


Conservation Collier Initial Criteria Screening Report



Property Name: Wojtys, Richard
Folio Number: 00100480009
Staff Report Date: October 10, 2005




Table of Contents

I.	Summary of Property Information	3
	Estimated Property Value	7
II.	Statement for Satisfying Initial Screening Criteria, including Biological and Hydrological Characteristics	8
III.	Potential for Land Use and Recommended Site Improvements	12
IV.	Assessment of Management Needs and Costs	13
V.	Potential for Matching Funds	15
VI.	Summary of Secondary Screening Criteria	16

Tables

Table 1.	Summary of Property Information	3
Table 2.	Summary of Estimated Management Needs and Costs	14
Table 3.	Tabulation of Secondary Screening Criteria	16

Figures

Figure 1.	Location Map	4
Figure 2.	Aerial Map	5
Figure 3.	Surrounding Lands Aerial	6
Figure 4.	Secondary Screening Criteria Scoring	16

Exhibits

A.	FLUCCs Map
B.	Soils Map
C.	Species Richness Map
D.	Wellfield Protection and Aquifer Recharge Map
E.	Completed and Scored Secondary Criteria Screening Form
F.	Photographs

I. Summary of Property Information

The purpose of this section is to provide information concerning the subject property describing its various physical characteristics and other general information.

Table 1. Summary of Property Information

Characteristic	Value	Comments
Name	Richard and Alice Wojtys	n/a
Folio Number	00100480009	n/a
Target Protection Area	Not within a TPA	Neutral Lands of RFMUD
Size	5 acres	Adjacent to 2 other 5-acre parcels being offered – all members of the extended Wojtys family
STR	S24, T47N, R27E	n/a
Zoning Category/TDRs	A-MHO – RFMUD-Neutral	Agriculture (A) with Mobile Home Overlay (MHO) Rural Fringe Mixed Use District (RFMUD) 1 unit per 5 acres – No TDRs associated (Neutral)
FEMA Flood Map Category	Zone D	Area located outside special flood hazard area
Existing structures	None	n/a
Adjoining properties and their Uses	Fallow Agriculture, rural residential and Vacant-undeveloped	N – Fallow agriculture land S, E and W – Tree nursery, undeveloped land, rural residential, zoned agricultural - MHO
Development Plans Submitted	None	No evidence of development plans in County computer system.
Known Property Irregularities	None observed	Completely wooded
Other County Department Interest	Transportation, Utilities, Parks and Recreation, Greenways	The Utilities Department has interest in this parcel for a well site

Figure 1. Location Map




Figure 2. Aerial Map





Figure 3. Surrounding Lands Aerial



Summary of Assessed Value and Property Costs Estimates

The interest being appraised for this estimate is fee simple for the purchase of the site, and the value of this interest is subject to the normal limiting conditions and the quality of market data. An appraisal of the parcel was estimated using three traditional approaches, cost, income capitalization and sales comparison. Each is based on the principal 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 from within 3 miles of this property 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 the report and the appraiser relied upon information provided by program staff. Conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and conditions that no other known or unknown adverse conditions exist. Pursuant to the Conservation Collier Purchase Policy, one appraisal is required.

Assessed Value: * \$75,000

Estimated Market Value: ** \$90,000 There are no TDRs associated with this parcel.

* Property Appraiser's Website

** Collier County Real Estate Services Department

II. Statement for satisfying Initial Screening Criteria, Including Biological and Hydrological Characteristics

Collier County Environmental Resources Department staff conducted a site visit on August 9, 2005.

MEETS INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA Yes

1. Are any of the following unique and endangered plant communities found on the property? Order of preference as follows: Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(a)

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. Other native habitats	Yes

Vegetative Communities:

Staff used two methods to determine native plant communities present; review of South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) electronic databases for Department of Transportation's Florida Land Use, Cover and Forms (FLUCCS) (1994/1995) and field verification of same.

FLUCCS:

The electronic database identified:

- FLUCCS 411 – Pine Flatwoods

The following native plant communities were observed:

- FLUCCS 411 – Pine Flatwoods

Characterization of Plant Communities present:

Ground Cover: redroot (*Lachnanthes caroliniana*), black root (*Pterocaulon pchnostachium*), hat pins (*Eriocaulon decangulare*), candyroot (*polygala nana*), paw paw (*Asimina* spp.), St. John's wart (*Hypericum* spp.), blueberry (*Vaccinium* spp.), tarflower (*Bejaria racemosa*), running oak (*Quercus elliotii*), gopher apple (*Licania michauxii*), rosemary (*Ceratiola ericoides*), beakrush (*Rhynchospora* spp.), yellow eye grass (*Xyris* spp.), grasses

Midstory: saw palmetto (*Serenoa repens*), rusty lyonia (*Lyonia ferruginea*), wax myrtle (*Myrica cerifera*), myrsine (*Rapanea punctata*), gallberry (*Ilex glabra*), dahoon holly (*Ilex cassine*), American beautyberry (*Callicarpa americana*),

Canopy: slash pine (*Pinus elliotii*)

Statement for satisfaction of criteria:

These data indicate that an intact native plant community exists on the parcel.

-
2. *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?* Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(b) **Yes - Marginally**

Statement for satisfaction of criteria:

The property is in an area where no Conservation Collier land has yet been acquired. Although the property is not visible from a public roadway, it is a very fine example of a pine flatwood community. An unimproved access easement extending from Lilac Lane (a private road) appears to run along the southern boundary of the parcel.

-
3. *Does the property offer opportunities for protection of water resource values, including aquifer recharge, water quality enhancement, protection of wetland dependant species habitat, and flood control?* Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(c) **No**

General Hydrologic Characteristics observed and description of adjacent upland /wetland buffers:

Wetland dependent plant species (OBL/ FACW) observed:

OBL	FACW
dahoon holly (<i>Ilex cassine</i>)	St. John's wart (<i>Hypericum</i> spp.)
yellow eye grass (<i>Xyris</i> spp.)	hat pins (<i>Eriocaulon decangulare</i>)

Wetland dependent wildlife species observed: none

Other Hydrologic indicators observed: none

Soils: Soils data is based on the Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida (USDA/NRCS, 1990). Mapped soil on this parcel was identified as Immokalee fine sand, which is found in flatwoods. Vegetation normally associated with this non-hydric soil includes: slash pine, saw palmetto, wax myrtle, chalky bluestem, creeping bluestem and pineland threeawn. The property contains similar vegetation. This soil normally will remain wet during the wet season and become very dry during the dry season.

Lower Tamiami recharge Capacity: Relatively low - 7 to < 14 inches annually

Surficial Aquifer Recharge Capacity: Moderate - 43 to < 56 inches annually

FEMA Flood map designation: Zone D, area located outside special flood hazard area

Statement for satisfaction of criteria:

Although the site contributes to aquifer recharge and contains some wetland plants, it does not appear to contain wetlands. No standing water was observed during the site visit. Soils may become saturated during wet periods, allowing some herbaceous wetland plants to grow; however, the dominant vegetation indicates an upland plant community.

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

Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(d)

Yes - Marginally

Listed Plant Species:

Listed plant species include those found on either the Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants 50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12, December 1999 (FWS) or the Florida Department of Agriculture, August 1997 (FDA).

No listed plant species were observed on site.

Listed Wildlife Species:

Listed wildlife species include those found on either the Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants 50 CFR 17.11 and 17.12, December 1999 (FWS) or the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWCC) (formerly the Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission), August 1997 (identified on official lists as GFC).

No listed wildlife species were observed on site

Bird Rookery observed?

No

FWCC-derived species richness score:

Ranges from 4-5 out of 10

Non-listed species observed:

Oak toad (*Bufo quercicus*) and evidence of a rabbit on site

Potential Listed Species:

Gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) scat was observed on site, but no burrows were observed. Gopher tortoises most likely utilize the parcel. Property is within Priority 2 Florida panther habitat; however the closest panther telemetry point is a section and a half to the northeast.

Statement for satisfaction of criteria:

The site appears to have high ecological quality and contains habitat suitable for listed species, including Florida panther (*Felis concolor coryii*) and gopher tortoises (and commensal species). It contains high quality pine flatwoods with no observed invasive exotic vegetation. Much of the surrounding lands have been previously cleared and

farmed but are vacant today. This parcel may serve as cover for animals moving through the surrounding un-forested area but it does not provide connectivity between conservation lands.

5. Does the property enhance and/or protect the environmental value of current conservation lands through function as a buffer, ecological link or habitat corridor?

Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(e)

No

Statement for satisfaction of criteria:

There is no known ecological link or habitat corridor.

Is the property within the boundary of another agency's acquisition project?

No

If yes, will use of Conservation Collier funds leverage a significantly higher rank or funding priority for the parcel?

N/A

Without such funding circumstances, Conservation Collier funds shall not be available for purchase of these lands. Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10 (1)(f)

III. Potential for Appropriate Use and Recommended Site Improvements

This use assessment will assume that 3 adjacent 5-acre parcels (both Wojtys properties and Snow) would be purchased together.

Potential Uses as Defined in Ordinance 2002-63, section 5.9:

Hiking:

Short hikes would be possible through the property if a trail were developed.

Nature Photography:

There may be opportunities for wildlife and vegetation photography on this and adjacent sites

Bird-watching:

Birds normally found in pine flatwoods and palmetto would be observed at this site.

Kayaking/Canoeing:

N/A

Swimming:

N/A

Hunting:

N/A

Fishing:

N/A

Recommended Site Improvements:

A trail would need to be cleared through the site. A parking area, signage and fence would need to be installed.

IV. Assessment of Management Needs and Costs

Management of this property will address the costs of exotic vegetation removal and control, the development of a parking area and short trail to allow the public to have access to the property. The following assessment addresses both the initial and recurring costs of management. These are very preliminary estimates; Ordinance 2002-63 requires a formal land management plan be developed for each property acquired by Conservation Collier.

Exotic, Invasive Plants Present:

None observed.

Exotic Vegetation Removal and Control

No initial exotic control would be necessary. Costs for follow-up maintenance, done anywhere from quarterly to annually have been estimated at between \$100 and \$450 per acre, per year for a total of \$500 to \$2,500 for 5 acres.

Public Parking Facility:

The property would require an area for visitor parking once a trail is developed. There are three adjacent parcels offered in this location, this one being the farthest from the road and the most vegetated of the three. The most appropriate place for a parking lot would be on the parcel nearest Lilac Lane, which has been previously cleared. This scenario would require the purchase of all three lots. **The cost of construction of a shell or gravel parking lot to accommodate approximately 10 cars today would be approximately \$15,000.** This value would include

- Land preparation
- Design
- Permitting costs

Public Access Trails:

A short trail with handicapped accessible portion can be constructed after obtaining a native vegetation removal permit.

Security and General Maintenance:

It would be desirable to fence the property with a type of fencing that would identify boundaries, yet allow wildlife free movement across it. Field fencing, similar to that used by FL DOT along I-75 can be used. Split rail can be used around parking. Cost including installation for field fencing is approx. \$3 per foot. Split rail is approx. \$10 per foot. Gates are approximately \$250 each. This information is the same as provided in the other Wojtys and Snow property reports.

Table 2. Summary of Estimated Management Needs and Costs (assuming purchase of the entire 15 acres including the two Wojtys lots and the Snow lot)

Management Element	Initial Cost	Annual Recurring Costs	Comments
Exotics Control	\$0	\$2,500	Yearly maintenance
Parking Facility	\$15,000		Today's costs
Access Trails ADA trail section	\$3,000 \$16,500	t.b.d.	A trail would be feasible if all three adjacent lots were purchased and previously cleared areas contained parking. Clearing estimated for trail \$3,000 ADA trail section approx. 500 feet @ \$33 (estimated) per foot.
Fencing	\$10,250	t.b.d.	Field fencing - \$3 per foot Split rail – Approx \$10 per foot Gate- Approx. \$250
Trash Removal	t.b.d.	t.b.d.	Large items to be done one a lump sum contract basis with cost being site specific Small items and routine trash barrel emptying can be done by contract/patnership
Entry Sign (1)	\$400	t.b.d.	Entry sign (1) - under 36 sq. feet - uninstalled - \$400 each
Boundary signs (3)	\$75		Boundary signs (3) – uninstalled includes post - \$25 each
Kiosk	\$14,000	t.b.d	Based on 2004 Palm Beach County actual costs
Rest room under 500 sq. feet	\$100,000	t.b.d	Estimate – includes septic, water, electricity and well.
Picnic table, 2 benches, 2 garbage cans	\$3,000	t.b.d.	Recycled plastic, uninstalled
Total	\$162,225	\$2,500	

t.b.d. To be determined; cost estimates have not been finalized.

V. Potential for Matching Funds

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

Florida Communities Trust:

Potential does exist for a grant; however, these grants are offered on a yearly cycle and are rarely coordinated with purchases to provide up-front partner funding. Application is typically made for pre-acquired sites. Each recipient is limited to a maximum of ten percent (10%) of the available bond proceeds. For the 2005 funding cycle the award limit per recipient, per cycle, was \$6.6 million. The next funding cycle closes in June of 2006. Multiple applications may be made, as long as the total amount requested does not exceed the 10% award maximum. Collier County, with a population exceeding 75,000, is required to provide a minimum match of twenty-five percent (25%) of the total for each project cost.

A cursory test scoring of this parcel with FCT criteria by staff gives this parcel a score of 95 out of a possible 320 points. In order to estimate this score, staff considered the 3 adjoining parcels together, assumed a minimum match of 55% and that a restroom facility would be constructed on the parcel which would provide trailhead facilities in close proximity to a planned greenway and trail route. These facilities add considerable cost to the project, and still do not result in probability for funding. Staff was verbally advised that if a score is under 125, chances of it being selected for funding are not likely. This parcel appears to be below the minimum mark for possibility of selection for FCT post-acquisition funding.

Florida Forever Program:

Staff was verbally advised that the Florida Forever Program is concentrating on larger, more rural parcels, unless those parcels are inside an existing acquisition boundary. This parcel is not inside a Florida Forever project boundary

Save Our Rivers Program / South Florida Water Management District:

SFWMD staff has advised that none of our current parcels is within a SFWMD project boundary and funding partnerships are unlikely unless that is the case.


VI. Summary of Secondary Screening Criteria

Staff has scored property on the Secondary Criteria Screening Form and attached the scoring form as Exhibit A. A total score of 188 out of a possible 400 was achieved. The chart and graph below show a breakdown of the specific components of the score.

Table 3. Tabulation of Secondary Screening Criteria

Secondary Screening Criteria	Possible Points	Scored Points	Percent of Possible Score
Ecological	100	21	21%
Human Values/Aesthetics	100	35	35%
Vulnerability	100	45	45%
Management	100	87	87%
Total Score:	400	188	47%
Percent of Maximum Score:			47%

Figure 4. Secondary Screening Criteria Scoring



Summary of factors contributing to score

Total Score 188 out of 400

Ecological (21): This low score resulted from the lack of unique and endangered plant community presence, absence of wetlands, only moderate surficial aquifer recharge capacity, a low species richness score and only one type of vegetative community present. The score achieved represents the good ecological quality of the existing vegetative community.

Human Values/Aesthetics (35): Both Wojtys and the Snow parcels were scored individually. If they were to be purchased together the entire 15 acres would achieve a slightly higher score in this category. This parcel has unimproved easement access, but no direct access. As a result, the score is low. If the other parcels are also considered, there would be direct access to a private, unpaved road. Additionally, if considered by itself, the size limits its recreational opportunities, but if considered together, a higher score would result.

Vulnerability (45): Vulnerability is moderate due to the limited ability to place one single family home on this property. No permits have been obtained for development of this property.

Management (87): The parcel scored well in this section due to no need for hydrologic changes and no exotic observed. Some points were lost because the surrounding properties might preclude the use of prescribed fire as a management tool.

Parcel Size: 5 acres While parcel size was not scored, the ordinance advises that based on comparative size, the larger of similar parcels is preferred. This parcel is similar to the Narsiff-1 parcel (same size) and the Brochu and Anderson parcels (both twice the size).

Score assuming a 3 parcel purchase:




Exhibit A. FLUCCs Map




Exhibit B. Soils Map




Exhibit C. Species Richness Map











Exhibit D. Wellfield Protection and Aquifer Recharge Maps



Conservation Collier Wojtys Lower Tamiami Aquifer Recharge Map



Legend - Wojtys

-  Wojtys
-  Wellfields
- Lower Tamiami Recharge**
-  "7 to < 14"

Data Source: Parcels - Collier County Property Appraiser
Lower Tamiami Aquifer Recharge - SFWMD Tech. Report 327
Created By: GIS \ CDES \ Environmental Services
G:\Conservation Collier 2002\ ISCR\ 3rdcycle\Wojtys6tam.mxd
G:\Conservation Collier 2002\ ISCR\ 3rdcycle\Wojtys6tam.jpg
Date: 8.4.05

Folio Number: 00100480009



Exhibit E. Completed and Scored Secondary Criteria Screening Form

Property Name: Wojtys (pronounced - Woitis)		Folio Numbers: 00100480009	
Geographical Distribution (Target Protection Area): n/a - In Neutral lands			
1. Confirmation of Initial Screening Criteria (Ecological)			
1.A Unique and Endangered Plant Communities	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
<i>Select the highest Score:</i>			
1. Tropical Hardwood Hammock	90		
2. Xeric Oak Scrub	80		
3. Coastal Strand	70		
4. Native Beach	60		
5. Xeric Pine	50		
6. Riverine Oak	40		
7. High Marsh (Saline)	30		
8. Tidal Freshwater Marsh	20		
9. Other Native Habitats	10	10	pine flatwood
10. Add additional 5 points for each additional listed plant community found on the parcel	5 each		
11. Add 5 additional points if plant community represents a unique feature, such as maturity of vegetation, outstanding example of plant community, etc.	5	5	very clean, no exotics
1.A. Total	100	15	
1.B Significance for Water Resources	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. Aquifer Recharge (<i>Select the Highest Score</i>)			
a. Parcel is within a wellfield protection zone	100		
b. Parcel is not in a wellfield protection zone but will contribute to aquifer recharge	50	50	Surficial aquifer-43 to 56" yearly; Lower Tamiami-7 to 14" yearly
c. Parcel would contribute minimally to aquifer recharge location	25		
	0		
2. Surface Water Quality (<i>Select the Highest Score</i>)			
a. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an Outstanding Florida Waterbody	100		
b. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for a creek, river, lake or other surface water body	75		
c. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an identified flowway	50		
d. Wetlands exist on site	25		
e. Acquisition of parcel will not provide opportunities for surface water quality enhancement	0	0	no wetland benefits apparent
3. Strategic to Floodplain Management (<i>Calculate for a and b; score c if applicable</i>)			
a. Depressional soils	80	0	(Prorate site based on area of Slough or Depressional Soils)
b. Slough Soils	40	0	
c. Parcel has known history of flooding and is likely to provide onsite water attenuation	20	0	soils are Immokalee Fine Sand - non hydric
Subtotal	300	50	
1.B Total	100	17	Obtained by dividing the subtotal by 3.
1.C Resource Ecological/Biological Value	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. Biodiversity (<i>Select the Highest Score for a, b and c</i>)			
a. The parcel has 5 or more FLUCCS native plant communities	100		
b. The parcel has 3 or 4 FLUCCS native plant communities	75		
c. The parcel has 2 or or less FLUCCS native plant communities	50		
d. The parcel has 1 FLUCCS code native plant communities	25	25	411 - pine flatwood
2. Listed species			
a. Listed wildlife species are observed on the parcel	80		<i>If a. or b. are scored, then c. Species Richness is not scored.</i>
b. Listed wildlife species have been documented on the parcel by	70		<i>Provide documentation source -</i>
c. Species Richness score ranging from 10 to 70	70	32	<i>Score is prorated from 10 to 70 based on the FWCC Species Richness map - Species richness score = 4.5</i>
d. Rookery found on the parcel	10		
e. Listed plant species observed on parcel - add additional 20 po	20		

Exhibit E. Completed and Scored Secondary Criteria Screening Form (Continued)

3. Restoration Potential				
a. Parcel can be restored to high ecological function with minimal alteration	100	100	Parcel appears to have high ecological function	
b. Parcel can be restored to high ecological function but will require moderate work, including but not limited to removal of exotics and alterations in topography.	50			
c. Parcel will require major alterations to be restored to high ecological function.	15			
d. Conditions are such that parcel cannot be restored to high ecological function	0		<i>explain limiting conditions</i>	
Subtotal	300	157		
1.C Total	100	52	<i>Divide the subtotal by 3</i>	
1.D Protection and Enhancement of Current Conservation Lands				
1. Proximity and Connectivity				
a. Property immediately contiguous with conservation land or conservation easement.	100			
b. Property not immediately contiguous, parcels in between it and the conservation land are undeveloped.	50			
c. Property not immediately contiguous, parcels in-between it and conservation land are developed	0	0	CREW (1 mile away) and Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary (1.5 miles away). Developed parcels are inbetween.	
d. If not contiguous and developed, add 20 points if an intact ecological link exists between the parcel and nearest conservation land	20		No clear ecological link	
1.D Total	100	0		
1. Ecological Total Score		100	21	<i>Sum of 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D then divided by 4</i>
2. Human Values/Aesthetics				
2.A Human Social Values/Aesthetics				
1. Access (Select the Highest Score)				
a. Parcel has access from a paved road	100			
b. Parcel has access from an unpaved road	75			
c. Parcel has seasonal access only or unimproved access easement	50	50	Unimproved access easement appears to run along southern boundary of parcel	
d. Parcel does not have physical or known legal access	0			
2. Recreational Potential (Select the Highest Score)				
a. Parcel offers multiple opportunities for natural resource-based recreation consistent with the goals of this program, including but not limited to, environmental education, hiking, nature photography, bird watching, kayaking, canoeing, swimming, hunting (based on size?) and fishing.	100			
b. Parcel offers only land-based opportunities for natural resource-based recreation consistent with the goals of this program, including but not limited to, environmental education, hiking, and nature photography.	75			
c. Parcel offers limited opportunities for natural-resource based recreation beyond simply accessing and walking on it	50	50	Due to small size, few recreational opportunities apparent	
d. Parcel does not offer opportunities for natural-resource based recreation	0			
3. Enhancement of Aesthetic Setting				
a. Percent of perimeter that can be seen by public. Score based on percentage of frontage of parcel on public thoroughfare	80		<i>Score between 0 and 80 based on the percentage of the parcel perimeter that can be seen by the public from a public thoroughfare.</i>	
b. Add up to 20 points if the site contains outstanding aesthetic characteristic(s), such as but not limited to water view, mature trees, native flowering plants, or archeological site	20	5	<i>Provide a description and photo documentation of the outstanding characteristic- Very nice pine flatwood</i>	
Subtotal	300	105		
2. Human Social Values/Aesthetics Total Score		100	35	<i>Obtained by dividing the subtotal by 3.</i>

Exhibit E. Completed and Scored Secondary Criteria Screening Form (Continued)

3. Vulnerability to Development/Degradation			
3.A Zoning/Land Use Designation	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. Zoning allows for Single Family, Multifamily, industrial or commercial	50		
2. Zoning allows for density of no greater than 1 unit per 5 acres	45	45	A-MHO - RFMUD Neutral lands
3. Zoning allows for agricultural use /density of no greater than 1 unit per 5 acres	40		
4. Zoning favors stewardship or conservation	0		
5. If parcel has ST overlay, remove 20 points	-20		
6. Property has been rezoned and/or there is SDP approval	25		
7. SFWMD and/or USACOE permit has been issued	25		
8. A rezone or SDP application has been submitted	15		
9. SFWMD and/or USACOE permit has been applied for	15		
3. Vulnerability Total Score	100	45	
4. Feasibility and Costs of Management			
4.A Hydrologic Management Needs	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. No hydrologic changes are necessary to sustain qualities of site in perpetuity	100	100	No hydrologic changes appear necessary to sustain site qualities
2. Minimal hydrologic changes are required to restore function, such a cut in an existing berm	75		
3. Moderate hydrologic changes are required to restore function, such as removal of existing berms or minor re-grading that require use of machinery	50		
4. Significant hydrologic changes are required to restore function, such as re-grading of substantial portions of the site, placement of a berm, removal of a road bed, culvert or the elevation of the water table by installing a physical structure and/or changes unlikely	0		
5.A Total	100	100	
4.B Exotics Management Needs	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. Exotic Plant Coverage			
a. No exotic plants present	100	100	No exotics observed
b. Exotic plants constitute less than 25% of plant cover	80		
c. Exotic plants constitute between 25% and 50% of plant cover	60		
d. Exotic plants constitute between 50% and 75% of plant cover	40		
e. Exotic plants constitute more than 75% of plant cover	20		
f. Significant maintenance effort and management will be needed (e.g., heavy infestation by air potato or downy rosemary)	-20		
g. Adjacent lands contain substantial seed source and exotic removal is not presently required	-20		
5.B Total	100	100	
4.C Land Manageability	Possible points	Scored points	Comments
1. Parcel requires minimal maintenance and management, examples: cypress slough, parcel requiring prescribed fire where fuel loads are low and neighbor conflicts unlikely	80		
2. Parcel requires moderate maintenance and management, examples: parcel contains trails, parcel requires prescribed fire and circumstances do not favor burning	60	60	Parcel may require fire management and surrounding developed lands would not favor - tree nursery adjoining
3. Parcel requires substantial maintenance and management, examples: parcel contains structures that must be maintained, parcel requires management using machinery or chemical means which will be difficult or expensive to accomplish	40		
4. Add 20 points if the maintenance by another entity is likely	20		
5. Subtract 10 points if chronic dumping or trespass issues exist	-10		
5.C Total	100	60	
4. Feasibility and Management Total Score	100	87	<i>Sum of 5A, 5B, 5C, then divided by 3</i>
Total Score	400	188	

Exhibit F. Photographs

Photo 1. Pine flatwood



Photo 2. Small naturally open area within pine flatwood

