applications to emergency management, hazard mitigation, and planning. The methods used, including GIS, surveys, and focus groups, and the case

study approach are common to hazards research as it has been undertaken for decades. The lessons learned from the papers presented here have influenced subsequent research as we continue to improve our understanding of risks and vulnerabilities as they play out in different places.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MAGNITUDE, FREQUENCY, AND SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF TORNADOES IN TEXAS: AN ASSESSMENT OF TORNADO RISK*

KEVIN R. MULLIGAN, LUCIA S. BARBATO
AND STEPHEN WEINBECK

Introduction

Understanding the risk posed by tornadoes is an important component of emergency planning and management efforts. In any given year tornadoes have the potential to cause millions of dollars in property damage and, in some cases, a significant number of injuries or loss of life. To understand the risk posed by tornadoes, it is important to understand the frequency and spatial distribution of tornadoes of varying magnitudes. Moreover, any assessment of tornado risk must take into account the density and spatial distribution of the population.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the magnitude, frequency and spatial distribution of tornadoes in the State of Texas and then apply this knowledge to an assessment of tornado risk. In the first part of this paper, maps are generated to show the spatial distribution of tornadoes in the state. These data are then used to create a map showing the density of strong or violent tornadoes by county. The aim is to identify those regions of the state that have a higher probability of significant tornadoes.

In the second part of this paper, the county tornado data are combined with county population data to create a spatial model of tornado risk. The purpose of this analysis is to create a composite variable for tornado risk that takes into account: 1) the historical frequency of strong or violent

* *Papers and Proceedings of the Applied Geography Conferences (2001) 24: 121-129*

tornado events, and 2) the likelihood that a tornado will cause significant property damage, injuries, or loss of life, given the population density within a county.

Tornado Data

Background

In 1987, Fujita published an exceptional map showing the spatial distribution of tornadoes in the United States (Fujita, 1987). The map was based on a dataset containing the magnitudes and locations of 23,264 tornadoes observed between 1930 and 1978. Given such a large dataset, the map was exceptional insofar as each tornado event was mapped by hand and the map took three years to construct.

After Fujita's tornado map was completed, the University of Chicago Tornado Tape became available (Fujita, 1987). This dataset included the magnitudes and locations of 31,054 tornadoes observed between 1916 and 1985. Subsequently, Fujita used this dataset to produce computer generated grid-point tornado maps. Although Fujita used these grid-point maps to analyze both the spatial and temporal distribution of tornadoes in the United States, by today's standards, these maps appear unrefined and are difficult to interpret.

In addition to Fujita's classic work, Grazulis has published what is perhaps the most comprehensive description of tornadoes in the United States (Grazulis, 1990). In the first volume of *Significant Tornadoes*, Grazulis provides a comprehensive analysis describing the spatial distribution of tornadoes mapped by state. In the second volume, Grazulis provides an exceptional chronology of tornadoes. In this volume, the author describes the location, time of day, magnitude, path length and width, and the damage associated with every known significant tornado in the United States from 1880 to 1989.

The SPC Tornado Archive

Although the books authored by Fujita and Grazulis provide an excellent foundation for understanding the spatial and temporal distribution of tornadoes in the United States, it is difficult to analyze the original tornado data because these data are not readily available in a digital format (Fujita, 1987; Grazulis 1990). To overcome this problem, digital tornado data were obtained from the NOAA Storm Prediction Center (SPC). A project was then undertaken to assemble a tornado