Austin Cary Flatwoods Parcel E 2/23/2017

Project Score:		6.93 of 10.00				
Size:		1242.83 acres	Natural Communities		Condition	
Parcel Numbers:		17641-000-000	Mesic Flatwoods		Poor to Fair	
		Portions of:	Dome Swamp		Poor to Good	
		17645-000-000	Bottomland Forest	ottomland Forest		
		17650-000-000			Excellent	
		17702-000-000	Blackwater Stream	kwater Stream		
S-T-R:	Portions of:				Excellent	
	11,13,23-9S-21E		Other:			
			2 within 2	ithin 2 miles		
Buildings:	0		Archaeological Sites	One within	tract	
Appraised Bare	\$2.532MM	\$2,037.28/ac				
Land Value:						

REPA Score: KBN Score: 7.36 of 9.44 Austin Cary Flatwoods Project Ranked 15th of 47 projects (Austin Cary Flatwoods)

Overall Description:

The 1,242.83 acre Parcel E nomination consists of four parcels in eastern Alachua County on the north side of SR 26, approximately 1 mile west of Orange Heights. The tract, currently owned by Weyerhaeuser, is managed for timber production. The property shares 1.48 miles of boundary with the Newnans Lake Conservation Area to the west, and 2.54 miles of boundary with Balu Forest to the east, both of which are part of the larger matrix of already conserved lands that stretch south to Newnan's Lake. The Donaldson Tract, currently on the Active Acquisition list, is located north of Parcel E. Parcel E is an important piece of the Critical Ecological Corridor identified in the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan, and is also part of the larger ecological greenway that connects the Ocala and Osceola National Forests. Additionally, the property contains approximately 1.25 miles of Beetree Creek, a major tributary to Hatchet Creek and ultimately to Newnans Lake. Acquisition of this property would not only contribute to the existing conservation lands in the Austin Cary Flatwoods project area, but would also contribute to maintaining and/or improving water quality in Hatchet Creek and the downstream Newnans Lake.

If acquired, the proposal is for Alachua County Forever Program Staff to manage the property as part of Balu Forest.

Parcel E is currently managed for timber production and the majority of the tract (953 acres) consists of bedded loblolly and slash pine plantations. Some of these plantations were clearcut in late 2016 (150 acres), while the oldest is 36 years old. The groundcover in these plantations is largely palmetto-gallberry typical of mesic flatwoods, but there are patches of native grasses throughout. There is one isolated upland stand that is just over 5 acres that is inaccessible without crossing Beetree Creek. It consists of an overstory of mature slash pine approximately 60 years old. A close examination of this stand was not possible during the field visit, but it appears that it should be considered in fair condition due to fire suppression and high stocking levels of pine.

The wetlands in Parcel E consist of dome swamps and bottomland hardwood forests totaling 250 acres of wetland. The dome swamps vary widely in quality. Timber was harvest from 69 acres of dome swamp 14 years ago, while the remainder of the wetlands have not seen any timber harvesting activities for nearly 70 years. These unharvested stands have an overstory of mature cypress, tupelo, red maple, and oaks. One alteration of note is that a previous landowner dug ditches connecting isolated wetlands. These ditches have not been maintained over the years and have revegetated and are stable. The bottomland hardwood forests on the property are located along Beetree Creek and its unnamed tributary. These forests are of good to excellent quality, with the exception that the ecotone is abrupt between this forest type and the upland pine plantations. The creeks themselves appear to be of excellent quality, as they drain out of Balu Forest to the east.

No rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife species were observed on Parcel E. FNAI element occurrence records indicate gopher tortoise and spotted turtle are present on the property. Two bald eagle nests are located within 2 miles west of the property, while Florida black bear and Sherman's fox squirrels are known to utilize the surrounding forests.

No non-native plant species were observed on the property. That being said, on Balu forest, Japanese climbing fern is frequently encountered along SR 26, and also infrequently along the unnamed tributary which also runs through Parcel E.

Due to its size and location among other conservation lands, Parcel E has great potential to provide recreational opportunities on its own and in concert with adjacent public lands.

The one known archeological site on the property is in the NE portion of the tract. This site is an old homesite from the early 1900's that is partially on Balu Forest.

Access to the site is directly off of State Route 26. The property itself has a good infrastructure of internal graded roads totaling 35 acres. It appears there is an easement to an inholding from SR26 along the SE edge of the property. The exact location of this easement still needs to be confirmed.

This development analysis is based on a limited desk-top review and is founded upon current Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan policies. Scenarios may be oversimplified, and are meant only to convey a general sense of the range of development intensities that would be possible.

The property is composed of one entire tax parcel (17641-000-000) and three partial parcels (17650-000-000, 17645-000-000, 17702-000-000) with combined total area of approximately 1250.54 acres. All parcels have a Rural/Agriculture future land use designation and an Agricultural zoning classification. Gross residential density allowed in Rural/Agriculture land use and Agricultural zoning is one dwelling unit per five acres (1 du / 5 ac).

The western boundary of parcels 17650-000-000 and 17702-000-000 abut the Newnans Lake Conservation Area (NLCA). The NLCA is a public land managed by the St. Johns River Water Management District for conservation purposes. Development of lands adjacent to the NLCA is subject to the provisions of Chapter 405, Article 8 (Preservation Buffer Overlay District) of the Unified Land Development Code.

The entire property lies within the Austin Cary Flatwoods Strategic Ecosystem. Development of lands designated as Strategic Ecosystem is subject to the provisions of Chapter 406, Article 5 (Strategic Ecosystems) of the Unified Land Development Code.

The following conservation resources are present (all numbers approximate):

100-year Floodplain	=	237.05 acres
Surface Waters / Wetlands	=	219.51 acres
Surface Water / Wetlands Buffers	=	183.73 acres
Strategic Ecosystem	=	1250.54 acres

The property has approximately 5,368 feet of frontage on SR 26, a paved, publicly maintained arterial road.

If the owner/developer paved all internal subdivision roads to county standards, provided paved access to SR 26, and demonstrated consistency with provisions of Chapter 406, Article 5 of the Unified Land Development Code, the maximum development scenario for the property would be as a Rural/Agriculture Clustered Subdivision. All wetlands, required wetland buffers, and up to 50% of uplands would be required to be protected in perpetuity and could not be included within lot boundaries. Wetland buffers and non-wetland flood zones would count toward the upland conservation requirement. As a result, such clustered subdivision theoretically would consist of 325 lots on 515.52 acres of developable uplands with 735.03 acres of permanently protected conservation open space. Generally speaking, the minimum lot size in a Rural/Agriculture Clustered Subdivision is one acre. Whether one could actually achieve the maximum of 325 one-acre lots would depend on how much of the 515.52 acres of developable area would need to be assigned to required infrastructure such as roads and stormwater management facilities.

	Austin Cary Flatwoods - Parcel E	Feb	oruary 201	7	
CATEGORY	Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteri Score Multiplie 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;	. Ši	4		
	C. Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs, sinkholes, or	1	4		
	wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface water quality;		2		
	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		3		
	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;	- 8	2		
	B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		100		
			2		
(I 1) PROTECTION	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property;	2	2		
(I-2) PROTECTION OF NATURAL	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		5		
COMMUNITIES	E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental		2		
AND LANDSCAPES	protections such as conservation easements;	- 8	5		
	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;	8	5		
	G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or springs;	8	2		
	H. Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects.		5		
	A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered		2		
	A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of speciel concern;		2		
	 B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home ranges; 	3	4		
(I-3) PROTECTION	C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua	Ц. Ц			
OF PLANT AND	County;		3		
ANIMAL SPECIES	D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as	- 4	71		
	breeding, roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering;		4		
	E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity;		3		
	F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species.		4		
A & SOCIAL AND	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate;		4		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining greenbelt, provides				
HUMAN VALUES	scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective.		5	e	38
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES			3.40	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333			4,53
(II-1)	A. Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and other values				
MANAGEMENT	(examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period, and so on);		4		
ISSUES	B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.	8	3		
	A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, state,				
III IN ECONOMICS	federal, or private contributions;		5		
(II-2) ECONOMIC AND ACQUISITION	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		4		
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		597		
	use, zoning, owner intent, location and		2	2	25
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES	.]	ļ	3.60	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667			2.40
	TOTAL SCORE				6.93



