Santa Fe River						
Robinson 5/23/2024						
	5.33 of 10.00	5 on ACPA, 5 on site - tiny house, pole barn,				
		greenhouse, 2 sheds				
Inspection Date		Just Value	Just Value Per Acre			
May 7, 2024		\$86,050.00	\$3,805.83			
Size (ACPA acres)		Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	g) Total Value Per Acre			
22.61 acres		\$93,788.00	\$4,148.07			
Parcel Number	Acreage	Acquisition Type				
02750 009 000	10.01	Fee Simple or Conservation Easement				
02750 013 000	12.6	Natural Community	Condition			
		Sinkhole Lake	Good			
		Farm Pond	Good to Fair			
		Improved Pasture	Good			
		Cropland	Good			
		Other	Condition			
		Successional Hardwoods	N/A			
Section-Township-Range		Archaeological Sites				
	33-6-18	0 recorded on site, 23 in 1 mile	9			
		Bald Eagle Nests				
		0 on site, 0 in one mile				
REPA Score	8.96 of 9.44 Santa Fe Ri	er Project Area				
KBN Score	N/A - (0.83 mile south of S	(0.83 mile south of Santa Fe River Strategic Ecosystem, Ranked 1 of 47 projects)				
Outstanding Florida Waters	Santa Fe River System	- 0.83 miles to the North				

ACPA = Alachua County Property Appraiser

Overall Description:

The Robinson property is in northern Alachua County along County Road 1491. The 22.61-acre property consists of two parcels (ACPA TPN 02750-009-000 and 02750-013-000) under one family ownership and has been nominated as a fee simple acquisition or a conservation easement. The property is located approximately 9 miles north of the City of Alachua and approximately 3 miles north of Mill Creek Preserve. The property is currently not on the market and there is not a current asking price for the property. This property currently does not have any direct connection to conservation lands, but the Matthews Preserve is located directly north across County Road 1491. This property lies within the ACF Santa Fe River project area. Additionally, the property is approximately 8 tenths of a mile south of the Santa Fe River Strategic Ecosystem and the designated Outstanding Florida Waters of the Santa Fe River system. The natural communities present on the property include a sinkhole lake, farm pond, improved pasture, cropland and successional hardwoods.

The sinkhole lake is in the northwestern portion of the property and is in good condition. The vegetation in and surrounding this feature includes rush species, pickerel weed, button bush, hickory species, magnolias, southern red cedar, and successional hardwoods. This sinkhole hole lake is home to largemouth bass and tilapia, which have been stocked by the landowner to help control some of the aquatic vegetation in leu of using herbicides.

I:\Land Conservation\Land Conservation Matrix\Santa Fe River\SFR site specific evaluations\Robinson Prepared by Mike Nelson, May 23, 2024 The farm pond is in the southeastern portion of the property and is in good to fair condition. Vegetation in and around the farm pond is limited to grass species, rush species, spatterdock and pickerel weed. The eastern side of the farm pond is beginning to regenerate with pole sized successional hardwoods.

The improved pasture is in the northeastern and southeastern portions of the property and is in good condition. The improved pasture is primarily used for Bahia hay production and totals approximately 5.5 acres.

The cropland is in the southwestern portion of the property and is in good condition. The approximately 1-acre cropland consists of a organic u-pick blueberries and grapes.

Invasive plants were found at low densities throughout the property. Invasive species that were noted at the site visit include tallow, torpedo grass and tropical soda apple. Solid waste that was discovered was relatively minor consisting of mainly farming related equipment and supplies.

Wildlife species that have been observed by the landowner include deer, coyotes, turkey, owls, sandhill cranes, otter, osprey, soft shelled turtle, and banded water snakes. Wildlife species viewed or heard during the site visit were limited to a red shouldered hawk, swallow tailed kites, and red winged black birds.

No archaeological site(s) are recorded on the property, however, in speaking with the landowner, she stated that there has been some chert that has been discovered during farming activities.

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 property is a total of 22.61 acres, comprised of two parcels, owned by several members of the Robinson family. The parcels have 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.

As per Alachua County ULDC, the wetlands on site would be protected from development along with a 75-ft upland buffer surrounding the wetlands. There is one wetland located on each parcel. The protected areas total 10.19 acres. There are no flood zones on the property.

This property contains developable area based on the current zoning, future land use, and limited natural resources. While the public road frontage contributes to the development potential, the remote location combined with limited infrastructure and associated higher construction costs may somewhat diminish the prospects and potential for development activities.

CATEGORY	Santa Fe River - Robinson - May 23, 2024 Criterion	WEIGHTING	Enter Criteria Value Based on Site Inspection	Average Criteria Score	Average Criteria Score Multiplied by Relative Importance
	A. Whether the property has geologic/hydrologic conditions that would easily enable	ଦ	mspection		тироттанес
(I-1) PROTECTION OF WATER RESOURCES	contamination of vulnerable aquifers that have value as drinking water sources;		3		
	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;		2		
	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		2		
(I-2) PROTECTION OF NATURAL COMMUNITIES AND LANDSCAPES	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;		2		
	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;		3		
	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		3		
	E. Whether the property is adjacent to properties that are in public ownership or have other environmental protections such as conservation easements;		1		
	F. Whether the property is large enough to contribute substantially to conservation efforts;		2		
	 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, 		3		
	and other features that create barriers and edge effects.		4		
(I-3) PROTECTION OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES	A. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species or species of special concern;		1		
	B. Whether the property serves as documented or potential habitat for species with large home ranges; C. Whether the property contains plants or animals that are endemic or near-endemic to		3		
	Florida or Alachua County;		2		
	 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.		3		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if appropriate; B. Whether the property contributes to urban green space, provides a municipal defining		3		
	greenbelt, provides scenic vistas, or has other value from an urban and regional planning perspective.		3		
	AVERAGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HUMAN VALUES			2.60	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333			3.47
(II-1) MANAGEMENT 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. A. Whether there is potential for purchasing the property with matching funds from municipal,		3		
(II-2) ECONOMIC AND ACQUISITION ISSUES	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			2.80	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667			1.86
	TOTAL SCORE				5.33



