Barr Hammock-Levy Prairie Sheffield							
Project Score		Natural Community	Condition				
4.67		Mesic Flatwoods	Fair to Poor				
Inspection Date		Shrub Swamp Fair to Po					
7/10/2023							
Size (ACPA)							
16.2							
Parcel Number	Acreage (ACPA)	Other	Condition				
16477-000-000	16.2	Successional Hardwoods	N/A				
Section-Township-Range							
21-11-20							
Buildings							
0 on ACPA, 0 on site							
Just Value	Just Value Per Acre						
\$91,260.00	\$5,633.33						
Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	Total Value Per Acre	Archaeological Sites					
\$91,260.00	\$5,633.33	1 recorded on site, 15 in 1 mile	е				
Acquisition Type		Bald Eagle Nests					
Fee Simple		0 recorded on site, 1 in 1 mile					
REPA Score	7.96 out of 9.44 (adjacent to	o Barr Hammock- Levy Prairie P	roject Area)				
KBN Score	6 out of 47 Levy Lake (Barr Hammock)						

Overall Description:

The Sheffield property is located northwest of Micanopy along SW Wacahoota Road and is bordered to the west by Interstate 75 and east by Paynes Prairie Preserve State Park. The 16.2-acre property consists of one parcel (ACPA TPN 16477-000-000) under one family ownership and has been nominated as a fee simple acquisition. The property is currently not on the market and there is not a current asking price for the property. This property is located less than one quarter of a mile southwest of Lake Wauburg, as well as one tenth of a mile north of Barr Hammock Preserve Levy Loop trailhead, across the Interstate 75 corridor. Additionally, the property does not lie within a Strategic Ecosystem, but it is adjacent to the ACF Barr Hammock-Levy Prairie Project Area. The natural communities present on the property include mesic flatwoods and a shrub swamp.

The wetland feature on the property consists of a shrub swamp in fair to poor condition. This wetland feature is located in the southeast portion of the property. The wetland is dominated by water hyacinth and buttonbush as well as various sedges and rushes.

The upland portion of the property is mesic flatwoods, in fair to poor condition. All of this area was clearcut in 2019 and left to naturally regenerate. At the time of the site visit, there were young loblolly pines re-establishing along with sweet gum, cabbage palm, successional oak species, hickory, live oak, and grapevine. Additional species that were identified on the site visit include toothache tree,

winged sumac, beautyberry, Ohio spider wort, highbush blueberry, and meadow beauty. The successional hardwoods were noted in high densities throughout the property.

Invasive plants were found in medium to high densities throughout the property. Invasive species that were noted at the site visit include chinaberry, mimosa, coral ardisia, and camphor trees. Solid waste that was discovered was relatively minor consisting of a tree stand and a feeder.

Wildlife species viewed or heard during the site visit were limited to a bluejay and a six lined racerunner.

One archaeological site is known to occur on the property. At the time of the site visit, no disturbance was noted at the archaeological site. Additionally, there are two billboards located at the eastern boundary along Interstate 75. In speaking with the landowner, he stated that there is a contract on the billboards but the exact details of the contract were unclear to him because the billboards were already in place when his father purchased the property.

Development Review:

This development analysis is based on a limited desk-top review and is founded upon current County Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan policies. The Development Scenario is oversimplified and is meant only to convey a general sense of the potential of development intensity that could be possible based on land use and zoning conditions.

The parcel is owned by Mr. Felton Sheffield. The parcel has a Future Land Use of Rural Agricultural. In accordance with the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan, Rural Agricultural areas are intended to be protected in a manner consistent with preservation of agriculture, open space, rural character, and the preservation of environmentally sensitive areas. Under the current land use and zoning the property may be developed at a maximum intensity of 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.

There are 2.58 acres of wetlands on the parcels that would have protection from development activities under current regulations. As per Alachua County ULDC, the wetlands on site would be protected as well as an upland buffer surrounding the wetlands that will be required to maintain a 50' minimum width and 75' average width. The wetland buffer area covers approximately 4.35 acres.

Given the current zoning and future land use, this property contains ample developable area with some wetlands and associated buffer that would be protected. However, the wetlands are located in the back portion of the property furthest from the road frontage and access points. The remote location and limited infrastructure and associated higher construction costs may somewhat diminish the prospects and potential for development activities. As a result a "3" rating has been assigned.

CATEGORY	Barr Hammock - Levy Prairie - Sheffield - 7 Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteria Score Multiplied by Relative Importance
(I-1) PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES	Whether the property has geologic/hydrologic conditions that would easily enable contamination of vulnerable aquifers that have value as drinking water sources;		2		
	B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function;		<u>3</u>		
	C. Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs, sinkholes, or wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface water quality;				
	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		2		
	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;				
(I-2) PROTECTION OF	B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare;		1	-	
	C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property;		3	1	
			2		
	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		2		
	E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental protections such as conservation easements;		2		
AND	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		3		
LANDSCAPES (G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or springs;		2		
	H. Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects.		3		
(I-3) PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES	Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern;		2		
	B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home ranges;		4		
	C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua County;		1		
	D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as breeding, roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering;		2		
	E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity;		2		
	F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species.		2		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate;		2		
	B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining greenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective.		2		
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES		_	2.30	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333		2.00	3.07
(II-1) MANAGEMENT	Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and other values (examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period, and so on);	1.000	2		0.01
	B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner.		2		
(II-2) ECONOMIC AND ACQUISITION ISSUES	Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, state, federal, or private contributions;		2		
	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		3		
	C. Whether there is imminent threat of losing the environmental, social or other values of the property through development and/or lack of sufficient legislative protections (this requires analysis of current land use, zoning, owner intent, location and		3		
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES		J	2.40	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667		2.40	1.00
					1.60



