Second round of comments on 1936 from Todd Kimberlain (replies by CWL are given in **boldface**):

Now Additional Notes (was Storm # 1) - I am pleased to see that Storm #1 was removed from the revised HURDAT. It was indeed a hard sell, and it likely does not belong in the data base. No further comment here.

**Thank you.**

Storm #1 (was Storm #2) - I still have an issue of depicting this system as a TC crossing Central America. The fact that this is so rare is certainly a point to consider. Nothing in the maps that Chris put in the binder since our previous review is enough to convince the Committee in this regard. It is suggestive that low pressure crossed this region, and I have no problem depicting that.

**The 8th through the 11th are removed from HURDAT as requested.**  
  
Storm #9 (was Storm #10) - Still had an issue with the genesis of this system. The lack of wind at the proposed genesis time is just one reason to consider a time later than that. In Chris's comments, he confuses closed low with tropical depression. A closed does not necessarily a tropical depression make.

**Because of the lack of satellite imagery in 1936 to determine the convective structure, the distinction between a closed low in the tropics and a tropical depression becomes almost moot. If the strongest winds in a closed low are 20 kt or less, then one may be able to indicate that tropical cyclogenesis has not occurred yet back in the 1930s. However, if one has 25-30 kt peak winds and a closed circulation over the tropical/subtropical oceans back in the 1930s, then this would be considered a tropical depression. Thus genesis is retained at 06Z on the 20th (unchanged from original HURDAT).**

Storm #11 - Didn't Chris raise the intensity to 70 kt or was that the original value? If the peak intensity was raised to that value, then 60 or 65 kt should be considered instead due to the evidence cited in our reviews. It's true that we should shave the intensity 5 kt with insufficient data, but we do have data that is suggestive that an intensity lower than 70 kt would be best.

**The original HURDAT value was indeed 70 kt.**  
  
Storm #16- There is still a possible issue with the genesis time that was not addressed. Please refer to my notes.

**It is not known what is being referred to here.**