


Conservation Collier Initial Criteria Screening Report Hoffman Parcels



↑ 0 0.5
Miles

Owner Name: Roy Hoffman
Folio Numbers: 00326400009 and 00328120002
Size: 15.0 acre
Staff Report Date: November 2, 2022




Table of Contents

- Table of Contents** 2
- 1. Introduction** 4
- 2. Summary of Property** 5
 - Figure 1 - Parcel Location Overview5
 - Figure 2 - Parcel Close-up6
 - 2.1 Summary of Property Information**.....7
 - Table 1 – Summary of Property Information7
 - Figure 3 - Secondary Criteria Score8
 - Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary8
 - 2.2 Summary of Assessed Value and Property Cost Estimates**9
 - Table 3. Assessed & Estimated Value9
 - 2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays**9
 - 2.3 Initial Screening Criteria Satisfaction (Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10)** 10
- 3. Initial Screening Criteria** 12
 - 3.1 Ecological Values**..... 12
 - 3.1.1 Vegetative Communities**..... 12
 - Figure 4 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities 13
 - Figure 5 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System 14
 - Figure 6 – Western side of 10-acre parcel..... 15
 - Figure 7 –Trail through 10-acre parcel looking south..... 15
 - 3.1.2 Wildlife Communities**..... 16
 - Table 4 – Listed Wildlife Detected..... 16
 - Figure 8 – Typical view of parcels..... 16
 - Figure 9 - Wildlife Spatial Data (i.e., telemetry, roosts, etc)..... 17
 - Figure 10 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness..... 18
 - 3.1.3 Water Resources** 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
 - 3.1.4 Ecosystem Connectivity** 23
 - Figure 14 - Conservation Lands 23
 - 3.2 Human Values** 24

- 3.2.1 Recreation** 24
- 3.2.2 Accessibility** 24
- 3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement** 24
- 3.3 Restoration and Management** 25
 - 3.3.1 Vegetation Management** 25
 - 3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation 25
 - 3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire 25
 - 3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security** 25
 - 3.3.3 Assistance** 25
- 3.4 Vulnerability** 25
 - 3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use** 25
 - Figure 15 – Zoning 26
 - Figure 16 – Zoning Overlay 27
 - Figure 17 – Future Land Use 28
 - 3.4.2 Development Plans** 29
- 4. Acquisition Considerations** 29
 - Figure 18 – Northern-most potential alignment for Wilson Benfield Road Extension 30
- 5. Management Needs and Costs** 31
 - Table 5 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management 31
- 6. Potential for Matching Funds** 31
- 7. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form** 32
- 8. Additional Site Photos** 38
- APPENDIX 1 – Critical Lands and Water Identification Maps (CLIP) Definitions** 43

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 (Quarter B) 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	Hoffman	Roy Hoffman
Folio Number	00326400009 00328120002	No site address
Target Protection Area	RFMUD	North Belle Meade Mailing area Cycle 11
Size	15.0 acres	
Section, Township, and Range	S28, Twn 49, R27	
Zoning Category/TDRs	A-RFMUD-NBMO - Receiving	Agricultural - Rural Fringe Mixed Use District – North Belle Meade Overlay – Receiving Lands; Baseline zoning allows 1 unit per 5 acres; with TDR credits allows 1 unit per acre
FEMA Flood Map Category	AH	1% annual chance of shallow flooding, usually in the form of a pond, with an average depth ranging from 1 to 3 feet. These areas have a 26% chance of flooding over the life of a 30-year mortgage.
Existing structures	None	
Adjoining properties and their Uses	Undeveloped	Undeveloped land on all sides; improved pasture to the north
Development Plans Submitted	None	
Known Property Irregularities	Partially cleared for Ag use	Understory and small cabbage palms cleared throughout parcel
Other County Dept Interest	Transportation	Parcels are within the northern-most potential alignment for Wilson Benfield Road Extension




Figure 3 - Secondary Criteria Score

Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary

Criteria	Awarded Weighted Points	Possible Weighted Points	Awarded/Possible Points
1 - Ecological Value	59	160	37%
1.1 - Vegetative Communities	13	53	25%
1.2 - Wildlife Communities	21	27	80%
1.3 - Water Resources	13	27	50%
1.4 - Ecosystem Connectivity	11	53	20%
2 - Human Values	23	80	29%
2.1 - Recreation	17	34	50%
2.2 - Accessibility	6	34	17%
2.3 - Aesthetics/Cultural Enhancement	0	11	0%
3 - Restoration and Management	57	80	71%
3.1 - Vegetation Management	55	55	100%
3.2 - Remediation and Site Security	2	23	10%
3.3 - Assistance	0	2	0%
4 - Vulnerability	62	80	78%
4.1 - Zoning and Land Use	56	58	96%
4.2 - Development Plans	7	22	30%
Total	201	400	50%

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 parcels 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 relies 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 chooses 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 Hoffman parcels, which have 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**
Roy Hoffman	No address	15.0	\$75,000	TBD

* 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 Hoffman parcels will be obtained from the Collier County Real Estate Services Department prior to CCLAAC ranking in December 2022.

2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays

Zoning, growth management and conservation overlays will affect the value of a parcel. The parcels are zoned Agricultural but are Receiving Lands within the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD) and have a North Belle Meade Overlay. The maximum building density is 1 dwelling unit per acre with redemption of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) credits and 0.2 units per acre (1 unit per 5 acres) without redemption of TDR credits.

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: **YES**

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

Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 1: The parcels consist of disturbed cabbage palm

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? **NO**

Statement for Satisfaction of Criteria 2: The parcels are not visible or readily accessible from a public roadway.

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: Although the parcels are within a 20-year wellfield protection zone, they contain no wetlands and contribute only minimally to aquifer recharge.

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 parcels and surrounding lands show heavy use by Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*). Florida black bears (*Ursus americanus floridanus*) and red-cockaded woodpeckers (*Picoides borealis*) have also been documented using adjacent parcels. The parcels themselves do not contain significant biological values, but in addition to surrounding undeveloped lands, they provide value.

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 is surrounded by undeveloped land.

3. Initial Screening Criteria

3.1 Ecological Values

3.1.1 Vegetative Communities

Although the parcels are mapped as mesic flatwoods, improved pasture, and hydric pine flatwoods, they can best be described as disturbed Cabbage Palm with much of the understory cleared. The canopy consists almost entirely of cabbage palms (*Sabal palmetto*). There are occasional laurel oaks (*Quercus laurifolia*), but also dead snags that appear to have been oaks. Other plants observed in the midstory and groundcover include cabbage palm, various grasses, dogfennel (*Eupatorium capillifolium*), American beautyberry (*Callicarpa americana*), muscadine (*Vitis rotundifolia*), golden polypody (*Phlebodium aureum*), and bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum*).

Exotic plants present at a density between 10%-15% and included primarily Caesarweed (*Urena lobata*) with some lantana (*Lantana strigocamara*), Brazilian pepper (*Schinus terebinthifolia*) and melaleuca (*Melaleuca quinquenervia*).

No listed plant species were observed.




Figure 4 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities




Figure 5 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System



Figure 6 – Western side of 10-acre parcel



Figure 7 –Trail through 10-acre parcel looking south

3.1.2 Wildlife Communities

No wildlife was observed within the parcels; however, white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) and hog (*Sus Scrofa*) tracks were observed within the parcel and a northern bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*), pileated woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*), and red-bellied woodpecker (*Melanerpes carolinus*) were heard on adjacent parcels. Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*) telemetry points have been detected within the parcel while Florida black bear (*Ursus americanus floridanus*) telemetry points and red cockaded woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) observations have been documented within surrounding parcels.

Although the parcels contain little biodiversity, their open understory is desirable to many Florida panther prey species and, coupled with the many acres of surrounding undeveloped land, would be desirable to a variety of different wildlife species including sandhill crane (*Antigone canadensis*) and crested caracara (*Caracara plancus*).

Table 4 – Listed Wildlife Detected

Common Name	Scientific Name	State Status	Federal Status	Mode of Detection
Florida panther	<i>Puma concolor coryi</i>	Endangered	Endangered	Telemetry points



Figure 8 – Typical view of parcels




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




Figure 10 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness

3.1.3 Water Resources

The parcels do not significantly protect water resources, beyond being within a 20-year wellfield protection zone and adding very minimally to the surficial aquifer. The parcels and adjacent properties are comprised nearly entirely of uplands.

Soils data is based on the Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida (USDA/NRCS, 1990). Mapped soils on this parcel include “Riviera Fine Sand, Limestone Substratum” and “Holopaw Fine Sand, Limestone Substratum” – both poorly drained hydric soils normally associated with sloughs and poorly defined drainageways.




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

These parcels do not directly connect to conservation lands; however, undeveloped land exists between them and a large block of conservation easements to the east, the Picayune Strand State Forest via wildlife underpasses to the south, and to the remaining undeveloped portions of the Golden Gate Estates to the north and west. These parcels also provide an ecological link to the northern range expansion goals of the Red-Cockaded Woodpecker Recovery Plan.




Figure 14 - Conservation Lands

3.2 Human Values

3.2.1 Recreation

These parcels could provide year-round access for a variety of recreational activities including equestrian, cycling, and hiking, if access could be provided. The open landscape provides opportunities for wildlife viewing and there are established trails that could provide hiking opportunities with minimal alteration.

3.2.2 Accessibility

The parcels are not accessible to the public. They are approximately 1 mile east of the end of Keane Ave. through two different locked gates. Public access would not be possible unless major improvements were made to the trail east of Keane Ave.

3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement

These parcels do not contain any noteworthy features that would make them aesthetically or culturally significant.

3.3 Restoration and Management

3.3.1 Vegetation Management

3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation

Between 10% and 15% of the parcels are covered with exotic vegetation – primarily Caesar weed with some lantana, Brazilian pepper, and melaleuca.

3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire

In their present state, the parcels would not carry fire.

3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security

No site security issues appear to exist within the parcel.

3.3.3 Assistance

Assistance from other agencies or organizations is not anticipated.

3.4 Vulnerability

3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use

The parcels are zoned Agricultural but are Receiving Lands within the Rural Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD) and have a North Belle Meade Overlay. The maximum building density is 1 dwelling unit per acre with redemption of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) credits and 0.2 units per acre (1 unit per 5 acres) without redemption of TDR credits.




Figure 15 – Zoning





Figure 16 – Zoning Overlay



HOFFMAN, ROY

Future Land Use

- Agricultural / Rural Designation
- RF-Receiving

Collier County

CONSERVATION COLLIER

The complex block contains a legend for the property owner and future land use designations. It also includes an inset map showing the property's location within a larger geographic context, the Collier County logo, and the Conservation Collier logo.

Figure 17 – Future Land Use

3.4.2 Development Plans

The parcel is not currently planned for development.

4. Acquisition Considerations

Staff would like to bring the following items to the attention of the Advisory Committee during the review of this property. The following items may not have significantly affected the scoring but are worth noting.

A cattle lease currently exists on the parcels.

These properties could be within the alignment of the future Wilson Benfield Road Extension. If these properties are approved for the A-List, staff will take this information into consideration when planning amenities and public access on the site. Additionally, when applicable, language will be memorialized in the Purchase Agreements and related closing documents to ensure Collier County Transportation will be able to purchase a portion of the properties from Conservation Collier for future right-of-way, if and when needed, at the original per-acre acquisition cost.

Additionally, there is a potential that adjacent lands surrounding these parcels will be mined. Without the surrounding lands, the significance of these parcels is diminished.




Figure 18 – Northern-most potential alignment for Wilson Benfield Road Extension

5. Management Needs and Costs

Table 5 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management

Management Element	Initial Cost	Annual Recurring Cost	Comments
Invasive Vegetation Removal	\$3,800	\$2,300	Initial assumes \$250/acre; recurring assumes \$150/acre
Cabbage palm removal	\$7,500	n/a	Assumes \$500/acre for initial removal and recurring will be rolled into exotics costs
Native plantings	\$7,500	n/a	Assumes \$500/acre
TOTAL	\$18,800	\$2,300	

6. 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. These parcels are 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.

7. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form

Property Name: Hoffman			
Target Protection Mailing Area: North Belle Meade			
Folio(s): 00326400009; 00328120002			
Secondary Criteria Scoring	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Percentage
1 - Ecological Value	160	59	37
2 - Human Value	80	23	29
3 - Restoration and Management	80	57	71
4 - Vulnerability	80	62	78
TOTAL SCORE	400	201	50

1 - ECOLOGICAL VALUES (40% of total)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
1.1 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES	200	50	
1.1.1 - Priority natural communities (Select highest score)			
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		
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	0	Disturbed cabbage palm
1.1.2 - Plant community diversity (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel has \geq 3 CLC native plant communities (Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System native plant communities)	20		
b. Parcel has \leq 2 CLC native plant communities	10	10	Disturbed cabbage palm
c. Parcel has 0 CLC native plant communities	0		
1.1.3 - Listed plant species (excluding commercially exploited species) (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel has \geq 5 CLC listed plant species	30		
b. Parcel has 3-4 CLC listed plant species	20		
c. Parcel has \leq 2 CLC listed plant species	10		
d. Parcel has 0 CLC listed plant species	0	0	None observed
1.1.4 - Invasive Plant Infestation (Select highest score)			
a. 0 - 10% infestation	50		

b. 10 - 25% infestation	40	40	primarily Caesarweed; some lantana, Brazilian pepper and melaleuca
c. 25 - 50% infestation	30		
d. 50 - 75% infestation	20		
e. ≥75% infestation	10		
1.2 - WILDLIFE COMMUNITIES	100	80	
1.2.1 - Listed wildlife species (Select the highest score)			
a. Listed wildlife species documented on the parcel	80	80	Panther telemetry points from 2019
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		
1.2.2 - Significant wildlife habitat (Rookeries, roosts, denning sites, nesting grounds, high population densities, etc) (Select highest score)			
a. Parcel protects significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	20		
b. Parcel enhances adjacent to significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	10		
c. Parcel does not enhance significant wildlife habitat	0	0	
1.3 - WATER RESOURCES	100	50	
1.3.1 - Aquifer recharge (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel is located within a wellfield protection zone or within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 1 area	40	40	Wellfield protection zone
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		
1.3.2 - Surface Water Protection (Select the highest score)			
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	No wetlands observed on site

1.3.3 - Floodplain Management (Select all that apply)			
a. Parcel has depressional or slough soils	10	10	hydric soils; but no wetland indicators on property
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		
1.4 - ECOSYSTEM CONNECTIVITY	200	40	
1.4.1 - Acreage (Select Highest Score)			
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	15	15 acres
e. Parcel is < 10 acres	0		
1.4.2 - Connectivity (Select highest score)			
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	approx. 0.5 miles west of private conservation land
c. Parcel is isolated from conservation land	0		
ECOLOGICAL VALUES TOTAL POINTS	600	220	
ECOLOGICAL VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*160)	160	59	

2 - HUMAN VALUES (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
2.1 - RECREATION	120	60	
2.1.1 - Compatible recreation activities (Select all that apply)			
a. Hunting	20		small size would not be compatible
b. Fishing	20		
c. Water-based recreation (paddling, swimming, etc)	20		
d. Biking	20	20	small parcel, but compatible

e. Equestrian	20	20	small parcel, but compatible
f. Passive natural-resource based recreation (Hiking, photography, wildlife watching, environmental education, etc)	20	20	
g. Parcel is incompatible with nature-based recreation	0		
2.2 - ACCESSIBILITY	120	20	
2.2.1 - Seasonality (Select the highest score)			
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		
2.2.2 - Vehicle access (Select the highest score)			
a. Public access via paved road	50		
b. Public access via unpaved road	30		
c. Public access via private road	20		
d. No public access	0	0	Approx. 1 mile east of locked gate
2.2.3 - Parking Availability (Select the highest score)			
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		
c. Street parking available	10		
d. No public parking available	0	0	
2.2.4 - Pedestrian access (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel is easily accessible to pedestrians (within walking distance of housing development)	10		
b. Parcel is not easily accessible to pedestrians	0	0	
2.3 - AESTHETICS/CULTURAL ENHANCEMENT	40	0	
2.3.1 - Aesthetic/cultural value (Choose all that apply)			
a. Mature/outstanding native vegetation	5		
b. Scenic vistas	5		
c. Frontage enhances aesthetics of public thoroughfare	10		
d. Archaeological/historical structures present	15		
e. Other (Please describe)	5		
f. None	0	0	
HUMAN VALUES TOTAL SCORE	280	80	
HUMAN VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	23	

3 - RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
3.1 - VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	120	120	
3.1.1 - Invasive plant management needs (Select the highest score)			
a. Minimal invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (<30%)	100	100	primarily Caesarweed; some lantana, Brazilian pepper and melaleuca
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		
3.1.2 - Prescribed fire necessity and compatibility (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is compatible with prescribed fire or parcel does not contain fire dependent plant communities	20	20	In its present state parcel would not carry fire
b. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is incompatible with prescribed fire	0		
3.2 - REMEDIATION AND SITE SECURITY	50	5	
3.2.1 - Site remediation and human conflict potential (Dumping, contamination, trespassing, vandalism, other) (Select the highest score)			
a. Minimal site remediation or human conflict issues predicted	50		
b. Moderate site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	20		
c. Major site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	5	5	Cabbage palm thinning and extensive native plantings
d. Resolving site remediation or human conflict issues not feasible	0		
3.3 - ASSISTANCE	5	0	
3.4.1 - Management assistance by other entity			
a. Management assistance by other entity likely	5		
b. Management assistance by other entity unlikely	0	0	
RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT TOTAL SCORE	175	125	
RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	57	

4 - VULNERABILITY (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
4.1 - ZONING AND LAND USE	130	125	
4.1.1 - Zoning and land use designation (Select the highest score)			
a. Zoning allows for Single Family, Multifamily, industrial or commercial	100	100	Rural Fringe - Receiving
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		
4.1.2 - Future Land Use Type (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel designated Urban	30		
b. Parcel designated Estates, Rural Fringe Receiving and Neutral, Agriculture	25	25	
c. Parcel designated Rural Fringe Sending, Rural Lands Stewardship Area	5		
d. Parcel is designated Conservation	0		
4.2 - DEVELOPMENT PLANS	50	15	
4.2.1 - Development plans (Select the highest score)			
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	
4.2.2 - Site characteristics amenable to development (Select all that apply)			
a. Parcel is primarily upland	10	10	
b. Parcel is along a major roadway	10		
c. Parcel is >10 acres	5	5	
d. Parcel is within 1 mile of a current or planned commercial or multi-unit residential development	5		
VULNERABILITY TOTAL SCORE	180	140	
VULNERABILITY WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	62	

8. Additional Site Photos



Typical view of parcels



Typical view of parcels



Typical view of parcels



Recently cleared area



Recently cleared area



East side of 10-acre parcel – slightly grown understory from less recent clearing



Approximate boundaries of parcels looking south



Cleared understory within parcels



Approximate boundaries of parcels looking north – note mine lakes in background



Approximate boundaries of parcels looking east

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 10 - 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 11 - 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.