## Lochloosa Connector Smith & Smith 5/23/2019

Project Score			<b>Natural Community</b>	Condition		
6.73 of 10.00			Mesic Hammock	Good-Excellent		
Inspection Date			Basin Swamp	Good-Excellent		
5/21/2019			Gum Pond	Excellent		
Size						
14.52						
Parcel Number	Acreage					
18354-037-001	14.	52				
Section-Township-Range						
35-11-21			Other	Condition		
Buildings						
0 ACPA						
Just Value	Just Value Per Acre		Archaeological Sites			
\$32,900	\$2,266		13 Master Site file Sites within 1 mile			
Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	<b>Total Value Per Acre</b>		Bald Eagle Nests			
\$32,900	\$2,266		9 within 1 mile, with one onsite			
Acquisition Type			Nuisance Bear Reports			
Donation			1 Within a mile of site			

**REPA Score** 7.73 of 9.44

KBN Sccore N/A

Outstanding Florida Waters Adjacent to Orange Lake and less than 1 mile from Lochloosa Lake

**Cross Creek Special Area Study** 

## **Overall Description:**

The Lochloosa Connector Smith & Smith property is 14.5 acres in size and is comprised of 1 parcel owned by Joel and Richmond Smith, 2 brothers, who would like to donate the property to Alachua County through the Alachua County Forever Program. The Property is located in Cross Creek and is accessed from County Road 325 via SE 171<sup>st</sup> Lane. Cross Creek is nestled between Orange Lake and Lake Lochloosa and is nearly surrounded by the Weyerhaeuser (Georgia Pacific) Lochloosa Conservation Easement and the Saint Johns River Water Management District's Lochloosa Conservation Area. The Smith & Smith property is bordered on the west by a marshy portion of Orange Lake that is owned by the Audubon Society Inc. and on east by SE 171<sup>st</sup> Lane. It is surrounded by large rural lots ranging from 5 to 30 acres in size with limited existing development (Map 2). Conservation Florida is working on conservation easements with several adjacent and nearby land owners (approximately 100 acres) that are interested in protecting their lands.

The property is a mosaic of natural communities dominated by mesic hammock in good to excellent condition that transitions from a cabbage palm, live oak, dominated community on the western part of the property, to a more hydric hammock near the basin swamp with black gum and loblolly bay, to a more diverse upland hardwood forest type community with southern magnolia, pignut hickory, sweet gum, live oak, southern hackberry, devils waking stick, and flowering dogwood on the eastern portion of

the site. Notable plants observed were milkvine and green dragon. The gum pond on the southeast portion of the property appears to be a former (relic) sink hole that holds water.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)reported 9 bald eagle nests and one nuisance bear within a mile of the Smith & Smith Property. According to FWC data, one of the FWC bald eagle nests is on the property. However, this nest was not observed by staff.

Coral Ardisia and a single small tropical soda apple were the only non-native invasive plants observed on the property. Coral ardisia was found near the wetter areas of the property in low densities. The highest density of plants were near the eastern side of the property, including a tree fall gap which had a moderate density patch of ardisia.

An aerial review of the property from the 1938 aerials to present did not reveal any obvious clearing or building on the property. Although there was evidence of previous hunting on the property, including a derelict hunt stand, blind and small hoist system. There are 13 Department of Historical Resources Master Site file Sites within a mile of the property ranging from prehistoric mounds to artifact scatter and pottery.

## Development Review

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 Development Scenario is oversimplified, and is only meant to convey a general sense of the potential of development intensity that could be possible based on land use and zoning conditions.

The parcel is zoned Agriculture (A) which allows the construction of one (1) unit per five (5) acres. As for Future Land Use, this parcel is located in the "Cross Creek Special Area Study (SAS)", (ULDC, Article 4, Section 405.14 Cross Creek). The Cross Creek SAS has been divided into resource protection zones, and this specific parcel has been categorized as "Exceptional Upland Habitat." The location of this parcel allows the potential for a property owner to transfer permitted density in a resource protection area to appropriate adjoining property not under the same ownership if all of the affected property are presented for development as a Planned Development (PD). For "Exceptional Upland Habitat," such a transfer could increase the allowable unit construction to two (2) dwellings per five (5) acres.

There would be minimal probability for multi-development plans to coincide for the transfer of credits within this SAS, and in reality would only increase density from two (2) to four (4) allowable units for this parcel. Even though the parcel is remote with minimal residential structures or supporting infrastructure, the concentration of available upland within the eastern half of the property and available driveway access to SE 171st Lane and CR 325 does increase the potential options for the construction of at least a couple residential structures.

## Note on the Cross Creek Special Study Area:

The purpose of the Cross Creek Village Special Area Study is 'to establish general policies and development guidelines for future development in this study area so that future land development is designed to place the environmental integrity of this area in the forefront of all development proposals. These development regulations have the purpose of guiding and accomplishing the coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development called for in the Cross Creek Special Area Study.' The focus is on

special recognition of the unique environmental (wetlands, exceptional upland habitat and hammocks, eagle nests), cultural (MKR house), and historical conditions (historic village center) of the area.

	Lochloosa Forest Connector - Smith & Smitl	า - 5/	23/2019		
CATEGORY	Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteria Score Multiplied by Relative Importance
	A. Whether the property has geologic/hydrologic conditions that would easily enable				
(I-1) PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES	contamination of vulnerable aquifers that have value as drinking water sources;  B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function;		2		
	C. Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs,		2		
	sinkholes, or wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface		•		
	water quality;  D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		3		
	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;		2		
	B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		2		
	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property;		4		
(I-2)	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		4		
PROTECTION OF NATURAL	E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other		4		
COMMUNITIES	environmental protections such as conservation easements;		3		
AND LANDSCAPES	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		2		
	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		
	Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern;		3		
	B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home		5		
(I-3) PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES	ranges;  C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua County;		4		
	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;     B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining.		2		
	greenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective.		4		
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES			3.15	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333			4.20
(II-1)	A. Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and				
MANAGEMENT ISSUES	other values (examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period, and so on);		4		
	B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.		3		
(II-2) ECONOMIC AND ACQUISITION ISSUES	A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, state, federal, or private contributions;		5		
	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		4		
	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		<u> </u>	3.80	1
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667		3.00	2.53
	TOTAL SCORE	0.007			6.73
	TOTAL GOOKL				0.10





