


Conservation Collier

Initial Criteria Screening Report

Gore TPMA



Target Protection Mailing Area Parcels and Acreage: 78 parcels (179.6 ac)

Application Parcel Owners: Raul and Carmen S. Perez

Staff Report: August 3, 2022

(Revised 8/26/22, 2/7/24, 3/6/24, 3/5/25, and 4/5/2025)




Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Summary of Property	5
Figure 1 - Parcel Location Overview	5
Figure 2 - Parcel Close-up	6
Figure 3 – Aerial of Multi-parcel Project and TPMA boundary	7
2.1 Summary of Property Information	8
Table 1 – Summary of Property Information	8
Figure 4 - Secondary Criteria Score	9
Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary	9
2.2 Summary of Assessed Value and Property Cost Estimates	10
Table 3. Assessed & Estimated Value	10
2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays	10
2.3 Summary of Initial Screening Criteria Satisfaction (Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10)	11
3. Initial Screening Criteria	13
3.1 Ecological Values	13
3.1.1 Vegetative Communities	13
Table 4. Listed Plant Species	13
Figure 5 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities	14
Figure 6 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System	15
Figure 7 – Cypress/Tupelo	16
Figure 8 – Mixed Wetland Hardwoods	16
Figure 9 – Mixed Shrub/Scrub Wetlands	17
Figure 10 – Transportation	17
3.1.2 Wildlife Communities	18
Table 5 – Listed Wildlife Species	18
Figure 11 - Wildlife Spatial Data (i.e., telemetry, roosts, etc)	19
Figure 12 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness	20
3.1.3 Water Resources	21
Figure 13 – CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones	22
Figure 14 - Collier County Soil Survey	23
Figure 15 - LIDAR Elevation Map	24

3.1.4 Ecosystem Connectivity	25
Figure 16 - Conservation Lands.....	26
3.2 Human Values	27
3.2.1 Recreation	27
3.2.2 Accessibility	27
3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement	28
Figure 17 – Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve Hiking Trail.....	28
3.3 Restoration and Management.....	29
3.3.1 Vegetation Management.....	29
3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation.....	29
3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire.....	29
3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security.....	29
3.3.3 Assistance	29
3.4 Vulnerability.....	29
3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use	29
Figure 18 – Zoning.....	30
Figure 19 –Future Land Use	31
3.4.2 Development Plans	32
4. Acquisition Considerations.....	32
5. Management Needs and Costs	32
Table 6 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management.....	32
6. Potential for Matching Funds.....	33
7. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form.....	34
8. Additional Site Photos	40
APPENDIX 1 – Critical Lands and Water Identification Maps (CLIP) Definitions.....	43

1. Introduction

The Conservation Collier Program (Program) is an environmentally sensitive land acquisition and management program approved by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners (Board) in 2002 and by Collier County Voters in 2002 and 2006. The Program was active in acquisition between 2003 and 2011, under the terms of the referendum. Between 2011 and 2016, the Program was in management mode. In 2017, the Collier County Board re-authorized Conservation Collier to seek additional lands (2/14/17, Agenda Item 11B). On November 3, 2020, the Collier County electors approved the Conservation Collier Re-establishment referendum with a 76.5% majority.

This Initial Criteria Screening Report (ICSR) has been prepared for the Conservation Collier Program to meet requirements specified in the Conservation Collier Implementation Ordinance, 2002-63, as amended, and for purposes of the Conservation Collier Program. The sole purpose of this report is to provide objective data to demonstrate how properties meet the criteria defined by the ordinance.

The following sections characterize the property location and assessed value, elaborate on the initial and secondary screening criteria scoring, and describe potential funding sources, appropriate use, site improvements, and estimated management costs.

This Initial Criteria Screening Report evaluates the entire Robert H. Gore III Preserve Target Protection Mailing Area (TPMA). The current TPMA includes a total of 78 parcels (179.6 acres). Parcels within the Robert H. Gore III Preserve TPMA, which is outside the multi-parcel project area, must be evaluated by the Conservation Collier Land Acquisition Advisory Committee (CCLAAC) and placed on the recommended Conservation Collier Active Acquisition List for Board consideration.

2. Summary of Property




Figure 1 - Parcel Location Overview




Figure 2 - Parcel Close-up




Figure 3 – Aerial of Multi-parcel Project and TPMA boundary

2.1 Summary of Property Information

Table 1 – Summary of Property Information

Characteristic	Value	Comments
Name	Multiple	Perez has applied
Folio Number	78 Parcels	179.6 parcels – current application folio is: 41500560009
Target Protection Area	NGGE	Within Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve Target Protection Mailing Area
Size	177.9 total acres	
Section, Township, and Range	S32 and S33, T49S, R28E	Sections 32 and 33, Township 49S, Range 28E
Zoning Category/TDRs	Estates	1 unit per 2.25 acres
FEMA Flood Map Category	AH, with some small areas AE and X500	AH and AE- Area close to water hazard that has a one percent chance of experiencing shallow flooding between one and three feet each year. X500 – low flood risk
Existing structures	none	
Adjoining properties and their Uses	Conservation, Residential, Easement and roadway	TPMA parcels are adjacent to existing Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve parcels, undeveloped land, limited residential inholdings, Desoto Blvd, and bordered on the east by conservation easement and the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge and south by Picayune Strand State Forest.
Development Plans Submitted	None	
Known Property Irregularities	None known	
Other County Dept Interest	Transportation	Desoto Blvd. may be widened, and an I-75 interchange may be developed in this area in the future




Figure 4 - Secondary Criteria Score

Table 2 - Secondary Criteria Score Summary

Criteria	Awarded Weighted Points	Possible Weighted Points	Awarded/Possible Points
1 - Ecological Value	120	160	75%
1.1 - Vegetative Communities	32	53	60%
1.2 - Wildlife Communities	24	27	90%
1.3 - Water Resources	11	27	40%
1.4 - Ecosystem Connectivity	53	53	100%
2 - Human Values	54	80	68%
2.1 - Recreation	23	34	67%
2.2 - Accessibility	27	34	79%
2.3 - Aesthetics/Cultural Enhancement	4	11	38%
3 - Restoration and Management	46	80	57%
3.1 - Vegetation Management	23	55	42%
3.2 - Remediation and Site Security	23	23	100%
3.3 - Assistance	0	2	0%
4 - Vulnerability	64	80	81%
4.1 - Zoning and Land Use	56	58	96%
4.2 - Development Plans	9	22	40%
Total	284	400	71%

2.2 Summary of Assessed Value and Property Cost Estimates

The interest being appraised is fee simple “as is” for the purchase of the site. A value of the parcel was estimated using only one of the three traditional approaches to value, the sales comparison approach. It is based on the principal of substitution 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 were selected for comparison, each with similar site characteristics, utility availability, zoning classification and road access. No inspection was made of the property or comparable used in this report and the Real Estate Services Department staff relied upon information solely provided by program staff. The valuation conclusion is limited only by the reported assumptions and conditions that no other known or unknown adverse conditions exist.

If the Board of County Commissioners choose to acquire this property, an appraisal by an independent Real Estate Appraiser will be obtained at that time. Pursuant to the Conservation Collier Purchase Policy, one appraisal is required for this parcel, which has a valuation under \$500,000; one independent Real Estate Appraiser will value the subject parcel, and that appraisal report will be used to determine an offer amount.

Table 3. Assessed & Estimated Value

Property owner	Address	Acreage	Assessed Value*	Estimated Value**
Raul and Carmen S. Perez	No address	5.00	\$70,000	TBD

* Assessed Value is obtained from the Property Appraiser’s Website. The Assessed Value is based off the current use of the property.

**The Estimated Market Value for this Gore TPMA parcel will be obtained from the Real Property Management Section prior to ranking by the Board.

2.2.1 Zoning, Growth Management and Conservation Overlays

Zoning, growth management and conservation overlays will affect the value of a parcel. The parcels are zoned Estates which allows 1 unit per 2.25 acres.

2.3 Summary of Initial Screening Criteria Satisfaction (Ord. 2002-63, Sec. 10)

Criteria 1: CLIP Priority 1 Natural Community

Does the property contain Upland Hardwood Forest, Scrub, Coastal Upland, Dry Prairie, or Upland Pine? **NO**

Criteria 2: CLIP Priority 2 Natural Community

Does the property contain Pine Flatwoods or Coastal Wetlands? **YES**

TPMA contains Pine Flatwoods.

Criteria 3: Other Native, Natural Communities

Does the property contain other native, natural communities? **N/A**

The parcels also Cypress, Cypress- Mixed Hardwoods, Mixed Wetland Hardwoods, and Mixed Scrub-Shrub Wetland, but already contain a CLIP Priority 2 Natural Community.

Criteria 4: Human Social Values

Does the property offer cultural values, appropriate access for natural resource-based recreation, and the enhancement of the aesthetic setting of Collier County? **YES**

These parcels are in North Golden Gate Estates. They have access from four public roads: Desoto Blvd., 34th Ave. SE, and 36th Ave. SE. Desoto is paved road, both 34th Ave. SE and 36th Ave. SE are unpaved but passable by vehicle. Properties could accommodate seasonal outdoor recreation with some clearing for trails.

Criteria 5: Water Resources

Does the property offer opportunities for protection of water resource values, including aquifer recharge, water quality enhancement, protection of wetland dependent species habitat, wildfire risk reduction, storm surge protection, and flood control? **YES**

Hydric soils exist on just over 81% of the parcels; wetland indicators noted, and numerous wetland dependent plants species noted.

Criteria 6: Biological and Ecological Value

Does the property offer significant biological values, including biodiversity and listed species habitat? **YES**

FWC telemetry shows use by panther and black bear. Habitat for Florida bonneted bats and Everglades snail kites.

Criteria 7: Enhancement of Current Conservation Lands

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

Parcels will enhance the Dr. Robert Gore III Preserve. Parcels are within a historic wetland that connects with the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge (FPNWR) to the east; however, they are separated by Desoto and the old Harley Davidson Test Track. Picayune Strand State Forest (PSSF) is located across I-75 to the south and Fakahatchee Strand State Preserve to the SE across I-75. Wildlife ledges under Miller and FakaUnion canals connect to PSSF.

Criteria 8: Target Area

Is the property within a Board-approved target protection mailing area? **YES**

Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve TPMA

The Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve TPMA parcels met 6 out of the 8 Initial Screening Criteria.

3. Initial Screening Criteria

3.1 Ecological Values

3.1.1 Vegetative Communities

Characterization of Plant Communities present:

Native plant communities that make up the TPMA parcels as indicated through the Cooperative Land Cover Classification System and ground and aerial observations include: Cypress, Cypress- Mixed Hardwoods, Mixed Wetland Hardwoods, Mixed Scrub-Shrub Wetland, Pine Flatwood.

Ground Cover: Ground cover species observed bidens (*Bidens alba*), winged sumac (*Rhus copallinum* L.), morning-glory (*Ipomoea sagittata* Poir), sweet acacia (*Vachellia farnesiana*) and various epiphytic ferns

Midstory: Midstory species included beautyberry (*Callicarpa americana*), marlberry (*Ardesia escallonioides*), wild coffee (*Psychotria nervosa* and *P. sulzneri*), myrsine (*Myrsine floridana*), Carolina willow (*Salix caroliniana*), pond apple (*Annona glabra*), and buttonbush (*Cephalanthus occidentalis*).

Canopy: The canopy for most of the parcels consists of, in order of abundance, a mix of cypress (*Taxodium distichum*) cabbage palm (*Sabal palmetto*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), bay (*Persea sp.*), and slash pine (*Pinus elliottii*). Laurel oak (*Quercus laurifolia*) were also observed in various areas. In depressional areas, pop ash (*Fraxinus caroliniana*) was observed.

As a result of historic efforts to develop the Golden Gate Estates and habitat alterations that reduced the hydroperiod, some parcels within the TPMA have transitioned to pine flatwoods with upland vegetation in the understory.

In general, the condition of the on-site native plant communities varied from moderate to poor as a result of the consistent infestation level throughout each community type by invasive, exotic plant species. The native plant communities found throughout the TPMA, while heavily impacted by exotics, feature mature native trees and a diverse midstory and understory where native plant species occur. Because of this persistence of a rich diversity of native plant species throughout the impacted communities found within the preserve, restoration forecasts are optimistic following intensive efforts to kill and remove the exotic plant species dominating the landscape.

Table 4. Listed Plant Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	State Status	Federal Status
Butterfly orchid	<i>Encyclia tempensis</i>	CE	n/a
Twisted airplant	<i>Tillandsia flexuosa</i>	T	n/a
common wild pine	<i>Tillandsia fasciculata</i>	T	n/a
reflexed wild pine	<i>Tillandsia balbisiana</i>	T	n/a
giant air plant	<i>Tillandsia utriculata</i>	E	n/a




Figure 5 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities




Figure 6 - Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System



Figure 7 – Cypress/Tupelo



Figure 8 – Mixed Wetland Hardwoods



Figure 9 – Mixed Shrub/Scrub Wetlands



Figure 10 – Transportation

3.1.2 Wildlife Communities

As a result of regional connectivity, Florida panther, Florida black bear, wild turkey, white-tailed deer, spotted skunk, bobcat, grey fox, red-headed woodpeckers, and coyote are commonly sighted on the wildlife cameras located throughout the existing Gore Preserve lands. As the parcels within the Gore TPMA are adjacent to or near the acquired lands, it is reasonable that the TPMA parcels would provide similar habitat for species observed on preserve lands. Table 5 details imperiled species that are likely found or have been observed utilizing the parcels within the Gore TPMA. Figure 10 provides a reference to the utilization of the TPMA by the Federally Endangered Florida panther.

Table 5 – Listed Wildlife Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Observation Documented
American Alligator	<i>Alligator mississippiensis</i>	FT (S/A)	Yes
Audobon's crested caracara	<i>Polyborus plancus audubonii</i>	FT	Within 2 miles
Big Cypress fox squirrel	<i>Sciurus niger avicennia</i>	ST	No
Cassius blue butterfly	<i>Leptotes cassius theonus</i>	FT (S/A)	No
Ceraunus blue butterfly	<i>Hemiargus ceraunus antibubastus</i>	FT (S/A)	No
Eastern indigo snake	<i>Dymarchon corais couperi</i>	FT	No
Everglade snail kite	<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbeus</i>	FE	Within 3 miles
Everglades mink	<i>Neovison vison evergladensis</i>	ST	Within 10 miles
Florida bonneted bat	<i>Eumops floridanus</i>	FE	Within 5 miles
Florida panther	<i>Puma Felis concolor coryi</i>	SE	Yes
Florida sandhill crane	<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	ST	Yes
Gopher tortoise	<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	ST	Within 2 miles
Little blue heron	<i>Egretta caerulea</i>	ST	Yes
Red-cockaded woodpecker	<i>Picoides borealis</i>	FE	Within 5 miles
Roseate spoonbill	<i>Platalea ajaja</i>	ST	Yes
Sherman's short-tailed shrew	<i>Blarina shermani</i>	ST	No
Tricolored heron	<i>Egretta tricolor</i>	ST	Yes
Wood stork	<i>Mycteria americana</i>	FT	Yes

FE= Federally Endangered, FT= Federally Threatened, FT (S/A) = Federally Threatened for Similar Appearance, SE= State Endangered, ST = State Threatened,




Figure 11 - Wildlife Spatial Data (i.e., telemetry, roosts, etc)




Figure 12 - CLIP4 Potential Habitat Richness

3.1.3 Water Resources

The project area provides moderate recharge of the surficial aquifer. Surface water pooling and storage throughout the wet season are observed in the depressional cypress sloughs, roadside swales, and seasonal ponds that make up the wetlands throughout the TPMA. Changes to the regional hydrology through the installation of roadways, swales, and the Faka-Union canal have facilitated a significant infestation of the native plant communities by exotic, invasive plant species. As a result of these hydrologic manipulations, areas noted on the map as freshwater forested wetlands have been observed to remain dry throughout the wet season. Wetland dependent wildlife species such as wood stork, little blue heron, and roseate spoonbill have been observed utilizing the seasonally flooded wetlands throughout the TPMA.

Soils data is based on the Soil Survey of Collier County Area, Florida (USDA/NRCS, 1990). Mapped soils on this parcel show the TPMA is comprised of mainly non-hydric soils. Hallandale Fine Sand, nearly level, poorly drained soils associated with flatwoods, are mapped within 59% of the TPMA. Boca, Riviera, Limestone Substratum and Copeland Fine Sand, Depressional soils, hydric, very poorly drained soils found in depressions, swamps, and marshes, are mapped within 35% of the TPMA. Hallandale and Boca Fine Sand, hydric, very poorly drained soils found in depressions, swamps, and marshes, are mapped within 6% of the TPMA.




Figure 13 – CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones




Figure 14 - Collier County Soil Survey




Figure 15 - LIDAR Elevation Map

3.1.4 Ecosystem Connectivity

The parcels within the Gore TPMA provide habitat and dispersal corridors for a significant number of imperiled and common wildlife species. The TPMA parcels are located within 1 mile of the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge, Picayune Strand State Forest and Fakahatchee Strand State Preserve, as well as the low-density development of the Northern Golden Gate Estates residential area. A wildlife crossing exists beneath I-75 which provides connectivity between the Gore TPMA and Picayune Strand State Forest.




Figure 16 - Conservation Lands

3.2 Human Values

3.2.1 Recreation

Acquisition of the parcels within the Gore TPMA would be an expansion of the existing Conservation Collier Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve. The Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve currently provides 1.5 miles of hiking trails with conceptual plans for expansion in the coming years dependent on acquisitions. Overall, it is important to note that adding onto the preserve will provide additional acreage that will not be developed and in turn will be available for wildlife utilization. The addition of trails and site improvements to these parcels will be evaluated and reviewed. Potential public use opportunities for the parcels within the TPMA include:

Hiking: Some of the parcels could be incorporated into the preserve trail system.

Nature Photography: These properties provide opportunities for nature photography.

Birdwatching: Parcels will provide opportunities for birdwatching and are included in an annual Christmas Bird Count Route.

Kayaking/Canoeing: The parcels do not provide opportunities for kayaking or canoeing. However, the preserve as a whole may have such opportunities in the future along the canal as budgeting and permitting consideration allow.

Hunting: Hunting opportunities will be assessed with each management plan update to the preserve. The limited acreage and existing private inholdings indicate that hunting would not be a compatible land use at this time.

Fishing: Acquisition of TPMA parcels may provide opportunities for fishing in the future along the canal as budgeting and permitting consideration allow.

Environmental Education: Programs and special events could be held within the existing Gore Nature Center parcel, if acquired.

3.2.2 Accessibility

Additional passive recreational hiking trails may be considered for incorporation on the parcels within the Gore TPMA. Parcels within the TPMA are accessible via Desoto Blvd, 36th Ave SE, and 34th Ave SE. The Cypress Cove Conservancy parcel has been developed for public natural resource based educational opportunities containing walking trails, a main building, an education center, a small gazebo, a chickee hut, and a gravel parking lot.

3.2.3 Aesthetic/Cultural Enhancement

The TPMA parcels are visible along Desoto Blvd, 36th Ave SE, and 34th Ave SE and would contribute to preserving the natural aesthetics of the Golden Gate Estates.



Figure 17 – Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve Hiking Trail

3.3 Restoration and Management

3.3.1 Vegetation Management

3.3.1.1 Invasive Vegetation

Approximately 50-65% of the plant communities within the TPMA parcels are infested with invasive vegetation – primarily Brazilian pepper. Other species of concern include lantana, mission grass, cogon grass, and Boston fern.

3.3.1.2 Prescribed Fire

The TPMA parcels contain fire dependent communities that have experienced decades of fire suppression and hydrologic changes that have resulted in a significant dry down of wetland habitats. The TPMA parcels and surrounding areas have significant wildfire risk and would be unlikely candidates for maintenance through controlled burning until significant fuel reduction took place within the parcels and surrounding private lands.

3.3.2 Remediation and Site Security

Parcels within the Gore TPMA experience occasional ATV trespass issues and some illegal dumping in the road right of ways. Consideration must be made to preventing ATV trespass if incorporating public use opportunities onto acquisition parcels.

3.3.3 Assistance

The FWC Invasive Plant Management Section (IPMS) has provided funding assistance for exotic vegetation removal within the Gore Preserve in the past. Opportunities exist for additional funding assistance to offset initial exotic removal costs.

3.4 Vulnerability

3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use

The parcels are Zoned as Estates. Estates zoning provides lands for low density residential development in a semi-rural to rural environment, with limited agricultural activities. Allowable density is 1 unit per 2.25 acres, or 1 unit per lot if under 2.25 acres. In addition to low density residential density with limited agricultural activities, the E district is also designed to accommodate as Conditional Uses, Development that provides services for and is compatible with the low density residential, semi-rural and rural character of the E district.




Figure 18 – Zoning




Figure 19 –Future Land Use

3.4.2 Development Plans

The parcels within the Gore TPMA are within an area being rapidly targeted for development for clearing and new home construction.

4. Acquisition Considerations

Staff would like to bring the following items to the attention of the Advisory Committee during the review of this property. The following does not affect the scoring. The following are items that will be addressed in the Executive Summary to the Board of County Commissioners if this property moves forward for ranking.

Trash and dumping concerns will be reviewed and highlighted on a parcel-by-parcel basis as applications are received. A telephone pole and some large plastic piping was observed on the Rivera parcel. There is potential for an I-75 Interchange in the area of the Gore TPMA, and a roadway expansion and stormwater ponds may be needed in the near future. If these properties are approved for the A-List, staff will take this information into consideration when planning amenities and public access on the site. Additionally, when applicable, language will be memorialized in the Purchase Agreements and related closing documents to ensure Collier County Transportation will be able to purchase a portion of the properties from Conservation Collier for future right-of-way, if and when needed, at the original per-acre acquisition cost.

5. Management Needs and Costs

Table 6 - Estimated Costs of Site Remediation, Improvements, and Management

Management Element	Initial Cost	Annual Recurring Cost	Comments
Invasive Vegetation Removal	\$89,800	\$44,900	Acquired lands within the Gore TPMA would be treated on an annual basis and acreage incorporated into the existing preserve maintenance to reduce acreage cost. Initial estimated \$500/acre cost will be higher for newly acquired parcels and should reduce over time with continued maintenance to an estimated \$250/acre
Trail Construction and Signage	\$5,000	\$100	If public access trails are incorporated into acquisition parcels
TOTAL	\$93,950	\$44,600	

6. Potential for Matching Funds

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

Florida Communities Trust - Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program: The FCT Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program provides grant funds to local governments and nonprofit organizations to acquire conservation lands, urban open spaces, parks and greenways. Application for this program is typically made for pre-acquired sites up to two years from the time of acquisition. The Parks and Open Space Florida Forever grant program assists the Department of Environmental Protection in helping communities meet the challenges of growth, supporting viable community development and protecting natural resources and open space. The program receives 21 percent Florida Forever appropriation.

Florida Forever Program: Staff has been advised that the Florida Forever Program is concentrating on funding parcels already included on its ranked priority list. This parcel is not inside a Florida Forever priority project boundary. Additionally, the Conservation Collier Program has not been successful in partnering with the Florida Forever Program due to conflicting acquisition policies and issues regarding joint title between the programs.

7. Secondary Criteria Scoring Form

Property Name: Gore TPMA			
Target Protection Mailing Area: Gore			
Folio(s): 79 parcels – 179.6 ac.			
Secondary Criteria Scoring	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Percentage
1 - Ecological Value	160	120	75
2 - Human Value	80	54	68
3 - Restoration and Management	80	46	57
4 - Vulnerability	80	64	81
TOTAL SCORE	400	284	71

1 - ECOLOGICAL VALUES (40% of total)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
1.1 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES	200	120	
1.1.1 - Priority natural communities (Select highest score)			
a. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 1 communities (1130 - Rockland Hammock, 1210 - Scrub, 1213 - Sand Pine Scrub, 1214 - Coastal Scrub, 1312 - Scrubby Flatwoods, 1610 - Beach Dune, 1620 - Coastal Berm, 1630 - Coastal Grasslands, 1640 - Coastal Strand, or 1650 - Maritime Hammock)	100		
b. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 2 communities (22211 - Hydric Pine Flatwoods, 2221 - Wet Flatwoods, or 1311 - Mesic Flatwoods)	60	60	Mesic flatwoods in areas where wetland hardwoods have transitioned from hydrologic changes
c. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 3 communities (5250 - Mangrove Swamp, or 5240 - Salt Marsh)	50		
d. Parcel contains CLIP4 Priority 4 communities (5250 - Mangrove Swamp)	25		
1.1.2 - Plant community diversity (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel has ≥ 3 CLC native plant communities (Florida Cooperative Land Cover Classification System native plant communities)	20	20	
b. Parcel has ≤ 2 CLC native plant communities	10		
c. Parcel has 0 CLC native plant communities	0		
1.1.3 - Listed plant species (excluding commercially exploited species) (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel has ≥ 5 CLC listed plant species	30		
b. Parcel has 3-4 CLC listed plant species	20	20	
c. Parcel has ≤ 2 CLC listed plant species	10		
d. Parcel has 0 CLC listed plant species	0		

1.1.4 - Invasive Plant Infestation (Select highest score)			
a. 0 - 10% infestation	50		
b. 10 - 25% infestation	40		
c. 25 - 50% infestation	30		
d. 50 - 75% infestation	20	20	
e. ≥75% infestation	10		
1.2 - WILDLIFE COMMUNITIES	100	90	
1.2.1 - Listed wildlife species (Select the highest score)			
a. Listed wildlife species documented on the parcel	80	80	FL panther
b. Listed wildlife species documented on adjacent property	60		
c. CLIP Potential Habitat Richness ≥5 species	40		
d. No listed wildlife documented near parcel	0		
1.2.2 - Significant wildlife habitat (Rookeries, roosts, denning sites, nesting grounds, high population densities, etc) (Select highest score)			
a. Parcel protects significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	20		
b. Parcel enhances adjacent to significant wildlife habitat (Please describe)	10	10	adjacent to Gore
c. Parcel does not enhance significant wildlife habitat	0		
1.3 - WATER RESOURCES	100	40	
1.3.1 - Aquifer recharge (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel is located within a wellfield protection zone or within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 1 area	40		
b. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 2 or 3 area	30		
c. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 4 or 5 area	20		
d. Parcel is located within a CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority 6 area	0	0	
1.3.2 - Surface Water Protection (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an Outstanding Florida Waterbody	30		
b. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for a creek, river, lake, canal or other surface water body	20	20	Faka Union canal
c. Parcel is contiguous with and provides buffering for an identified flowway	15		
d. Wetlands exist on site	10		
e. Parcel does not provide opportunities for surface water quality enhancement	0	0	
1.3.3 - Floodplain Management (Select all that apply)			
a. Parcel has depressional or slough soils	10	10	
b. Parcel has known history of flooding and is likely to provide onsite water attenuation	10	10	
c. Parcel provides storm surge buffering	10		

d. Parcel does not provide floodplain management benefits	0		
1.4 - ECOSYSTEM CONNECTIVITY	200	200	
1.4.1 - Acreage (Select Highest Score)			
a. Parcel is \geq 300 acres	150	150	177.9 ac.
b. Parcel is \geq 100 acres	100		
b. Parcel is \geq 50 acres	75		
c. Parcel is \geq 25 acres	25		
d. Parcel is \geq 10 acres	15		
e. Parcel is $<$ 10 acres	0		
1.4.2 - Connectivity (Select highest score)			
a. Parcel is immediately contiguous with conservation lands	50	50	Dr. Robert H. Gore III Preserve
b. Parcel is not immediately contiguous, but parcels between it and nearby conservation lands are undeveloped	25		
c. Parcel is isolated from conservation land	0	0	
ECOLOGICAL VALUES TOTAL POINTS	600	450	
ECOLOGICAL VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*160)	160	120	

2 - HUMAN VALUES (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
2.1 - RECREATION	120	80	
2.1.1 - Compatible recreation activities (Select all that apply)			
a. Hunting	20		
b. Fishing	20	20	
c. Water-based recreation (paddling, swimming, etc)	20		
d. Biking	20	20	
e. Equestrian	20	20	
f. Passive natural-resource based recreation (Hiking, photography, wildlife watching, environmental education, etc)	20	20	
g. Parcel is incompatible with nature-based recreation	0		
2.2 - ACCESSIBILITY	120	95	
2.2.1 - Seasonality (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel accessible for land-based recreation year round	20	20	
b. Parcel accessible for land-based recreation seasonally	10		
c. Parcel is inaccessible for land-based recreation	0		
2.2.2 - Vehicle access (Select the highest score)			
a. Public access via paved road	50	50	
b. Public access via unpaved road	30		
c. Public access via private road	20		
d. No public access	0		
2.2.3 - Parking Availability (Select the highest score)			

a. Minor improvements necessary to provide on-site parking	40		
b. Major improvements necessary to provide on-site parking (Requires site development plan)	25	25	
b. Public parking available nearby or on adjacent preserve	20		
c. Street parking available	10		
d. No public parking available	0		
2.2.4 - Pedestrian access (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel is easily accessible to pedestrians (within walking distance of housing development)	10		
b. Parcel is not easily accessible to pedestrians	0		
2.3 - AESTHETICS/CULTURAL ENHANCEMENT	40	15	
2.3.1 - Aesthetic/cultural value (Choose all that apply)			
a. Mature/outstanding native vegetation	5	5	Mature Cypress and pine
b. Scenic vistas	5		
c. Frontage enhances aesthetics of public thoroughfare	10	10	adjacent to Desoto Blvd
d. Archaeological/historical structures present	15		
e. Other (Please describe)	5		
f. None	0		
HUMAN VALUES TOTAL SCORE	280	190	
HUMAN VALUES WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	54	


3 - RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
3.1 - VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	120	50	
3.1.1 - Invasive plant management needs (Select the highest score)			
a. Minimal invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (<30%)	100		
b. Moderate invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (30-65%)	75		
c. Major invasive/nuisance plant management necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (>65%)	50	50	High invasive density but equally high native seed source and diversity intermixed.
d. Major invasive/nuisance plant management and replanting necessary to restore and maintain native plant communities (>65%)	25		
e. Restoration of native plant community not feasible	0		

3.1.2 - Prescribed fire necessity and compatibility (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is compatible with prescribed fire or parcel does not contain fire dependent plant communities	20		
b. Parcel contains fire dependent plant communities and is incompatible with prescribed fire	0	0	Fire unlikely to be safely contained
3.2 - REMEDIATION AND SITE SECURITY	50	50	
3.2.1 - Site remediation and human conflict potential (Dumping, contamination, trespassing, vandalism, other) (Select the highest score)			
a. Minimal site remediation or human conflict issues predicted	50	50	ATV trespass and minimal potential dumping
b. Moderate site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	20		
c. Major site remediation or human conflict issues predicted (Please describe)	5		
d. Resolving site remediation or human conflict issues not feasible	0		
3.3 - ASSISTANCE	5	0	
3.3.1 - Management assistance by other entity			
a. Management assistance by other entity likely	5		
b. Management assistance by other entity unlikely	0	0	
RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT TOTAL SCORE	175	100	
RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	46	

4 - VULNERABILITY (20%)	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Comments
4.1 - ZONING AND LAND USE	130	125	
4.1.1 - Zoning and land use designation (Select the highest score)			
a. Zoning allows for Single Family, Multifamily, industrial or commercial	100	100	Estates
b. Zoning allows for density of no greater than 1 unit per 5 acres	75		
c. Zoning allows for agricultural use /density of no greater than 1 unit per 40 acres	50		
d. Zoning favors stewardship or conservation	0		
4.1.2 - Future Land Use Type (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel designated Urban	30		
b. Parcel designated Estates, Rural Fringe Receiving and Neutral, Agriculture	25	25	

c. Parcel designated Rural Fringe Sending, Rural Lands Stewardship Area	5		
d. Parcel is designated Conservation	0		
4.2 - DEVELOPMENT PLANS	50	20	
4.2.1 - Development plans (Select the highest score)			
a. Parcel has been approved for development	20		
b. SFWMD and/or USACOE permit has been applied for or SDP application has been submitted	15		
c. Parcel has no current development plans	0	0	
4.2.2 - Site characteristics amenable to development (Select all that apply)			
a. Parcel is primarily upland	10	10	
b. Parcel is along a major roadway	10	5	
c. Parcel is >10 acres	5	5	
d. Parcel is within 1 mile of a current or planned commercial or multi-unit residential development	5		
VULNERABILITY TOTAL SCORE	180	145	
VULNERABILITY WEIGHTED SCORE (Awarded Points/Possible Points*80)	80	64	

8. Additional Site Photos



Mature Cypress within Gore TPMA



Faka-Union canal with opportunities for enhance public access amenities



Typical site conditions of wetland hardwood communities that have transitioned to mesic flatwood.



Perez parcel



Perez parcel view looking north from 36th Ave. SE

APPENDIX 1 – Critical Lands and Water Identification Maps (CLIP) Definitions

This report makes use of data layers from the Florida Natural Areas Inventory and University of Florida Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP4). CLIP4 is a collection of spatial data that identify statewide priorities for a broad range of natural resources in Florida. It was developed through a collaborative effort between the Florida Areas Natural Inventory (FNAI), the University of Florida GeoPlan Center and Center for Landscape Conservation Planning, and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). It is used in the Florida Forever Program to evaluate properties for acquisition. CLIP4 is organized into a set of core natural resource data layers which are representative of 5 resource categories: biodiversity, landscapes, surface water, groundwater and marine. The first 3 categories have also been combined into the Aggregated layer, which identifies 5 priority levels for natural resource conservation.

Below is a description of each of the three CLIP4 data layers used in this report.

Figure 5 - CLIP4 Priority Natural Communities

Consists of 12 priority natural community types: upland glades, pine rocklands, seepage slopes, scrub, sandhill, sandhill upland lakes, rockland hammock, coastal uplands, imperiled coastal lakes, dry prairie, upland pine, pine flatwoods, upland hardwood forest, or coastal wetlands. These natural communities are prioritized by a combination of their heritage global status rank (G-rank) and landscape context, based on the Land Use Intensity Index (subset of CLIP Landscape Integrity Index) and FNAI Potential Natural Areas. Priority 1 includes G1-G3 communities with Very High or High landscape context. Priority 2 includes G1-G3 Medium and G4 Very High/High. Priority 3 includes G4 Medium and G5 Very High/High. Priority 5 is G5 Medium.

This data layer was created by FNAI originally to inform the Florida Forever environmental land acquisition program. The natural communities were mapped primarily based on the FNAI/FWC Cooperative Land Cover (CLC) data layer, which is a compilation of best-available land cover data for the entire state. The CLC is based on both remote-sensed (from aerial photography, primarily from water management district FLUCCS data) and ground-truthed (from field surveys on many conservation lands) data.

Figure 12 - Potential Habitat Richness CLIP4 Map

This CLIP version 4.0 data layer is unchanged from CLIP v3.0. FWC Potential Habitat Richness. Because SHCAs do not address species richness, FWC also developed the potential habitat richness layer to identify areas of overlapping vertebrate species habitat. FWC created a statewide potential habitat model for each species included in their analysis. In some cases, only a portion of the potential habitat was ultimately designated as SHCA for each species. The Potential Habitat Richness layer includes the entire potential habitat model for each species and provides a count of the number of species habitat models occurring at each location. The highest number of focal species co-occurring at any location in the model is 13.

Figure 13 - CLIP4 Aquifer Recharge Priority and Wellfield Protection Zones

High priorities indicate high potential for recharge to an underlying aquifer system (typically the Floridan aquifer but could be intermediate or surficial aquifers in some portions of the state). The highest priorities indicate high potential for recharge to springs or public water supplies. This figure also includes Wellfield Protection Zones. Collier County Wellfield Protection Zones are referenced in the Land Development Code and updated in 2010 by Pollution Control and Prevention Department Staff. The public water supply wellfields, identified in section 3.06.06 and permitted by the SFWMD for potable water to withdraw a minimum of 100,000 average gallons per day (GPD), are identified as protected wellfields, around which specific land use and activity (regulated development) shall be regulated under this section.