Santa Fe River Block Family Partnership of Gainesville, LTD 6/23/2022

| Droinet Coare | | Buildings | | | | |
|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Project Score | | _ | | | | |
| 6.13 of 10.00 | | 0 on ACPA, 0 on site | | | | |
| Inspection Date | | Just Value | Just Value Per Acre | | | |
| 6/9/2022 | | \$298,534 | \$1,193 | | | |
| Size (ACPA) | | Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg) | Total Value Per Acre | | | |
| 250.21 | | \$298,534 | \$1,193 | | | |
| Parcel Number | Acreage | Acquisition Type | | | | |
| 01454-000-000 | 248.57 | Fee Simple | | | | |
| 01475-001-000 | 1.64 | Natural Community | Condition | | | |
| | | Sinkhole | Good-Fair | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Other | Condition | | | |
| | | pine plantation w/ some native flora | | | | |
| Section-Township-Range | | Archaeological Sites | | | | |
| 06-08-17 | 06-08-17 | | 0 recorded on site, 0 in 1 mile | | | |
| 07-08-17 | | Bald Eagle Nests | | | | |
| | | 0 on site, 0 in one mile | | | | |

REPA Score 8.96 of 9.44 (Santa Fe River)

KBN Score Not within a Strategic Ecosystem

Outstanding FL Waters Santa Fe River System - within 0.5 mile

OVERALL DESCRIPTION:

The 250.21-acre Block Family Partnership of Gainesville, LTD property is two parcels located in northwest Alachua County along the boundary with Gilchrist County. It is just south of CR340/ State Hwy 236, across the road from Alachua County's Poe Springs Park. It has public road frontage along CR 340 to the north, NW 298 St to the west, and NW 174 Ave to the south. The property is located immediately adjacent to the highest ranked ACF Project Area, the Santa Fe River Project Area, and falls fully within the Santa Fe River watershed. The property also falls with an Outstanding Florida Springs Priority Focus Area, and is located in the area of the County where the aquifer is unconfined and highly vulnerable to contamination. It does not fall within a Strategic Ecosystem, and there are no mapped wetlands onsite, but there are several karst features which are described below The property is currently listed for sale.

The property is almost entirely slash pine plantation with trees ranging from less than one year in age to approximately five years in age. The youngest trees were planted in January 2022. The stands with the older trees support a variety of remnant native vegetation in the understory. The majority of the native plant species observed were fairly consistent throughout the site and primarily include beauty berry, a variety of grape vine species, blackberries, winged sumac, and bracken ferns. Several other native

species were also observed, but individual plants were more widely scattered. Some of these observations included sand live oak, pawpaws, prickly ash, coral bean, prickly pear cactus, fetterbush, gallberry, sassafras, shiny blueberry, Adam's needle, and coreopsis. There are also several large old live oak trees situated along the roadways.

There are approximately eleven known or suspected sinkholes on the property, and we were able to see eight of them during the site visit. They all varied in size and depth ranging from very shallow basins to steeper depressions with depths greater than 15ft. None were holding water during the time of our site visit, but one did have a few wetland-associated species, including royal fern and buttonbush, that indicate that it holds water at least some parts of the year. One sinkhole contained some old garbage, but the rest that we were able to see were free of debris. There was only a small amount of additional solid waste observed on site in other places. The overstory in all of the sinkholes was largely oak dominated, but there were several other tree species represented including black cherry, sugar maple, and red bay, loblolly pines, pignut hickory, sweet gums, and at least one white oak.

Nonnative plants were observed in low densities across the site and included mimosa trees, tropical soda apple, showy rattlebox, and a few patches of cogon grass. Gopher tortoise burrows were abundant, and staff also observed deer and turkey. There are no documented archeological sites on the property, and staff did not observe any cultural resources during the site visit.

DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

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 currently owned by the Block Family Partnership of Gainesville, LTD and has a Future Land Use of Rural/Agriculture. Under the current land use and zoning, development of the parcel is limited primarily to agricultural uses and low-density single-family development (1 unit per 5 acres), with other development types allowed on a limited basis. Parcel #01454-000-000, located in unincorporated Alachua County, north of NW 174th Ave., south of State Hwy 236, and east of NW 298th St. It is just south of Poe Springs Park, across State Hwy 236. The parcel has 3,990 feet of public road frontage.

There are natural features on the parcel that would have protection from development activities under current regulations. The parcel is located within an Outstanding Florida Springs Priority Focus Area (PFA). The nomination paperwork indicates there are 11 sinkholes/karst features within the property. Geologic resources are regulated by Chapter 406, Article XVI of the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC). If the sinkholes and other features are determined to be significant geologic features, a buffer with 100' minimum, 150' average width will be required to be maintained around each feature since the parcel is within a springs PFA. There are no known wetlands on the property, and the parcel is not located within a strategic ecosystem.

Given the current zoning and future land use and the extent of regulated resources on the parcel, the property is still developable. However, the remote location, limited availability of infrastructure, construction costs, and generally limited development demand in the area would limit development potential for the site.

| | Santa Fe River - Block Family Partnership - 6/23/2022 | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--|
| CATEGORY | Criterion | WEIGHTING | Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection | Average Criteria Score | Average Criteri Score Multiplie 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; | | 4 | | | |
| | B. Whether the property serves an important groundwater recharge function; | | 5 | | | |
| | C. Whether the property contains or has direct connections to lakes, creeks, rivers, springs, sinkholes, or wetlands for which conservation of the property will protect or improve surface water quality; | | 1 | | | |
| | D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function. | | 1 | | | |
| (I-2) PROTECTION OF NATURAL COMMUNITIES AND LANDSCAPES | A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities; | | 1 | | | |
| | B. Whether the natural communities present on the property are rare; | | 3 | | | |
| | C. Whether there is ecological quality in the communities present on the property; | | 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 | | | |
| | F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts; | | <u>3</u> | - | | |
| | G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or | | - | | | |
| | springs; H. Whether the property is relatively free from internal fragmentation from roads, power lines, and other features that create barriers and edge effects. | | 5 3 | | | |
| (I-3) PROTECTION OF PLANT AND FANIMAL SPECIES S | A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern; | | 3 | | | |
| | B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home | | 4 | | | |
| | ranges; C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to Florida or Alachua County; | | 4 | | | |
| | D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as breeding, roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering; | | 3 | | | |
| | E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity; | | 3 | | | |
| | F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species. | | 4 | | | |
| (I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES | A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate; | | 3 | | | |
| | B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining greenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective. | | 4 | | | |
| | AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES | | | 3.10 | | |
| | RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE | 1.333 | | | 4.13 | |
| (II-1) MANAGEMENT a ISSUES | A. Whether it will be practical to manage the property to protect its environmental, social and other values (examples include controlled burning, exotics removal, maintaining hydro-period, and so on); | | 3 | | | |
| | B. Whether this management can be completed in a cost-effective manner. | | 4 | | | |
| (II-2) ECONOMIC AND ACQUISITION ISSUES | A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal, state, federal, or private contributions; | | 1 | | | |
| | B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition; | | 4 | | | |
| | 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 | | | 3.00 | | |
| | RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE | 0.667 | | | 2.00 | |
| | TOTAL SCORE | | | | 6.13 | |
| NOTES . | | | | | | |
| | General Criteria Scoring Guidelines 1 = Least beneficial, 2 = Less Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Beneficial than Average Beneficial than Ave | . . : - : - : · | ^ | = N4c - 4 D | | |



