Watermelon Pond Pinkoson and Upshaw 12/12/19

Project Score:	6.53 of 10.00 Natural Communities:					
Inspection Date:	11/26/20		Sandhill	Excellent to Very Good		
Size:	119.3 acres		Depression marsh	Very Good		
Parcel Numbers: 02649-000-000 39.3 acres 02646-000-000 (partial) 80 acres			OTHER: Successional Hardwoods			
S-T-R:	26-10S-17E					
Buildings:	0 ACPA, 0 on site		Archaeological Sit	0 recorded on site.		
Just Value:	\$680,000	\$5,714/acre		1 in 1 mile		
Total Value: (Just, Misc, Bld)	\$680,000	\$5,714/acre	Bald Eagle Nests:	0 in 1 mile		
Acquisition Type:		Fee Simple				

REPA Score: 7.47 of 9.44

KBN Score: Ranked 15 of 47 projects (Watermelon Pond)

Overall Description:

The 119 acre Pinkoson and Upshaw property is located in southwest Alachua County, approximately 1.3 miles due north of the Watermelon Pond Preserve Metzger tract, and 1.3 miles northwest of the Watermelon Pond Preserve Wright and Kinnard tracts. The property is located within the Watermelon Pond watershed. ACF staff visited the site on 09/30/2019, and 11/26/2019.

The property is primarily high quality, intact sandhill natural community, with a highly diverse groundcover, an uneven–aged longleaf pine overstory and wide-spread longleaf pine natural regeneration. The sandhill natural community has been reduced to less than 10% of its historic range in the southeastern United States. Sites with intact groundcover are both extremely rare and additionally highly valuable for the role they can play as seed donor sites in restoration of degraded sites. This fire dependent-ecosystem has been well-maintained with prescribed fire on the northern 80 acres, but has less frequent recent fire history on the southern 39 acres.

The understory is highly diverse, dominated by wiregrass and pineywoods dropseed, but also contains a variety of other grasses and forbs typical of healthy sandhill groundcover. Some species of interest that are present include lopsided indiangrass, yellow indiangrass, gopher apple, *Pityopsis, Liatris, Carphephorus, Rhynchosia, Polygonella, Balduina*, shiny blueberry, and coontie. Upland oaks, including turkey oak and sand live oak are scattered throughout the site, but they are mostly restricted to the midstory and understory due to the burn history of the site. Aerial imagery shows that much of the pine overstory was harvested between 1968 and 1974, but enough were left on site to create a scattered, uneven aged stand of longleaf pine today.

The southern 39 acres are in a slightly different condition. An area of oak-intruded sandhill is located in the southwestern 20 acres of the property. This area contains a midstory of upland oaks and woody shrubs, with dense, intact groundcover, only needing prescribed fire for rapid improvement. The southeastern 19 acres has a higher density of turkey oak, sand live oak, but also has a higher percentage of laurel oak and water oak, trending toward successional hardwood forest. This condition overlaps with a historic site clearing visible in the in the 1948 aerial imagery indicating possible use as unimproved pasture. Despite the hardwood component it still contains desirable species including mature longleaf pine and widely-occurring but suppressed wiregrass.

Numerous active gopher tortoise burrows were observed throughout the site. Sherman's fox squirrels, indigo snakes, pine snakes, northern bob white quail, Florida black bear, Eastern diamondback rattlesnake, deer, turkey, kestrels, Eastern bluebirds, and many other wildlife species have been observed on site by the landowner and FFS County Forester. During the site visit, ACF staff observed sandhill cranes, swamp sparrows, common yellowthroats, Eastern phoebe, pine warblers, palm warblers, ovenbirds, white-eyed vireos, blue-headed vireos, Carolina chickadees, ruby-crowned kinglets, turkey, downy woodpecker, red-bellied woodpecker, red-headed woodpecker, and other bird species. Two ephemeral wetlands, typical of sandhill communities, are present on the property, but have not been surveyed for gopher frogs.

The only exotic plant species observed on site was a 20 ft x 20 ft patch of bahaia grass near the south boundary of the property, and one tropical soda apple plant in the hardwood edge on the south boundary.

There are no documented historic resources present on the property. The lands to the west and south have been converted to center-pivot irrigation agricultural fields. The lands to the north and east are in a forested condition, including intact sandhill, longleaf pine plantation, and slash pine plantation.

The property is not conducive to recreational activities because of the difficulty in accessing the site. The property can be accessed by a private road from the northeast, which would not be an appropriate route for public access.

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

Development Scenario

The parcels are zoned Agriculture (A) and have a Land Use designation of Rural/Agriculture. The parcels have no frontage on a publicly maintained road. Access is via a private, unpaved road and ingress/egress easements. Based on the existing zoning, which allows for 1 unit per 5 acres, up to 23 residential units could be built within the 119-acre subject site. Depending on the presence and locations of upland areas potentially designated as significant habitat combined with the required wetland and buffer protection, residential design layout would probably require some degree of clustering individual lots. Because of the lower density zoning requirements, it may be possible that clustering would not necessarily result in lowering the quantity of residential units. However, there are few residential structures in this remote rural area and there would be increased construction costs associated with providing adequate infrastructure (i.e. utilities, access roads, potable wells, septic tanks, etc.).

V	Vatermelon Pond - Pinkoson and Upshaw	N	lovember	2019	
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; B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function; 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 water quality;		5 5		
(I-2) PROTECTION OF NATURAL COMMUNITIES AND LANDSCAPES	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function. A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities; B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		1 1 2		
	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property; D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities; E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental protections such as conservation easements;		5 3 2		
	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts; G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or springs; H. Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects.		4 1		
(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; B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home ranges; C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua County; D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as breeding,		4 4		
	roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering; E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity; F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species. A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate;		4 5 5 2		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	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 perspective. AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES		3	3.30	
(II-1) MANAGEMENT ISSUES	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE A. Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and other values (examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period, and so on); B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.	1.3333	4 5		4.40
(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; B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition; 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		1 3		
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE TOTAL SCORE	0.6667	,	3.20	2.13 6.53



