## **Paynes Prairie Additions Woodbine Community Association** 6/26/2025

Project Score		Buildings	
7.27 of 10.00		0 on ACPA, 0 on site	
Inspection Date		Just Value	Just Value Per Acre
6/6/2025		\$30,600	\$513
Total Size (ACPA Acres)		Total Value (Just, Misc, Bldg)	<b>Total Value Per Acre</b>
59.7		\$30,600	\$513
Parcel Number	Acreage	Acquisition Type	
16223-006-000	55	Conservation Easement	(Donation)
16223-012-000	4.7	Natural Community	Condition
		Xeric hammock	Good
Section-Township-Range		Upland mixed woodland	Fair
16223-006-000	15-10-20	Mesic hammock	Good
16223-012-000	15-10-20	Upland hardwood forest	Excellent-Good
		Bottomland forest	Excellent-Good
Archaeological Sites		Sinkhole	Good
0 recorded on site, 11 in 1 mile		Blackwater stream	Fair
Bald Eagle Nests		Basin swamp	Excellent-Good
0 on site, 2 in one mile		Basin Marsh	Good
REPA Score	-	y projects scored 6.98 and 8.18 of thin a strategic ecosystem. Nearby	

**KBN Score** Greenway ranked 14/47

**Outstanding Florida Waters** Paynes Prairie State Preserve - within 0.7 miles

## **Overall Description:**

The Woodbine Community Association property is located on SE 27<sup>th</sup> street in the Kincade loop area of Southeast Gainesville. The 59-acre property consists of two parcels (16223-006-000 and 16223-012-000) under single ownership and has been nominated as a conservation easement donation. The parcels do not fall within an ACF project area or a strategic ecosystem. The closest ACF project areas are Paynes Prairie Additions and the Lochloosa Forest-Levy Prairie Connector, both within 0.2 miles. Gentle variations in the soil and topography create a mosaic of ecosystems on the property. The natural communities on site include xeric hammock, upland mixed woodland, mesic hammock, upland hardwood forest, bottomland forest, sinkhole pond, blackwater stream, and basin swamp. Nearly all are in good condition.

The uplands along the northern boundary are predominantly high-quality xeric hammock. Sand live oak, sparkleberry, and rusty lyonia form a twisted canopy above a saw palmetto understory. To the west, the canopy thins and longleaf pine tower over the palmettos, huckleberry, deerberry, and scrubby oaks, marking the transition to upland mixed woodlands.

Mesic hammock covers much of the center of the property surrounding the wetlands. The canopy consists of sizeable loblolly pines, southern magnolia, pignut hickory, and cabbage palm and the condition of the natural community is good overall. Fringing the many wetland features, the forest takes on more hydric or bottomland characteristics, consisting of laurel oak, water oak, red maple, and sweet bay magnolia.

Although adjacent parcels to the south contain large areas of upland hardwood forest, this habitat only occurs on a small portion in the southeast corner and along parts of the eastern boundary of the nominated property. However, this community is notable in its excellent quality and unusually high diversity of hardwood trees. It is characterized by a closed canopy consisting of swamp chestnut oak, southern magnolia, basswood, eastern hop hornbeam, bluff oak, rusty black haw, red mulberry, American holly, fringe tree, and American olive. The trunk diameter of the midstory trees is notable.

The mesic hammock and upland hardwood forest are interspersed with multiple swamps, sinkholes, and creeks. The ecotones between the upland and wetland communities support a number of interesting plants, including sweet pinxter azalea and an unidentified terrestrial orchid, possibly *Habenaria quinquesetta*. Basin swamps dot the property, with a codominant canopy of cypress and tupelo. The swamps appear to have vastly different hydroperiods. Some were inundated at the time of this evaluation. Others held no water and had a groundcover of lizards' tail and royal fern. The largest of these graded into an open, shrubby marsh system with buttonbush and grasses at one end.

At least three creek beds meander through the property. The first, Calf Pond Creek, is a blackwater stream which crosses the property in the northeast corner before terminating in Calf Pond east of the property. This is partially channelized and becomes a shallow braided flow where wild rice and canna were observed. Another creek originates in the west part of the property at the base of a gentle slope and flows east through a bottomland forest of excellent quality. This creek runs clear and cold, indicating a groundwater seep or possible spring flow. Additional ephemeral creeks cross the property but were dry at the time of this evaluation visit. One of these creeks feeds a sinkhole pond on the northeastern side of the property, and there is at least one other dry sinkhole that was observed during the site visit.

Wildlife observations include a red shouldered hawk, great egret, barred owl, and pileated woodpecker. Numerous other birds, as well as frogs and insects, could be heard throughout the property, particularly in the wetlands. Landowners attest to seeing turkey, bobcat, box turtle, eastern kingsnake, and peninsula newt. Evidence of black bear activity has been observed in the area, and there is some evidence to suggest they have utilized the property in the past, but the landowners have not seen any specifically onsite.

Human alteration appears to be minimal on the site. A narrow walking trail encircles the property and two wooden bridges span the wider creek beds. These are maintained by the current owners. Tree size and more successional species composition in one area suggests clearing in the past, consistent with landowner accounts of a former encampment. In this area, a small bottle dump was observed as well as some topographical features that were possibly hand-dug drainage ditches.

Most of the property is in good condition with few invasive plants. There are scattered patches of air potato, primarily along road edges. Occasional Japanese climbing fern also occurs in these areas. Occasional Chinese tallow seedlings and saplings were found in the wetlands, and there was one area of concentrated taro in the braided streambed of Calf Pond Creek. The landowners reported Coral ardisia as the primary invasive species concern, but it has been maintained at a low-moderate cover class by hand-pulling during community workdays.

The property is within 1 mile of eleven archeological sites, but none are known to occur on the property. The landowners had some knowledge of a previous settlement and legacy solid waste, though minimal, confirms prior use.

## **Development Review:**

This development analysis is primarily 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 two parcels are currently owned by the Woodbine Community Association. The property consists of two parcels 16223-006-000 (55 acres) and parcel 16223-012-000 (4.7 acres). None of these parcels are within a Strategic Ecosystem.

The Future Land Use for this parcel is Estate. Under current land use and zoning, the property may be developed at a maximum intensity of 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres within the urban cluster.

There are natural resources on the parcels that are protected from development activities under current regulations. As per Alachua County ULDC, Chapter 406, Article VI, the wetlands on the property would be protected as well as a 75ft average/50ft minimum upland buffer. According to geospatial data, the wetlands consist of 49.12 acres over the two parcels and 52.72 acres total including the buffer. The 100-year flood zone overlaps with the wetland and wetland buffer.

In addition, a site visit by staff have indicated the upland portion of this property to be of high quality. Under Chapter 406, Article III, Significant Plant and Wildlife Habitat, allows up to 25% set-aside of the upland portion of the property

The property consists of approximately 6.98 acres of developable area and is adjacent to a few existing single-family residential properties. However, access to the developable portion of this property will pose challenges given the protection and location of the natural resources on site. It is reasonable to say the land is moderately protected from development activities.

	Paynes Prairie Additions - Woodbine Community As:	socia	tion - 6/ <u>2</u> 6	5/202 <u>5</u>	
CATEGORY	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	Mhether 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;		4		
	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;		5		
	D. Whether the property serves an important flood management function.		4		
	A. Whether the property contains a diversity of natural communities;		3		
	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;		4		
(I-2) PROTECTION	D. Whether the property is functionally connected to other natural communities;		3		
COMMUNITIES AND LANDSCAPES	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;		3	-	
	G. Whether the property contains important, Florida-specific geologic features such as caves or		3		
	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;		4		
	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;  D. Whether the property serves as a special wildlife migration or aggregation site for activities such as breeding, roosting, colonial nesting, or over-wintering;		5		
	E. Whether the property offers high vegetation quality and species diversity;		4		
	F. Whether the property has low incidence of non-native invasive species.		4		
	A. Whether the property offers opportunities for compatible resource-based recreation, if		4		
(I-4) SOCIAL AND HUMAN VALUES	appropriate;  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			3.45	]
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	1.333		0.40	4.60
(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);		4		
	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;		5		
	B. Whether the overall resource values justifies the potential cost of acquisition;		5		
	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		2		
	AVERAGE FOR ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT VALUES			4.00	
	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CRITERIA SET IN THE OVERALL SCORE	0.667		→.∪∪	2.67
	TOTAL SCORE	5.507			7.27
<u>NOTES</u>					
	General Criteria Scoring Guidelines	.6.1.10			
	1 = Least beneficial, 2 = Less Beneficial than Average, 3 = Average, 4 = More Ben	ericiai tr	ıarı Average, 5	= iviost B	eneticiai





