

**9.7 VILLAGE OF CATO**

This section presents the jurisdictional annex for the Village of Cato.

**A.) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT**

Primary Point of Contact	Alternate Point of Contact
Name: Carl Lincoln, Mayor Address: 2564 Millard Avenue Cato, NY 13033 Phone Number: 315-626-2397 Fax Number: 315-626-9993 Email address: villageofcato@yahoo.com	Name: Jay Youngs, Superintendent Address: 2564 Millard Avenue Cato, NY 13033 Phone Number: 315-626-2397 Fax Number: 315-626-9993 Email address: villageofcato@yahoo.com

**B.) PROFILE**

**Population**

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the estimated Village of Cato population was 532. The Village of Cato is one of the 9 villages in Cayuga County.

**Location**

The Village of Cato is located in northeast Cayuga County, and lies within and between the towns of Cato and Ira.

**Brief History**

The first settlement in the Village appeared in 1805 as new residents built an area now called Jakway’s Corners, named after Dr. John Jakway who became the first permanent resident in 1809. Prior to this development, the former Indian lands where the village now lies had been set aside in 1782 by the State of New York as payment to Revolutionary War veterans (Village of Cato, 1880).

**Governing Body Format**

Home rule is strong in New York State and thus, each town and village has its own governing body. Towns are made up of a Town Board and Supervisor. The Villages all have a Village Mayor, Clerk, Village Department of Public works, and Village Board. Along with town and village roads, any public water and sewer systems are operated by the local municipality, though they may cooperate with County departments. Each municipality has charge over its own planning and zoning and uses the County personnel as a resource (Cayuga County, 2010).

**Growth/Development Trends**

No major residential/commercial development or major infrastructure development are projected at this time for the next five (5) years in the municipality.

## C.) NATURAL HAZARD EVENT HISTORY

Cayuga County has a history of natural hazard events as detailed in Volume I, Section 5 of this plan. A summary of historical events is provided in each of the hazard profiles and includes a chronology of events affecting the County and its municipalities. Below is presented a summary of historical events to indicate the range and impact of natural hazard events in the County. Specific damages have been indicated if available from reference or local sources.

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster # (if applicable)	County Designated?	Date	Approximate Damage Assessment
Tropical Storm Agnes	DR-338	Y – IA, PA	6/1972	Auburn's Mill Street dam washed out, Owasco Lake dam weakened, Cayuga Lake rises 1.25 feet higher than 1916 level
Hurricane Eloise /Severe Storm, Heavy Rain, Landslide/Flooding	DR-487	Yes - IA, PA	9/1975	Caused severe damage in Moravia and Locke
Blizzard followed by lake and river flooding in April	EM-3107	Yes - PA	3/17/1993	Blizzard followed by lake and river flooding in April
County-wide flooding	DR-1095	Yes - IA, PA	1/19/1996	1 death (MVA)
Labor Day storm.	DR-1244	Yes - IA, PA	9/1998	
Flood			5/2002	Road flooding in Union Springs and Meridian.
Landslide along Seneca River near Cross Lake in Town of Cato.			2/2003	
Ice storm	DR-1467	Yes - IA, PA	4/2003	3 deaths in Cayuga County.
NE blackout.	EM-3186	Yes - PA	8/23/2003	
Snow emergency declared	EM-3195	Yes - PA	1/2004	
Rain/Flooding	DR-1589	Yes - PA	4/2005	Flooding triggered by snow melt and rain.
Severe Storms, Flooding, Tornadoes, and Straightline Winds	EM 3341	No	September 7-8, 2011	

Note: N/A = Not applicable

D.) NATURAL HAZARD RISK/VULNERABILITY RISK RANKING

Hazard type	Estimate of Potential Dollar Losses to Structures Vulnerable to the Hazard <sup>a, c</sup>	Probability of Occurrence	Risk Ranking Score (Probability x Impact)	Hazard Ranking <sup>b</sup>
Flood	1% Annual Chance: \$0 0.2% Annual Chance: \$956	Frequent	18	Medium
Severe Storm	100-Year MRP: \$0 500-Year MRP: \$182 Annualized Loss: \$17	Frequent	18	Medium
Severe Winter Storm	1% of GBS: \$159,852 5% of GBS: \$799,258	Frequent	48	High
Transportation	Not available	Rare	6	Low
Ground Failure	Karst Exposure \$0 Moderate Incidence \$0 Moderate Susceptibility \$25,489,778	Rare	10	Low

- a. Building damage ratio estimates based on FEMA 386-2 (August 2001)
- b. High = Total hazard priority risk ranking score of 30 and above  
Medium = Total hazard priority risk ranking of 15-29  
Low = Total hazard risk ranking below 15
- c. The valuation of general building stock and loss estimates was based on custom inventory for Cayuga County.
- d. Loss estimates for the severe storm and severe winter storm hazards are structural values only and do not include the value of contents.
- e. Loss estimates for the flood hazard represents both structure and contents.

**E.) CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT**

This section identifies the following capabilities of the local jurisdiction:

- Legal and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability
- Community resiliency
- Community political capability
- Community classification.

The village indicates that it has moderate planning, regulatory, administrative, technical, fiscal, community resiliency, and community political capability; with a moderately willing political capability to enact policies or programs to reduce hazard vulnerabilities in the community.

## E.1) Legal and Regulatory Capability

Regulatory Tools (Codes, Ordinances., Plans)	Do you have this? (Y or N)	Enforcement Authority	Code Citation (Section, Paragraph, Page Number, Date of adoption)
1) Building Code	Y	Local	Local Law 1983-1
2) Zoning Ordinance	Y	Local	Local Law 1982-1, Local Law 1994-1 amended zoning law and map.
3) Subdivision Ordinance	Y	Local	Local Law 1992-3
4) NFIP Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Y	Local	Local Law 2007-2.
4a) Cumulative Substantial Damages	N		
4b) Freeboard	N		
5) Growth Management	N		
6) Floodplain Management / Basin Plan	N		
7) Stormwater Management Plan/Ordinance	N		
8) Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan/ General Plan	Y	Local	1998
9) Capital Improvements Plan	N		
10) Site Plan Review Requirements	N		
11) Open Space Plan	N		
12) Stream Corridor Management Plan	N		
13) Watershed Management or Protection Plan	N		
14) Economic Development Plan	N		
15) Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan	N		
16) Emergency Response Plan	N		
17) Post Disaster Recovery Plan	N		
18) Post Disaster Recovery Ordinance	N		
19) Real Estate Disclosure Requirement		State	State Requirement
20) Other [Special Purpose Ordinances (i.e., critical or sensitive areas)]	N		

**E.2) Administrative and Technical Capability**

Staff/ Personnel Resources	Available (Y or N)	Department/ Agency/ Position
1) Planner(s) or Engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	N	
2) Engineer(s) or Professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	N	
3) Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	N	
4) NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Y	Howard Tanner, Code Enforcement Officer
5) Surveyor(s)	N	
6) Personnel skilled or trained in "GIS" applications	N	
7) Scientist familiar with natural hazards	N	
8) Emergency Manager	N	
9) Grant Writer(s)	N	
10) Staff with expertise or training in benefit/cost analysis	N	

**E.3) Fiscal Capability**

Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to use (Yes/No/Don't know)
1) Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	N
2) Capital Improvements Project Funding	N
3) Authority to Levy Taxes for specific purposes	N
4) User fees for water, sewer, gas or electric service	N
5) Impact Fees for homebuyers or developers of new development/homes	N
6) Incur debt through general obligation bonds	N
7) Incur debt through special tax bonds	N
8) Incur debt through private activity bonds	N
9) Withhold public expenditures in hazard-prone areas	N
10) State mitigation grant programs (e.g. NYSDEC, NYCDEP)	N
11) Other	

**E.4) Community Classifications**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Date Classified</b>
Community Rating System (CRS)	NP	
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS)		
Public Protection		
Storm Ready	NP	
Firewise	NP	

N/A = Not applicable. NP = Not participating. - = Unavailable.

The classifications listed above relate to the community’s effectiveness in providing services that may impact it’s vulnerability to the natural hazards identified. These classifications can be viewed as a gauge of the community’s capabilities in all phases of emergency management (preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation) and are used as an underwriting parameter for determining the costs of various forms of insurance. The CRS class applies to flood insurance while the BCEGS and Public Protection classifications apply to standard property insurance. CRS classifications range on a scale of 1 to 10 with class one (1) being the best possible classification, and class 10 representing no classification benefit. Firewise classifications include a higher classification when the subject property is located beyond 1000 feet of a creditable fire hydrant and is within 5 road miles of a recognized Fire Station.

Criteria for classification credits are outlined in the following documents:

- The Community Rating System Coordinators Manual
- The Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule
- The ISO Mitigation online ISO’s Public Protection website at <http://www.isomitigation.com/ppc/0000/ppc0001.html>
- The National Weather Service Storm Ready website at <http://www.weather.gov/stormready/howto.htm>
- The National Firewise Communities website at <http://firewise.org/>

**F. MITIGATION STRATEGY**

**F.1) Past Mitigation Actions/Status**

The jurisdiction has indicated that no mitigation actions have been incorporated into its planning and land use mechanisms.

**F.2) Hazard Vulnerabilities Identified**

The Village identifies the following as vulnerabilities:

- Truck accident blocked access to Village Hall and DPW.
- Mill Pond needs to be dredged and improvements made to the spill gate.
- Water is backing up from Parker Pond, close to flooding Mott Memorial Park’s basketball courts which is close to the Village Hall and DPW. Can back up to Mill Pond.
- Need generators for water tower, well, and treatment chlorination system (two total.)

## NFIP Summary

Municipality	# Policies (1)	# Claims (Losses) (1)	Total Loss Payments (2)	# Rep. Loss Prop. (1)	# Severe Rep. Loss Prop. (1)	# Policies in 100-year Boundary (3)	# Policies in 500-Boundary (3)	# Policies Outside the 500-year Flood Hazard (3)
Cato (V)	0	8	\$17,978	0	0	0	0	0

Source:

- (1) Policies, claims, repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss statistics provided by FEMA Region 2, in June 2012 using the "Comm\_Name". These statistics are current as of June, 2012. Please note the total number of repetitive loss properties includes the severe repetitive loss properties.
- (2) Total building and content losses from the claims file provided by FEMA Region 2 (current as of June, 2012).
- (3) The policy locations used are based on the latitude and longitude provided by FEMA Region 2.

It is estimated that in the Village of Cato, 2 residents live within the 1% annual chance flood area (NFIP Special Flood Hazard Area). Of the municipality's total land area, 14.6% is located within the 1% annual chance flood area. \$185,650 (0.7%) of the municipality's general building stock replacement cost value (structure and contents) is located within the 1% annual chance flood area. There are 0 NFIP policies in the community and there are 0 policies located within the 1% annual chance flood area. FEMA has identified 0 Repetitive Loss (RL) including 0 Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) properties in the municipality.

HAZUS-MH estimates that for a 1% annual chance flood, \$0 (0%) of the municipality's general building stock replacement cost value (structure and contents) will be damaged and 0 tons of debris could be generated. HAZUS-MH estimates no damage or loss of use to critical facilities in the community as a result of a 1% annual chance flood event. In some cases, a facility may be located in the DFIRM flood hazard boundary; however HAZUS did not calculate potential loss. This may be because the depth of flooding does not amount to any damages to the structure according to the depth damage function used in HAZUS for that facility type.

Please refer to the Hazard Profiles for additional vulnerability information relevant to this jurisdiction.



## F.3) PROPOSED HAZARD MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Note some of the identified mitigation initiatives in Table F are dependent upon available funding (grants and local match availability) and may be modified or omitted at any time based on the occurrence of new hazard events and changes in municipal priorities.

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals and Objectives Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category
CV-1	Develop a comprehensive beaver management plan along flood prone streams and marshes in the town.	Both	Flood	1-5 1-6	Municipality with support from County and NYSDEC.	Medium	Low	Municipal	Short	High	NR
CV-2	Develop a debris control plan for all protected and unprotected streams in the county and work with County agencies, towns, villages and landowners to implement.	Both	Flood	1-5 1-6	County, municipality	High	Low	County, Municipal, Grants	Short	High	NR
CV-3	Create another exit from the Village Hall so if the main road is blocked, it can be accessed.	N/A	All Hazards	3-3 3-4	Municipality	Medium	Low	Municipal	Short	Medium	ES
CV-4	Improvements to Old Mill Pond including dredging, install dry hydrant, and install better spill gate.	Existing	Flood	4-1	Municipality	Medium	Medium	Municipal, grants	Short	High	NR
CV-5	Examine why water is backing up from Parker Pond and explore mitigation.	NA	Flood	1-5 1-6	Municipality, County	Medium	Low	Municipal	Short	High	PP
CV-6	Conduct and facilitate community and public education and outreach for residents and businesses to include, but not be limited to, the following to promote and effect natural hazard risk reduction: <input type="checkbox"/> Provide and maintain links to the HMP website, and regularly post notices on the County/municipal homepage(s) referencing the HMP webpages. <input type="checkbox"/> Prepare and distribute informational letters to flood vulnerable property	N/A	All Hazards	2-1 2-2 2-3 2-4 2-5	Municipality with support from Planning Partners, County Planning, NYSOEM, FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget, HMA programs with local or county match	Short Term	High	PE

**SECTION 9.7: VILLAGE OF CATO**

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals and Objectives Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category
	owners and neighborhood associations, explaining the availability of mitigation grant funding to mitigate their properties, and instructing them on how they can learn more and implement mitigation.										
CV-7	Improve communication systems.	N/A	All Hazards	3-3 3-7	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Short	Medium	ES PR
CV-8	Develop programs/procedures to capture and archive loss data from events. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Record location and length of roadway closures;</li> <li>Develop a database of residential and commercial property damage, including permit history for such repairs;</li> <li>High water marks, perhaps painting phone poles with high water marks and or regulatory Base Flood Elevations (BFEs).</li> </ul>	N/A	All Hazards	1-3 1-4	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Short	Medium	PR
CV-9	Obtain and install backup power sources at critical facilities. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Tower</li> <li>Water Treatment</li> <li>Chlorination System</li> </ul>	N/A	All Hazards	3-3 3-5	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Short	Medium	ES
CV-10	Participate in local, county and/or state level projects and programs to develop improved structure and facility inventories and hazard datasets to support enhanced risk assessment efforts.	N/A	All Hazards	1-1 1-3 1-4	Hazard Mitigation Plan Coordinator	Medium-High	Medium-High	FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs with local match	Long Term DOF	Medium	PR
CV-11	Support ongoing updates of	New and	All Hazards	1-6	Municipality	Low	Low	Municipal	On-going	High	PR



**SECTION 9.7: VILLAGE OF CATO**

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals and Objectives Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category
	Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans	Existing			with support from County Emergency Management			Budget			
CV-12	Create/Enhance/Maintain Mutual Aid agreements with neighboring communities for continuity of operations	N/A	All Hazards	3-2 3-5 3-6 3-7	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM, FEMA and surrounding communities	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	Short Term	High	PR, ES
CV-13	Identify and develop agreements with entities that can provide support with FEMA/SOEM paperwork after disasters; qualified damage assessment personnel – Improve post-disaster capabilities – damage assessment; FEMA/SOEM paperwork compilation, submissions, record-keeping	N/A	All Hazards	3-7	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Short Term	Medium	PR, ES
CV-14	Work with regional agencies (i.e. County and NYSOEM) to help develop damage assessment capabilities at the local level through such things as training programs, certification of qualified individuals (e.g. code officials, floodplain managers, engineers).	N/A	All Hazards	3-6 3-7	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget, FEMA HMA and HLS grant programs	Short-Long Term DOF	Medium	PR
CV-15	Continue to support the implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and updating of this Plan, as defined in Section 7.0	New and Existing	All Hazards	3-1 3-5	Municipality with support from Planning Partners, County Planning, NYSOEM, FEMA	High	Low – High (for 5 year update)	Municipal Budget, FEMA planning grants	On-going	High	PR
CV-16	Maintain compliance with and good-standing in the NFIP including adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements (e.g. regulating all new and	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	1-4 1-6 1-7 4-3	Municipality (via Municipal Engineer/NFIP Floodplain Administrator) with support	High	Low-Medium	Municipal Budget	Ongoing	High	PR, PE



**SECTION 9.7: VILLAGE OF CATO**

Initiative	Mitigation Initiative	Applies to New and/or Existing Structures*	Hazard(s) Mitigated	Goals and Objectives Met	Lead and Support Agencies	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Priority	Mitigation Category
	substantially improved construction in Special Hazard Flood Areas), floodplain identification and mapping, and flood insurance outreach to the community. Further, continue to meet and/or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and criteria through the following NFIP-related continued compliance actions identified as Initiatives below.				from NYSOEM, FEMA						
CV-17	Obtain and archive elevation certificates	N/A	Flood, Severe Storm	1-4 1-6	NFIP Floodplain Administrator	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	On-going	High	PR
CV-18	Promote the participation of Floodplain Administrators within the planning process and other activities.	N/A	Flood	1-4 1-7	Municipality with support from County, NYSOEM and FEMA	Medium	Medium	Municipal Budget	Short	Medium	PR
CV-19	Adopt regulations for undergrounding utilities in new developments.	N/A	Severe Storm	1-6 3-1	Municipal Council	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	Short	High	PR
CV-20	Implement permit fee waivers for installation of backup power for private property.	N/A	Severe Storm	2-4 2-5	Municipal Council	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	Short	High	PR
CV-21	Provide public education and outreach on proper installation and/or use of backup power	N/A	Severe Storm	2-1 2-2	Municipal Clerk	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	Short	High	PR
CV-22	Implement, review, and enforce municipal policies and programs to prevent trees from threatening lives and impacting power availability/interruption.	N/A	Severe Storm	1-6 4-3	Municipal Code Enforcement	Medium	Low	Municipal Budget	Short	High	PR

Notes:

\*Does this mitigation initiative reduce the effects of hazards on new and/or existing buildings and/or infrastructure? Not applicable (NA) is inserted if this does not apply.

**Acronyms and Abbreviations:**

- ARC American Red Cross
- DPW Department of Public Works
- FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency
- HMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance
- HMP Hazard Mitigation Proposal



N/A	Not applicable
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NYSOEM	New York State Office of Emergency Management
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
SWCD	Cayuga County Soil and Water Conservation District
USACE	U.S Army Corp of Engineers
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

**Costs:**

Where actual project costs have been reasonably estimated:

Low = < \$10,000

Medium = \$10,000 to \$100,000

High = > \$100,000

Where actual project costs cannot reasonably be established at this time:

Low = Possible to fund under existing budget. Project is part of, or can be part of an existing on-going program.

Medium = Could budget for under existing work-plan, but would require a reapportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the project would have to be spread over multiple years.

High = Would require an increase in revenue via an alternative source (i.e., bonds, grants, fee increases) to implement. Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed project.

**Benefits:**

Where possible, an estimate of project benefits (per FEMA’s benefit calculation methodology) has been evaluated against the project costs, and is presented as:

Low = < \$10,000

Medium = \$10,000 to \$100,000

High = > \$100,000

Where numerical project benefits cannot reasonably be established at this time:

Low = Long term benefits of the project are difficult to quantify in the short term.

Medium = Project will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property, or project will provide an immediate reduction in the risk exposure to property.

High = Project will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.

**Potential FEMA HMA Funding Sources:**

PDM = Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program

FMA = Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program

RFC = Repetitive Flood Claims Grant Program

SRL = Severe Repetitive Loss Grant Program

HMGP = Hazard Mitigation Grant Program

**Timeline:**

Short = 1 to 5 years. Long Term= 5 years or greater. OG = On-going program.

DOF = Depending on funding.

**Notes (for Mitigation Type):**

1. PR=Prevention: Government, administrative or regulatory actions or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built Examples of these are acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofits, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.



2. PP= Property Protection: These actions also include public activities to reduce hazard losses or actions that involve (1) modification of existing buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or (2) removal of the structures from the hazard area. Examples include planning and zoning, floodplain local laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and storm water management regulations.
3. PE=Public Education and Awareness: Actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Such actions include outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and school-age and adult education programs.
4. NR=Natural Resource Protection: Actions that minimize hazard loss and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. These actions include sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
5. SP=Structural Projects: Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Such structures include dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.
6. ES=Emergency Services: Actions that protect people and property, during and immediately following, a disaster or hazard event. Services include warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities.

## G.) PRIORITIZATION OF MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Initiative #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits equal or exceed Costs? (Yes or No)	Is project Grant eligible? (Yes or No)	Can Project be funded under existing programs/budgets? (Yes or No)	Priority (High, Med., Low)
CV-1	2	M	L	Y	N	N	H
CV-2	2	H	L	Y	Y	Y	H
CV-3	2	M	L	Y	N	N	M
CV-4	1	M	M	Y	N	N	H
CV-5	2	M	L	Y	N	N	H
CV-6	5	M	M	Y	Y	N	H
CV-7	2	M	M	Y	Y	Y	M
CV-8	2	M	M	Y	Y	Y	M
CV-9	2	M	M	Y	Y	Y	M
CV-10	3	M	M	Y	Y	N	M
CV-11	1	L	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-12	4	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-13	1	M	M	Y	N	Y	M
CV-14	2	M	M	Y	Y	N	M
CV-15	2	H	L	Y	Y	N	H
CV-16	4	H	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-17	2	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-18	2	M	M	Y	N	Y	M
CV-19	2	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-20	2	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-21	2	M	L	Y	N	Y	H
CV-22	2	M	L	Y	N	Y	H

Notes: H = High. L = Low. M = Medium. N = No. N/A = Not applicable. Y = Yes.

**Explanation of Priorities**

High Priority = A project that meets multiple objectives (i.e., multiple hazards), benefits exceeds cost, has funding secured or is an on-going project and project meets eligibility requirements for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) or Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program (PDM) programs. High priority projects can be completed in the short term (1 to 5 years).

Medium Priority = A project that meets goals and objectives, benefits exceeds costs, funding has not been secured but project is grant eligible under, HMGP, PDM or other grant programs. Project can be completed in the short term, once funding is completed. Medium priority projects will become high priority projects once funding is secured.

Low Priority = Any project that will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits do not exceed the costs or are difficult to quantify, funding has not been secured and project is not eligible for HMGP or PDM grant funding, and time line for completion is considered long term (1 to 10 years). Low priority projects may be eligible other sources of grant funding from other programs. A low priority project could become a high priority project once funding is secured as long as it could be completed in the short term.

Prioritization of initiatives was based on above definitions: Yes

Prioritization of initiatives was based on parameters other than stated above: Not applicable.


**H.) FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/VULNERABILITY**

No information at this time.

**I.) HAZARD AREA EXTENT AND LOCATION**

A hazard area extent and location map has been generated for the jurisdiction to illustrate the probable areas impacted within the municipality and is provided on the next page. This map is based on the best available data at the time of the preparation of this Plan, and is considered to be adequate for planning purposes. Maps have only been generated for those hazards that can be clearly identified using mapping techniques and technologies, and for which the jurisdiction has significant exposure. The Planning Area maps are provided in the hazard profiles within Section 5.4, Volume I of this Plan.





**J.) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

No additional comments at this time.

**K.) NFIP ADMINISTRATOR INPUT**

**1. Planning and Regulatory**

The Village of Cato joined the NFIP on August 8, 1974, and is currently an active member of the NFIP. Flood Insurance Rate Maps have been in effect for the community since August 2, 2007.

**2. Administrative and Technical Staff**

The Village of Cato has identified personnel to manage and uphold the Village of Cato's compliance with the NFIP. Dedicated staff include: Howard Tanner, Code Enforcement Officer and NFIP Administrator.

**3. Financial**

As of June, 2012, there are zero policies enforced within the Village of Cato. A total of eight insurance claims have been reported within the Village of Cato. As of July, 2013 there have been zero repetitive loss properties and zero severe repetitive loss properties within the Village of Cato.

**4. Educational**

None at this time.

**5. Actions to Strengthen the Program**

None at this time.