	Lochloosa C	Connector			
	Steph	ens			
	12/12/				
Project Score		Natural Community	Condition		
6.67 of 10.00		Mesic Hammock	Excellent		
Inspection Date					
12/5/2019					
Size					
11.93 acres		Other	Condition		
Parcel Number	Acreage				
18354-037-007	11.93				
Section-Township-Range		Archaeological Sites			
35-11-21		13 Master site file sites within 1 mile			
Buildings		Bald Eagle Nests			
None		9 within 1 mile			
Just Value	Just Value Per Acre	Nuisance Bear Reports			
\$37,580	\$3,150	1 within a mile of site			
Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg) Total Value Per Acre				
\$37,580	\$3,150				
Acquisition Type					
Donation					
REPA Score	7.73 of 9.44				
KBN Score	N/A				
Outstanding Florida Waters	Adjacent to Orange Lake	and less than 1 mile from Lo	ochloosa Lake		
Cross Creek Special Area Stu	-				

Overall Description:

The Lochloosa Connector Stephens property is 11.93 acres in size and is comprised of one parcel owned by Phyllis I. Stephens, Trustee, who would like to donate the property to Alachua County through the Alachua County Forever Program (ACF). The Property is located in Cross Creek and is accessed from County Road 325 via SE 171st Lane, an unpaved private road. 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 Stephens property is bordered on the west by a marshy portion of Orange Lake that is owned by the Audubon Society Inc.; on the south by two lots owned by Gary L. Mayhew; on the east by SE 171st Lane; and on the north by the Smith property which is currently going through the ACF donation process and is expected to close on December 20th, 2019. It is surrounded by large rural lots ranging from 5 to 30 acres in size with limited existing development (Map 2). Alachua Conservation Trust and Conservation Florida are working on conservation easements with several adjacent and nearby land owners (approximately 100 acres) that are interested in protecting their lands.

The property is dominated by mesic hammock natural community in excellent condition that transitions from a cabbage palm, live oak, dominated community on the western side of the property to a more

diverse upland hardwood forest type community with southern magnolia, pignut hickory, sabal palm, sweet gum, live oak, southern hackberry, wood oats on the eastern portion of the site.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) reported 9 bald eagle nests and one nuisance bear within a mile of the Stephens Property. An eagle nest was observed on the Morrison property just to the north of the adjacent Smith and Smith Property.

A low density of coral ardisia near the eastern side of the property was the only non-native invasive plant observed on the property.

An aerial review of the property from the 1938 aerials to present did not reveal any obvious clearing or building on the property. 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 six 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 non-floodplain 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.

	REPA -Lochloosa connector - Stephens Decem	ber	12th, 2019		
CATEGORY	Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteria Score Multiplied by Relative Importance
С	A. Whether the property has geologic/hydrologic conditions that would easily enable contamination of vulnerable aquifers that have value as drinking water sources;		2		
(I-1) PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES	3. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function;		2		
	Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs, inkholes, or wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface vater quality;		3		
D	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		3		
A	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;		1		
	3. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		2		
C	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property;		4		
(I-2)	Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		4		
O	Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental protections such as conservation easements;		3		
AND F	. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		2		
	 Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or prings; 		2		
а	 Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects. 		4		
	A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern;		3		
	3. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home		5		
OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES	anges; 2. 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		
	. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity;		4		
	. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species.		4		
(I-4) SOCIAL	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate; 3. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining		2		
VALUES g	reenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective.		4		
Α	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES			3.10	
R	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333			4.13
(II-1) MANAGEMENT a	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); 3. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.		4 3		
A	A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, tate, federal, or private contributions;		5		
ACQUISITION ISSUES	Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		4		
			· ·		
ISSUES p	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		
ISSUES p	property through development and/or lack of sufficient legislative protections (this requires		3	3.80]
ISSUES p	property through development and/or lack of sufficient legislative protections (this requires analysis of current land use, zoning, owner intent, location and	0.667	3	3.80	2.54





