Lochloosa Slough Flatwoods Lochloosa Slough Fox Pen Connector 4/25/2019

	4/23/	2013			
Project Score		Buildings			
		0 ACOA, 4 on site (hunt camp sheds and outhouse			
7.27 of 10.00					
Inspection Date		Just Value	Just Value Per Acre		
4/8/2019		\$3,694,530 \$922			
Size		Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	Total Value Per Acre		
4007.28		\$3,694,530	\$922		
Parcel Number	Acreage	Acquisition Type			
20012-000-000	480 acres	Fee Simple			
20019-000-000	481.35 acres				
20023-000-000	257.26 acres				
20045-000-000	80 acres				
20052-000-000	465 acres				
20054-000-000	600 acres				
20055-000-000	40 acres	Natural Community	Condition		
20058-000-000	400 acres	Mesic Flatwood	Fair		
20060-000-000	240 acres	Depression Marsh	Good		
20061-000-000	80 acres	Basin Marsh	Fair-Good		
20062-000-000	299.83 acres	Basin Swamp	Good		
20072-000-000	16.12 acres*	Dome Swamp	Good		
20072-005-000	99.24 acres*	Flatwoods/Prairie Lake	Very Good		
20126-004-000	56.65 acres*	Sandhill	Fair		
20134-000-000	140.08 acres (20 acres*)	Scrubby Flatwoods	Fair		
20144-000-000	271.75 acres	Other	Condition		
*non contiguous parcels		Pine Plantation	Good		
		Old Field Pine Plantation	Good		
Section-Township-Range		Archaeological Sites			
		1 recorded on site, 4 in 1 mile			
		(plus 21 historic structures and 1			
		historic cemetery in 1 mile)			
13-11-22	26-11-22				
14-11-22	27-11-22	Bald Eagle Nests			
22-11-22	34-11-22	2 on site, 9 in one mile			
23-11-22	35-11-22				
24-11-22	36-11-22				
25-11-22					
REPA Score	7.73 of 9.44				
KBN Sccore	Ranked 15 of 47 projects (Lochloosa Slough)			
		= ·			

Outstanding Florida Waters Lochloosa Lake 1 mile to the west

Overall Description:

The Lochloosa Slough Fox Pen Connector property consists of 4,007 acres across 16 parcels in eastern Alachua County. The property is located east of Hwy 301 the community of Lochloosa, and Lake Lochloosa, extending to the Putnam County border. The majority of the property (3,940 ac) lies in two strategic ecosystems, East Lochloosa Forest Strategic Ecosystem = 3,895 acres, and Lochloosa Slough Strategic Ecosystem = 45 acres.

The Lochloosa Slough Fox Pen Connector property would create a physical corridor between the recently acquired Fox Pen preserve (581 acres), and the Lochloosa Slough property (1,879 acres) currently on the active acquisition list. Combined, these properties would make up to a 6,467 acre complex of conservation land, bringing the network of conservation lands surrounding Lake Lochloosa closer to bridging a connection toward the Ocala National Forest via the BJ Bar ranch and the Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Cross Florida Greenway. The property contains portions of 4 watersheds draining toward Lake Lochloosa, Lochloosa Slough, and Orange Creek.

The property is dominated by mesic flatwoods and an extensive network of wetlands. Much of the mesic flatwoods on the property have been converted to pine plantation, the majority of which have been bedded. In 1939, aerial imagery shows approximately 200 acres cleared for agricultural use, with the majority of the flatwoods having a natural open canopy, possibly with cattle ranging underneath, and the wetland marshes with an open condition and little woody encroachment. By the 1980s, active conversion to pine plantation had been initiated and today, over 1,500 acres of pine plantation occur on the property, in stands ranging in age from 3 years old to 29 years old. Fuel loading in the mesic flatwoods and pine plantation areas is moderate overall, with heavier shrub layers near the basin swamp and baygall margins, and lighter fuels in the younger timber stands. Native groundcover exists throughout most of the flatwoods and pine plantations at varying levels. The shrub layer is dominated by saw palmetto, with varying levels of gallberry, huckleberry, wax myrtle, *Lyonia* and *Vaccinium* species.

One of the most notable natural features of the property is the high quantity and overall quality of the wetlands, including: 60+ depression marshes, 7 flatwoods/prairie lakes, 6 dome swamps, 4 basin marshes, and areas of basin swamp and baygall. The lakes and marshes generally retain intact littoral zones were present on many of these, and though ecotones had been disturbed in some instances, most of wetland margins and riparian zones had been protected from direct disturbance associated with forestry practices in the surrounding areas. The basin marshes showed the greatest impact from management practices onsite, primarily fire exclusion. The 300+ acre basin marsh at the north end of the property was open in 1939, but over the decades became increasingly hardwood-encroached, appearing more like a shrub swamp at the time of the site evaluation.

The small area of sandhill and scrubby flatwoods near the center of the property retains several key species, including scattered longleaf pine, Chapman's oak, myrtle oak, sand live oak, post oak and suppressed wiregrass. A larger footprint of xeric habitat appears to have been cleared for agriculture prior to 1939. The area has been fire suppressed, but has components in place that will respond to management.

Non-native invasive plants were found in only four locations on the property, all of which were on road edges, and were in low numbers at each site. The greatest potential for other occurrences is on the non-contiguous, western parcels, which are neighbored by housing, and for which access was limited at the

time of evaluation. Notably, the isolated parcel, 20072-005-000, was not accessible during the evaluation. Feral hoot rooting was observed in a limited area near one of the wetlands.

Two commercially exploited plants occur on the property: Royal fern, and Cinnamon fern. Other notable native plants observed onsite include: spring ladies tresses, small butterwort, Florida indian plantain (endemic), netted pawpaw (endemic), one of the species of state-threatened milkvine, sawgrass in one marsh, and another marsh dominated by Walter's sedge.

Wildlife observed onsite during the site evaluation include: white-tailed deer, spicebush swallowtail, zebra swallowtail, eastern tiger swallowtail, giant swallowtail, belted kingfisher, wild turkey, little blue heron, Great egret, Great blue heron, swallow-tailed kite, wood duck, and gopher tortoise burrows in multiple locations. There are records of Florida black bear on the property, as well as bobcat.

Infrastructure/Improvements on the property include a network of vehicle access trails, and hunt camp which contains several RVs and small sheds, an outhouse (?), and a target practice mound.

One archaeological site has been identified on the property, recorded in the Florida Master Site File as a prehistoric burial mound for Cades Pond (300 BC to 800 AD) and St. Johns cultures (700 BC to 800 AD). Four additional sites, 21 historic structures and 1 historic cemetery are mapped within one mile, all associated with the community of Lochloosa. Remnants of historic turpentine harvest were found in multiple locations on the site, primarily catfaced stumps with herty cups on the edges of wetlands.

Development analysis:

This development analysis is based on a limited desk-top review and is founded upon current County Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan policies. The scenarios are oversimplified, and are meant only to convey a general sense of the potential of development intensity that could be possible based on land use and zoning conditions. The 16 parcels are zoned Agriculture, and have a Land Use designation of Rural/Agriculture, but also fall almost entirely within two strategic ecosystems. Based on the existing zoning which allows one unit per 5 acres, and the strategic ecosystem clustering, upland set-asides, and wetland setbacks, 1,097 total potential units that could be developed on the property. Though half of the property is within upland areas, there would be substantial limitations in the ability to prepare residential design plan that could incorporate and contain the necessary internal infrastructure (e.g. roadways, utilities, stormwater basins, etc.) within the uplands while protecting the wetlands and associated 75 ft. buffers. However, it is feasible that there may be some interest in development design proposing fewer and larger lot parcels where road frontage is available. Suggested Score = 3: Land is not currently protected from development but is only moderately likely to develop.

CATEGORY	Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteria Score Multiplied by Relative Importance
(I-1) PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES	A. Whether the property has geologic/hydrologic conditions that would easily enable contamination of vulnerable aquifers that have value as drinking water sources;		2		
	B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function;		3		
	C. Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs, sinkholes, or wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface		3		
	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		4		
(I-2) PROTECTION OF NATURAL COMMUNITIES AND LANDSCAPES	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;		4		
	B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		3		
	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property;		3		
	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		4		
	E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental protections such as conservation easements;		3		
	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		5		
	G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or springs;		2		
	H. Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects.		4		
(I-3) PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES	A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern;		5		
	B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home ranges;		5		
	C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua County;		5		
	D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as breeding, roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering;		4		
	E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity;		4		
	F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species.		4		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate;		4		
	B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining greenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning		4		
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES		4		
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	4 2222		3.75	5.00
	A. Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and	1.3333			5.00
MANAGEMENT ISSUES	other values (examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period,		3		
	B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.		5		
	A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, state, federal, or private contributions;		1		
(11-2)	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		5		
ACQUISITION ISSUES	C. Whether there is imminent threat of losing the environmental, social or other values of the property through development and/or lack of sufficient legislative protections (this requires analysis of current land use, zoning, owner intent, location and				
			3		
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES			3.40	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.6667			2.27

NOTES

General Criteria Scoring Guidelines

1 = Least beneficial, 2 = Less Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 5 = Most Beneficial



