


# Conservation Collier Initial Criteria Screening Report Chestnut Parcel



Owner Name: Diane Chestnut  
Folio Number: 57802400000  
Staff Report Date: July 6, 2022



# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	2
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>2. Summary of Property</b> .....	5
Figure 1 - Parcel Location Overview .....	5
Figure 2 - Parcel Close-up .....	6
<b>2.1 Summary of Property Information</b> .....	7
Table 1 – Summary of Property Information .....	7
Figure 3 - Secondary Criteria Score .....	8
Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary .....	8
<b>2.2 Summary of Assessed Value and Property Cost Estimates</b> .....	9
Table 3. Assessed & Estimated Value .....	9
<b>2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays</b> .....	9
<b>2.3 Initial Screening Criteria Satisfaction (Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10)</b> .....	10
<b>3. Initial Screening Criteria</b> .....	12
<b>3.1 Ecological Values</b> .....	12
<b>3.1.1 Vegetative Communities</b> .....	12
Table 4. Listed Plant Species .....	12
Figure 4 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities .....	13
Figure 5 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System .....	14
Figure 6 – Coastal scrub transitioning into maritime hammock .....	15
Figure 7 – Southern boundary of parcel – coastal scrub transitioning into maritime hammock .....	15
<b>3.1.2 Wildlife Communities</b> .....	16
Table 5 – Listed Wildlife Detected .....	16
Figure 8 – Active gopher tortoise burrow in NE corner of property .....	16
Figure 9 - Wildlife Spatial Data (i.e., telemetry, roosts, etc) .....	17
Figure 10 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness .....	18
<b>3.1.3 Water Resources</b> .....	19
Figure 11 - CLIP Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones .....	20
Figure 12 - Collier County Soil Survey .....	21
Figure 13 LIDAR Elevation Map .....	22
<b>3.1.4 Ecosystem Connectivity</b> .....	23

Figure 14 - Conservation Lands .....	23
<b>3.2 Human Values .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.2.1 Recreation .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.2.2 Accessibility .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Figure 15 - Cultural/ Aesthetic Attribute Photo 1.....	24
<b>3.3 Restoration and Management .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.3.1 Vegetation Management .....</b>	<b>25</b>
3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation .....	25
3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire .....	25
<b>3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.3.3 Assistance .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.4 Vulnerability.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Figure 16 – Zoning.....	26
Figure 17 –Future Land Use .....	26
<b>3.4.2 Development Plans .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. Management Needs and Costs .....</b>	<b>27</b>
Table 6 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management .....	27
<b>5. Potential for Matching Funds.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>7. Additional Site Photos .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 – Critical Lands and Water Identification Maps (CLIP) Definitions.....</b>	<b>33</b>

## 1. Introduction

The Conservation Collier Program (Program) is an environmentally sensitive land acquisition and management program approved by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners (Board) in 2002 and by Collier County Voters in 2002 and 2006. The Program was active in acquisition between 2003 and 2011, under the terms of the referendum. Between 2011 and 2016, the Program was in management mode. In 2017, the Collier County Board reauthorized Conservation Collier to seek additional lands (2/14/17, Agenda Item 11B). On November 3, 2020, the Collier County electors approved the Conservation Collier Re-establishment referendum with a 76.5% majority.

This Initial Criteria Screening Report (ICSR) has been prepared for the Conservation Collier Program in its 11th acquisition cycle to meet requirements specified in the Conservation Collier Implementation Ordinance, 2002-63, as amended, and for purposes of the Conservation Collier Program. The sole purpose of this report is to provide objective data to demonstrate how properties meet the criteria defined by the ordinance.

The following sections characterize the property location and assessed value, elaborate on the initial and secondary screening criteria scoring, and describe potential funding sources, appropriate use, site improvements, and estimated management costs.

## 2. Summary of Property



Figure 1 - Parcel Location Overview





Figure 2 - Parcel Close-up

## 2.1 Summary of Property Information

Table 1 – Summary of Property Information

Characteristic	Value	Comments
Name	Chestnut	Diane Chestnut
Folio Number	57802400000	Address: 660 Inlet Drive, Marco Island
Target Protection Area	Urban	Marco Island Target Mailing Area Cycle 11
Size	0.53 acres	
Section, Township, and Range	S16, Twn 52, R26	
Zoning Category/TDRs	RSF-3, Residential Single Family	RSF-3 maximum density is 3 units per gross acre
FEMA Flood Map Category	X	Low flood risk
Existing structures	None	
Adjoining properties and their Uses	Residential, Undeveloped, roadway	Single family residences to the north and west, undeveloped parcels to the south, and roadway (Inlet Dr.) to the east – with undeveloped parcels to the east of Inlet Dr.
Development Plans Submitted	None	
Known Property Irregularities	None known	
Other County Dept Interest	None	Parcel is within unincorporated Collier




Figure 3 - Secondary Criteria Score

Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary

Criteria	Awarded Weighted Points	Possible Weighted Points	Awarded/Possible Points
<b>1 - Ecological Value</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>46%</b>
1.1 - Vegetative Communities	43	53	80%
1.2 - Wildlife Communities	24	27	90%
1.3 - Water Resources	0	27	0%
1.4 - Ecosystem Connectivity	7	53	13%
<b>2 - Human Values</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>48%</b>
2.1 - Recreation	6	34	17%
2.2 - Accessibility	29	34	83%
2.3 - Aesthetics/Cultural Enhancement	4	11	38%
<b>3 - Restoration and Management</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>
3.1 - Vegetation Management	55	55	100%
3.2 - Remediation and Site Security	23	23	100%
3.4 - Assistance	2	2	100%
<b>4 - Vulnerability</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>81%</b>
4.1 - Zoning and Land Use	58	58	100%
4.2 - Development Plans	7	22	30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>64%</b>



## 2.2 Summary of Assessed Value and Property Cost Estimates

The interest being appraised is fee simple “as is” for the purchase of the site. A value of the parcel was estimated using only one of the three traditional approaches to value, the sales comparison approach. It is based on the principal of substitution that an informed purchaser would pay no more for the rights in acquiring a particular real property than the cost of acquiring, without undue delay, an equally desirable one. Three properties were selected for comparison, each with similar site characteristics, utility availability, zoning classification and road access. No inspection was made of the property or comparables used in this report and the Real Estate Services Department staff relied upon information solely provided by program staff. The valuation conclusion is limited only by the reported assumptions and conditions that no other known or unknown adverse conditions exist.

If the Board of County Commissioners choose to acquire the property, an appraisal by an independent Real Estate Appraiser will be obtained at that time. Pursuant to the Conservation Collier Purchase Policy, one appraisal is required for the Chestnut parcel, which has an initial valuation less than \$500,000; 1 independent Real Estate Appraiser will value the subject property and that appraisal report will determine the actual value of the subject property.

Table 3. Assessed & Estimated Value

Property owner	Address	Acreage	Assessed Value*	Estimated Value**
Diane Chestnut	660 Inlet Dr.	0.53	\$198,607	\$427,000

\* Assessed Value is obtained from the Property Appraiser’s Website. The Assessed Value is based off the current use of the property.

\*\*The Estimated Market Value for the Chestnut parcel was obtained from the Collier County Real Estate Services Department in June 2022.

### 2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays

Zoning, growth management and conservation overlays will affect the value of a parcel. The parcel is zoned Residential Single-Family-3. The maximum building density is 3 units per gross acre.

### 2.3 Initial Screening Criteria Satisfaction (Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10)

#### **Criteria 1: Native Habitats**

Are any of the following unique and endangered plant communities found on the property?  
Order of preference as follows:

<b>i.</b>	<b>Hardwood hammocks</b>	<b>Yes</b>
ii.	Xeric oak scrub	No
<b>iii.</b>	<b>Coastal strand</b>	<b>Yes</b>
iv.	Native beach	No
v.	Xeric pine	No
vi.	Riverine Oak	No
vii.	High marsh (saline)	No
viii.	Tidal freshwater marsh	No
ix.	Other native habitats	No

**Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 1:** The parcel consists primarily of maritime hammock, with some small patches of coastal scrub.

#### **Criteria 2: Human Social Values**

Does land offer significant human social values, such as equitable geographic distribution, appropriate access for nature-based recreation, and enhancement of the aesthetic setting of Collier County? **YES**

**Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 2:** This parcel is in the Urban Target Protection Area on Marco Island and has access from a public road. The parcel provides wildlife viewing and greenspace in a developed area. The parcel is too small to accommodate extensive trails but can be enjoyed from the sidewalk/road.

#### **Criteria 3: Water Resources**

Does the property offer opportunities for protection of water resource values, including aquifer recharge, water quality enhancement, protection of wetland dependent species habitat, and flood control? **NO**

**Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 3:** The parcel does not significantly protect water resources.

#### **Criteria 4: Biological and Ecological Value**

Does the property offer significant biological values, including biodiversity, listed species habitat, connectivity, restoration potential and ecological quality? **YES**

**Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 4:** The parcel contains migratory bird habitat and active gopher tortoise burrows.

**Criteria 5: Enhancement of Current Conservation Lands**

Does the property enhance and/or protect the environmental value of current conservation lands through function as a buffer, ecological link or habitat corridor? **No**

Is this property within the boundary of another agency's acquisition project? **No**

**Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 5:** There are no known conservation lands adjacent to this parcel. It abuts homes on the west and north, a road to the east, and undeveloped land to the south.

### 3. Initial Screening Criteria

#### 3.1 Ecological Values

##### 3.1.1 Vegetative Communities

The parcel consists primarily of disturbed, maritime hammock, but does contain patches of coastal scrub on the southern edge and middle. Maritime hammock is a predominantly evergreen hardwood forest growing on stabilized coastal dunes. Some of the components of this category that were observed on the parcel include: gumbo limbo, seagrape, wild coffee, catclaw blackbead, cocoplum, marlberry, snowberry, hoopvine, and rouge plant. The scrub category represents a wide variety of species found in the coastal zone. Some of the components of this category that were observed on the parcel include: sand live oak, tough bully, prickly pear, and gopher apple.

A large Brazilian pepper exists within the northeast corner of the parcel, and Burma reed lines the northern edge of the parcel. Other non-native, invasive plants are scattered throughout the parcel including guinea grass, tropical almond, Brazilian pepper, and umbrella tree.

Table 4. Listed Plant Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	State Status	Federal Status
Giant wild pine	<i>Tillandsia utriculata</i>	State Endangered	n/a
Hoopvine	<i>Trichostigma octandrum</i>	State Endangered	n/a




Figure 4 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities






Figure 5 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System



*Figure 6 – Coastal scrub transitioning into maritime hammock*



*Figure 7 – Southern boundary of parcel – coastal scrub transitioning into maritime hammock*



### 3.1.2 Wildlife Communities

Active gopher tortoise burrows were observed on the parcel itself. Multiple active burrows were observed on the adjacent parcels to the south. The maritime hammock community within the Chestnut parcel also provides habitat for migratory bird species.

Table 5 – Listed Wildlife Detected

Common Name	Scientific Name	State Status	Federal Status	Mode of Detection
Gopher tortoise	<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Threatened	n/A	Active burrow observed during site visit



Figure 8 – Active gopher tortoise burrow in NE corner of property




Figure 9 - Wildlife Spatial Data (i.e., telemetry, roosts, etc)






Figure 10 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness



### 3.1.3 Water Resources

The parcel does not significantly protect water resources, beyond adding very minimally to the surficial aquifer. The parcel and adjacent properties are comprised entirely of uplands. No wetlands exist on site, and the parcel is not within a wellfield protection zone.

Soils data is based on the Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida (USDA/NRCS, 1990). Mapped soils on this parcel show the entire site to be paola fine sand, 1 to 8 pct slopes – an excessively drained soil found on coastal dunes on Marco Island.




Figure 11 - CLIP Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones




Figure 12 - Collier County Soil Survey




Figure 13 LIDAR Elevation Map

### 3.1.4 Ecosystem Connectivity

This parcel does not provide direct connectivity to other conservation lands; however, there are undeveloped lands between this parcel and the Rookery Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve approximately 350 feet to the east. The parcel is within an urban, residential area with a road (Inlet Dr.) adjacent to the east (with undeveloped lots east of Inlet Dr.), single family residences to the north and west, and undeveloped parcels to the south.




Figure 14 - Conservation Lands



### 3.2 Human Values

#### 3.2.1 Recreation

This parcel is bordered by a road along its entire eastern edge. Birdwatching and photography would be encouraged from the road right of way. Providing access to the parcel with a short trail would not be recommended due to the small size of the parcel and the sensitivity and density of the vegetation.

#### 3.2.2 Accessibility

The parcel would be visible from a public road. No pedestrian or vehicular access onto the parcel would be recommended. The parcel is within walking distance of many residences and commercial parking lots. Creating parking within the parcel would also not be recommended because of its small size, native vegetation, and wildlife utilization. If this parcel is acquired along with other parcels in the area, Conservation Collier will coordinate with the City of Marco Island regarding parking. Depending on location, the City of Marco Island has offered to assist in providing off-street parking on pervious material and the installation of signage consistent with the City's Land Development Codes.

#### 3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement

This parcel is in the Urban Target Protection Area on Marco Island and has access from a public road. The parcel provides wildlife viewing and greenspace in a neighborhood where nearly every lot is developed. The parcel is too small to accommodate trails but can be enjoyed from the side of the road.



Figure 15 - Cultural/ Aesthetic Attribute Photo 1

### 3.3 Restoration and Management

#### 3.3.1 Vegetation Management

##### *3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation*

Approximately 30% of the parcel is covered with invasive vegetation – primarily Brazilian pepper. A large Brazilian pepper exists within the northeast corner of the parcel, and Burma reed lines the northern edge of the parcel. Other non-native, invasive plants are scattered throughout the parcel including guinea grass, tropical almond, Brazilian pepper, and umbrella tree. Madagascar periwinkle is also present in the groundcover.

##### *3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire*

The parcel contains primarily tropical hardwood hammock, which is not a fire dependent community.

#### 3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security

No site security issues appear to exist within the parcel. Educational signage regarding the importance of the parcel for native wildlife could be installed to discourage trespass and littering.

#### 3.3.3 Assistance

Assistance with gopher tortoise monitoring on this parcel will be provided by the Audubon of the Western Everglades. Funding assistance for invasive/nuisance plant removal may be sought from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

### 3.4 Vulnerability

#### 3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use

The parcel is zoned RSF-3, Residential Single Family. Residential Single Family Districts are intended to be single-family residential areas of low density. Permitted uses include single-family dwellings, family care facilities (subject to the Land Development Code), and public parks and open space. The Future Land Use of the parcel is Low Density Residential – 0-4 units per acre. The lot is vulnerable to development for a home.




Figure 16 – Zoning

**CITY OF MARCO ISLAND  
 FUTURE LAND USE MAP**






Figure 17 – Future Land Use

### 3.4.2 Development Plans

The parcel is not currently planned for development; however, its location near developed residential lots along a roadway makes it vulnerable to development. Although the gopher tortoises present on the parcel would make development cost prohibitive, development is still possible.

## 4. Management Needs and Costs

Table 6 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management

Management Element	Initial Cost	Annual Recurring Cost	Comments
Invasive Vegetation Removal	\$7,500	\$1,000	
Signage	\$5,000	\$100	Educational signage and signage denoting the property as Conservation Collier preserve
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,500</b>	<b>\$1,100</b>	

## 5. Potential for Matching Funds

The primary partnering agencies for conservation acquisitions, and those identified in the ordinance are the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) and The Florida Forever Program. The following highlights potential for partnering funds, as communicated by agency staff.

**Florida Communities Trust - Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program:** The FCT Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program provides grant funds to local governments and nonprofit organizations to acquire conservation lands, urban open spaces, parks and greenways. Application for this program is typically made for pre-acquired sites up to two years from the time of acquisition. The Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program assists the Department of Environmental Protection in helping communities meet the challenges of growth, supporting viable community development and protecting natural resources and open space. The program receives 21 percent Florida Forever appropriation.

**Florida Forever Program:** Staff has been advised that the Florida Forever Program is concentrating on funding parcels already included on its ranked priority list. This parcel is not inside a Florida Forever priority project boundary. Additionally, the Conservation Collier Program has not been successful in partnering with the Florida Forever Program due to conflicting acquisition policies and issues regarding joint title between the programs.

**Additional Funding Sources:** There are no additional funding sources known at this time.

## 6. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form

Property Name: Chestnut			
Target Protection Mailing Area: Marco Island			
Folio(s): 57802400000			
Secondary Criteria Scoring	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Percentage
1 - Ecological Value	160	73	46
2 - Human Value	80	39	48
3 - Restoration and Management	80	80	100
4 - Vulnerability	80	64	81
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>64</b>

1 - ECOLOGICAL VALUES (40% of total)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
<b>1.1 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>160</b>	
<b>1.1.1 - Priority natural communities (Select highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 1 communities (1130 - Rockland Hammock, 1210 - Scrub, 1213 - Sand Pine Scrub, 1214 - Coastal Scrub, 1312 - Scrubby Flatwoods, 1610 - Beach Dune, 1620 - Coastal Berm, 1630 - Coastal Grasslands, 1640 - Coastal Strand, or 1650 - Maritime Hammock)	100	100	Maritime Hammock; Coastal Scrub
b. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 2 communities (22211 - Hydric Pine Flatwoods, 2221 - Wet Flatwoods, or 1311 - Mesic Flatwoods)	60		
c. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 3 communities (5250 - Mangrove Swamp, or 5240 - Salt Marsh)	50		
d. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 4 communities (5250 - Mangrove Swamp)	25		
<b>1.1.2 - Plant community diversity (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel has ≥ 3 CLC native plant communities (Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System native plant communities)	20		
b. Parcel has ≤ 2 CLC native plant communities	10	10	Maritime Hammock; Coastal Scrub
c. Parcel has 0 CLC native plant communities	0		
<b>1.1.3 - Listed plant species (excluding commercially exploited species) (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel has ≥ 5 CLC listed plant species	30		
b. Parcel has 3-4 CLC listed plant species	20		
c. Parcel has ≤ 2 CLC listed plant species	10	10	<i>Tillandsia utriculata</i>
d. Parcel has 0 CLC listed plant species	0		
<b>1.1.4 - Invasive Plant Infestation (Select highest score)</b>			
a. 0 - 10% infestation	50		
b. 10 - 25% infestation	40	40	Large B. pepper in NE corner; burma reed along north; other scattered plants
c. 25 - 50% infestation	30		
d. 50 - 75% infestation	20		
e. ≥ 75% infestation	10		
<b>1.2 - WILDLIFE COMMUNITIES</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	
<b>1.2.1 - Listed wildlife species (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Listed wildlife species documented on the parcel	80	80	gopher tortoise
b. Listed wildlife species documented on adjacent property	60		
c. CLIP Potential Habitat Richness ≥ 5 species	40		
d. No listed wildlife documented near parcel	0		
<b>1.2.2 - Significant wildlife habitat (Rookeries, roosts, denning sites, nesting grounds, high population densities, etc) (Select highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel protects significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	20		
b. Parcel enhances adjacent to significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	10	10	gopher tortoise; migratory bird habitat
c. Parcel does not enhance significant wildlife habitat	0		



1.3 - WATER RESOURCES	100	0	
<b>1.3.1 - Aquifer recharge (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel is located within a wellfield protection zone or within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 1 area	40		
b. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 2 or 3 area	30		
c. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 4 or 5 area	20		
d. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 6 area	0	0	
<b>1.3.2 - Surface Water Protection (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an Outstanding Florida Waterbody	30		
b. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for a creek, river, lake, canal or other surface water body	20		
c. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an identified flowway	15		
d. Wetlands exist on site	10		
e. Parcel does not provide opportunities for surface water quality enhancement	0	0	
<b>1.3.3 - Floodplain Management (Select all that apply)</b>			
a. Parcel has depressional or slough soils	10		
b. Parcel has known history of flooding and is likely to provide onsite water attenuation	10		
c. Parcel provides storm surge buffering	10		
d. Parcel does not provide floodplain management benefits	0	0	
<b>1.4 - ECOSYSTEM CONNECTIVITY</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>1.4.1 - Acreage (Select Highest Score)</b>			
a. Parcel is ≥ 300 acres	150		
b. Parcel is ≥ 100 acres	100		
b. Parcel is ≥ 50 acres	75		
c. Parcel is ≥ 25 acres	25		
d. Parcel is ≥ 10 acres	15		
e. Parcel is < 10 acres	0	0	
<b>1.4.2 - Connectivity (Select highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel is immediately contiguous with conservation lands	50		
b. Parcel is not immediately contiguous, but parcels between it and nearby conservation lands are undeveloped	25	25	
c. Parcel is isolated from conservation land	0	0	
<b>ECOLOGICAL VALUES TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>275</b>	
<b>ECOLOGICAL VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*160)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>73</b>	

2 - HUMAN VALUES (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
<b>2.1 - RECREATION</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>2.1.1 - Compatible recreation activities (Select all that apply)</b>			
a. Hunting	20	0	
b. Fishing	20	0	
c. Water-based recreation (paddling, swimming, etc)	20	0	
d. Biking	20	0	
e. Equestrian	20	0	
f. Passive natural-resource based recreation (Hiking, photography, wildlife watching, environmental education, etc)	20	20	
g. Parcel is incompatible with nature-based recreation	0		
<b>2.2 - ACCESSIBILITY</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>2.2.1 - Seasonality (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel accessible for land-based recreation year round	20	20	
b. Parcel accessible for land-based recreation seasonally	10		
c. Parcel is inaccessible for land-based recreation	0		
<b>2.2.2 - Vehicle access (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Public access via paved road	50	50	
b. Public access via unpaved road	30		
c. Public access via private road	20		
d. No public access	0		
<b>2.2.3 - Parking Availability (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Minor improvements necessary to provide on-site parking	40		
b. Major improvements necessary to provide on-site parking (Requires site development plan)	25		
b. Public parking available nearby or on adjacent preserve	20	20	
c. Street parking available	10		
d. No public parking available	0		
<b>2.2.4 - Pedestrian access (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel is easily accessible to pedestrians (within walking distance of housing development)	10	10	
b. Parcel is not easily accessible to pedestrians	0		

<b>2.3 - AESTHETICS/CULTURAL ENHANCEMENT</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.3.1 - Aesthetic/cultural value (Choose all that apply)</b>		
a. Mature/outstanding native vegetation	5	5
b. Scenic vistas	5	
c. Frontage enhances aesthetics of public thoroughfare	10	10
d. Archaeological/historical structures present	15	
e. Other (Please describe)	5	
f. None	0	
<b>HUMAN VALUES TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>HUMAN VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>39</b>

<b>3 - RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT (20%)</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Awarded Points</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>3.1 - VEGETATION MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	
<b>3.1.1 - Invasive plant management needs (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Minimal invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (<30%)	100	100	
b. Moderate invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (30-65%)	75		
c. Major invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (>65%)	50		
d. Major invasive/nuisance plant management and replanting necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (>65%)	25		
e. Restoration of native plant community not feasible	0		
<b>3.1.2 - Prescribed fire necessity and compatibility (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is compatible with prescribed fire or parcel does not contain fire dependent plant communities	20	20	
b. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is incompatible with prescribed fire	0		
<b>3.2 - REMEDIATION AND SITE SECURITY</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	
<b>3.2.1 - Site remediation and human conflict potential (Dumping, contamination, trespassing, vandalism, other) (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Minimal site remediation or human conflict issues predicted	50	50	Parcel is easily accessible from road.
b. Moderate site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	20		
c. Major site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	5		
d. Resolving site remediation or human conflict issues not feasible	0		
<b>3.3 - ASSISTANCE</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>3.4.1 - Management assistance by other entity</b>			
a. Management assistance by other entity likely	5	5	
b. Management assistance by other entity unlikely	0		
<b>RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	
<b>RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	

<b>4 - VULNERABILITY (20%)</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Awarded Points</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>4.1 - ZONING AND LAND USE</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	
<b>4.1.1 - Zoning and land use designation (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Zoning allows for Single Family, Multifamily, industrial or commercial	100	100	
b. Zoning allows for density of no greater than 1 unit per 5 acres	75		
c. Zoning allows for agricultural use /density of no greater than 1 unit per 40 acres	50		
d. Zoning favors stewardship or conservation	0		
<b>4.1.2 - Future Land Use Type (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel designated Urban	30	30	
b. Parcel designated Estates, Rural Fringe Receiving and Neutral, Agriculture	25		
c. Parcel designated Rural Fringe Sending, Rural Lands Stewardship Area	5		
d. Parcel is designated Conservation	0		
<b>4.2 - DEVELOPMENT PLANS</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>4.2.1 - Development plans (Select the highest score)</b>			
a. Parcel has been approved for development	20		
b. SFWMD and/or USACOE permit has been applied for or SDP application has been submitted	15		
c. Parcel has no current development plans	0	0	
<b>4.2.2 - Site characteristics amenable to development (Select all that apply)</b>			
a. Parcel is primarily upland	10	10	
b. Parcel is along a major roadway	10		
c. Parcel is >10 acres	5		
d. Parcel is within 1 mile of a current or planned commercial or multi-unit residential development	5	5	
<b>VULNERABILITY TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>145</b>	
<b>VULNERABILITY WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>64</b>	

## 7. Additional Site Photos



Snowberry



Prickly pear, gopher apple, and tough bully





Giant Wild Pine

## APPENDIX 1 – Critical Lands and Water Identification Maps (CLIP) Definitions

This report makes use of data layers from the Florida Natural Areas Inventory and University of Florida Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP4). CLIP4 is a collection of spatial data that identify statewide priorities for a broad range of natural resources in Florida. It was developed through a collaborative effort between the Florida Areas Natural Inventory (FNAI), the University of Florida GeoPlan Center and Center for Landscape Conservation Planning, and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). It is used in the Florida Forever Program to evaluate properties for acquisition. CLIP4 is organized into a set of core natural resource data layers which are representative of 5 resource categories: biodiversity, landscapes, surface water, groundwater and marine. The first 3 categories have also been combined into the Aggregated layer, which identifies 5 priority levels for natural resource conservation.

Below is a description of each of the three CLIP4 data layers used in this report.

### Figure 4 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities

Consists of 12 priority natural community types: upland glades, pine rocklands, seepage slopes, scrub, sandhill, sandhill upland lakes, rockland hammock, coastal uplands, imperiled coastal lakes, dry prairie, upland pine, pine flatwoods, upland hardwood forest, or coastal wetlands. These natural communities are prioritized by a combination of their heritage global status rank (G-rank) and landscape context, based on the Land Use Intensity Index (subset of CLIP Landscape Integrity Index) and FNAI Potential Natural Areas. Priority 1 includes G1-G3 communities with Very High or High landscape context. Priority 2 includes G1-G3 Medium and G4 Very High/High. Priority 3 includes G4 Medium and G5 Very High/High. Priority 5 is G5 Medium.

This data layer was created by FNAI originally to inform the Florida Forever environmental land acquisition program. The natural communities were mapped primarily based on the FNAI/FWC Cooperative Land Cover (CLC) data layer, which is a compilation of best-available land cover data for the entire state. The CLC is based on both remote-sensed (from aerial photography, primarily from water management district FLUCCS data) and ground-truthed (from field surveys on many conservation lands) data.

### Figure 9. Potential Habitat Richness CLIP4 Map

This CLIP version 4.0 data layer is unchanged from CLIP v3.0. FWC Potential Habitat Richness. Because SHCAs do not address species richness, FWC also developed the potential habitat richness layer to identify areas of overlapping vertebrate species habitat. FWC created a statewide potential habitat model for each species included in their analysis. In some cases, only a portion of the potential habitat was ultimately designated as SHCA for each species. The Potential Habitat Richness layer includes the entire potential habitat model for each species and provides a count of the number of species habitat models occurring at each location. The highest number of focal species co-occurring at any location in the model is 13.

Figure 17: CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones

High priorities indicate high potential for recharge to an underlying aquifer system (typically the Floridan aquifer but could be intermediate or surficial aquifers in some portions of the state). The highest priorities indicate high potential for recharge to springs or public water supplies. This figure also includes Wellfield Protection Zones. Collier County Wellfield Protection Zones are referenced in the Land Development Code and updated in 2010 by Pollution Control and Prevention Department Staff. The public water supply wellfields, identified in section 3.06.06 and permitted by the SFWMD for potable water to withdraw a minimum of 100,000 average gallons per day (GPD), are identified as protected wellfields, around which specific land use and activity (regulated development) shall be regulated under this section.