

Kanapaha Prairie

Lane

7/23/2020

Project Score		Buildings	
7.00 of 10.00		1 ACPA, 2 on site (house, barn)	
Inspection Date		Just Value	Just Value Per Acre
7/14/2020		\$900,960	\$7,117
Size		Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	Total Value Per Acre
126.6 acres		\$1,287,332	\$10,168
Parcel Number	Acreage	Acquisition Type	
07397-004-006	50.3	Conservation Easement	
07354-022-000	20.22		
07354-001-000	15		
07354-004-001	3		
07398-016-000	38.08		
Section-Township-Range		Natural Community	Condition
16-11-19	09-11-19	Mesic Hammock	good
15-11-19		Upland Hardwood Forest	good
		Depression Swamp	good
		Basin Marsh	good-fair
		Wet Prairie	fair
		Depression Marsh	fair
		Upland Mixed Woodland	fair-poor
Archaeological Sites		Other	
0 recorded on site, 7 in 1 mile (<i>plus 3 historic structures in 1 mile</i>)		Improved pasture	
Bald Eagle Nests		Rough pasture	
0 on site, 2 in one mile		Low impact development	
REPA Score		Utility corridor	
7.18 of 9.44			
KBN Score			

OVERALL DESCRIPTION:

The Lane property consists of 126.6 acres in 5 parcels under one ownership, located in the Kanapaha Prairie Alachua County Forever project. The property is adjacent to the Frederick & Spalding conservation easement property and the Conservation Fund (Kanapaha Prairie Crane and Wildlife Refuge) conservation property and downstream of Barr Hammock Levy Prairie. A conservation easement on this land would protect the wildlife habitats and hydrological connections between these existing conservation lands. Protection of the property would also expand protection of the stream to sink system connecting Levy Prairie to Pierson Sink, a point of aquifer recharge. The property was previously evaluated in 2008, and placed into the Eligibility Pool by the Land Conservation Board on

12/11/2008. This is an update of the 2008 evaluation. Conditions on site have not changed significantly since the first review.

The Lane property consists of five individual parcels. The western four parcels are contiguous, and the eastern most parcel is disconnected. The following property description is broken into two areas: four western parcels & detached eastern parcel.

The four western parcels total ~77 acres and support a wide variety of ecosystems including: basin marsh, wet prairie, mesic hammock, upland hardwood forest with a very small remnant of upland mixed woodland. The south & west sides of the property are contiguous with the Frederick & Spalding and the Conservation Fund properties respectively. The western 41 acres of the property, which contain part of the Kanapaha Prairie basin, mesic hammock and basin marsh, are not fenced off from the larger Kanapaha Prairie property (owned by the Conservation Fund) and are impacted by cattle grazing and mowing, which in part are utilized as a management tool to maintain Kanapaha Prairie in an open condition. This property linkage contains an important hydrological & habitat connection for Kanapaha Prairie. The basin marsh supports a willow head and other wetland vegetation such as rush species, water lilies, maidencane and pickerel-weed. This willow head is a nesting site for little blue herons (2008 personal comm. Peter Frederick). The wet prairie is dominated by bahia grass but provides important habitat for resident and migrating sandhill cranes, federally endangered whooping cranes, and a broad range of wading birds, including federally threatened wood storks.

The mesic hammock and upland hardwood forests are in good condition but have some vehicular and footpath trails within them. The mesic hammock supports a mature stand of majestic live oaks with little regeneration due to mowing & grazing. The upland mixed woodland still has a good number of mockernut hickory, rusty blackhaws and southern red oaks, but would take a considerable effort to restore. The Lane residence and detached storage/garage are located on the edge of the Kanapaha Prairie. The residence area overlooking the prairie is fenced off from grazing but this basin marsh and wet prairie segment is mowed to provide a vista. The owners have expressed interest in ecosystem restoration, and in promoting community conservation strategies.

The eastern 50 acre parcel supports mesic hammock, upland hardwood forest, depression swamp, depression marsh, basin marsh, rough pasture, and an area of improved pasture. The majority of this parcel is mesic hammock and upland hardwood forest. Most importantly, on the southern boundary of this parcel is the hydrologic connection between Levy Prairie and Kanapaha Prairie. All the wetlands and surface waters have historically been altered, but still provide important connectivity.

Non-native plant species observed on the property in low densities include camphor tree, Caesars weed, Asiatic jasmine, Japanese climbing fern and Mimosa while forage grasses such as Bahia grass are in high density. A small garden landscape near the house contains additional invasive plants such as lantana, tuberous sword fern, and other. These have not spread from the landscape boundary.

Imperiled species documented on the property include Royal fern (commercially exploited), Whooping cranes, (FE), Florida sandhill crane (ST), tricolored heron (ST), Little Blue heron (ST), Southeastern American kestrel (ST) Florida black bear, gopher tortoise (ST), and American alligator (FT).

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

The four western parcels are contiguous and total approximately 77 acres in area. Alachua County land use and zoning designations for the parcels are Rural/Agriculture and Agricultural, respectively. Gross density allowed in these classifications is one single family detached unit per five acres (1 unit/5ac). Approximately 76.16 acres of the parcels lie within the 100-year floodplain (0.84 acres on parcel 07354-022-000 lie outside of the floodplain). This is the controlling factor with respect to how many lots could be created. The comprehensive plan and land development regulations prohibit the creation of new lots without sufficient buildable area outside of conservation areas. Floodplains are considered conservation areas. Development potential, therefore, is one single family dwelling on each of the four parent parcels. Parcel 07354-001-000 currently already contains a residence.

The detached eastern parcel is approximately 50 acres in area. Alachua County land use and zoning designations for the parcel are Rural/Agriculture and Agricultural, respectively. Gross density allowed in these classifications is one single family detached unit per five acres (1 unit/5ac). Approximately 47 acres of the parcel lie within the 100-year floodplain. This is the controlling factor with respect to how many lots could be created. The three non-floodplain acres are located in the northeast corner of the parcel adjacent to SR 121. The comprehensive plan and land development regulations prohibit the creation of new lots without sufficient buildable area outside of conservation areas. Floodplains are considered conservation areas. Generally speaking, one lot could be developed on this parcel. Approximately three lots might be created in a Rural/Agriculture Clustered Subdivision scenario.

REPA - Kanapaha Prairie - Lane - 07/23/20					
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;		5		
	B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function;		5		
	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		
	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;		3		
	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;		4		
	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		4		
	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.		3		
(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;		3		
	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;		3		
	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;		2		
	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.		4		
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES			3.75	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333			5.00
(II-1) MANAGEMENT ISSUES	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);		4		
	B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.		4		
(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;		2		
	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		3		
	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		2		
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES			3.00	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667			2.00
	TOTAL SCORE				7.00



