

Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

Agenda

Meeting: June 30, 2026, 9:00 am to 2:00 pm
Lake County Administration Building - Board Chambers
315 West Main Street, Tavares, Florida 32778

Call to Order and Pledge

Meeting Properly Noticed

Confirm Quorum Present

Request for Approval of Minutes: April 16, 2026

Public Comments

Presentation:

- Introduction: Wendy Poag, Public Lands Manager
- IT Support, Alana Foote – GIS Data Technician
- Phase 1 – Property Submissions:

Please note: We will begin staff presentations on the site visit evaluations and review as many properties as time allows. Any properties not completed during this meeting will automatically be carried forward to the July 30 agenda for consideration alongside the Wekiva Trail site review.

- Staff site evaluation reviews, in order of FINAL score, highest to lowest:
 - Sunderman – Groveland – Scored 38 out of 48 points
 - Shelley/Chasteen – Howey-in-the-Hills – Scored 30 out of 48 points
 - Holloway – Paisley – Scored 27 out of 48 points
 - National Developers LLC/Rood – Ferndale – Scored 14 out of 48 points
 - King Grove Organic Farm – Eustis – Scored 11 out of 48 points, fee simple and conservation easement application
 - Sharp – Clermont – Scored 9 out of 48 points

Next Steps for July 30 Agenda

Next Meeting: Date: July 30, 2026

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Location: Lake County Administration Building – Board Chambers
315 Main Street, Tavares, FL 32778

Adjournment

COUNTY SUPPORT STAFF

Wendy Poag
E wendy.poag@lakecountyfl.gov
P 352-253-4950

Gallus Quigley
E gallus.quigley@lakecountyfl.gov
P 352-253-4950

The Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners on matters relating to property acquisitions to protect natural spaces, water quality, wildlife connectivity and trails. Visit <https://www.lakecountyfl.gov/boards-and-committees> for meeting schedules and agendas.

1 A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PUBLIC LANDS AND TRAILS ACQUISITION

2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3 APRIL 16, 2026

4 The Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee (PLTAAC) met in regular
5 session on Thursday, April 16, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake
6 County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. PLTAAC members present at the meeting
7 were: Commr. Sean Parks, Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Liaison; Tim Sallin, Chairman
8 (arrived at 9:03 a.m.); Cade Carter, Vice Chairman; Patrick Rose; Greg Gensheimer; Donna
9 Bosold; Steve Crawford; A.J. Rohe; and Daniel Whitehouse. Member not present: Gavin Rollins.
10 Others present were: Angela Harrold, Operations Director for Parks and Water Resources;
11 Lindsaia Johansmeyer, Director for the Office of Parks and Trails; Melanie Marsh, County
12 Attorney; and Josh Pearson, Deputy Clerk.

13 CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

14 Vice Chairman Cade Carter called the meeting to order. He then led the Pledge of
15 Allegiance.

16 Ms. Angela Harrold, Operations Director for Parks and Water Resources, commented that
17 the meeting was properly noticed and that there was a quorum.

18 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19 On a motion by Mr. Whitehouse, seconded by Mr. Rohe and carried unanimously by a vote
20 of 7-0, the PLTAAC approved the minutes for the meeting of January 15, 2026 (Regular Meeting)
21 as presented.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT

23 Ms. Susan Fetter, a resident of the City of Leesburg, thanked the Board for their work on
24 this project and encouraged them to continue their effort to acquire great conservation lands. She
25 mentioned a story from Flagler County, noting that she had submitted a copy of this. She specified
26 that Flagler County just had an amazing accomplishment for a beautiful piece of conservation land,
27 and that this was the kind of item that Lake County residents had in mind when they supported
28 renewing the bond initiative.

29 Chairman Tim Sallin arrived at 9:03 a.m.

30 PRESENTATION FROM FLORIDA WILDLIFE CORRIDOR FOUNDATION

31 Mr. Dylan Rigsby, Conservation Planning Specialist for the Florida Wildlife Corridor
32 Foundation, explained that the Florida Wildlife Corridor was a statewide vision of connected lands
33 from the Florida Everglades to the States of Georgia and Alabama, and that it connected large
34 ecological hubs to one another through a series of connected landscapes. He displayed a map with
35 permanently protected areas, noting that these included Federally protected lands, State lands and
36 a collection of private easements. He relayed that of those 18 million acres, 10 million acres were
37 in permanent conservation, and eight million acres of the connected landscape were unprotected.
38 He added that the corridor was enshrined in the State Legislature with the Florida Wildlife Corridor
39 Act of 2021, and he read that it was to create incentives for conservation and sustainable
40 development while sustaining and conserving the green infrastructure that was the foundation of

1 the state's economy and quality of life; additionally, he pointed out the opportunities on a map.
2 He said that the corridor included a vast collection of wetlands and uplands, along with lakes,
3 streams and rivers where Floridians could participate in recreational activities, and that it was also
4 home to precarious and endemic habitats and species. He commented that the corridor was a
5 mosaic of agricultural lands which were working lands of cattle, timber and citrus, noting that of
6 the eight million opportunity acres, about 75 percent were working lands; therefore, a mission of
7 the corridor was to keep working lands in working hands, as agriculture was under a number of
8 threats. He related that the state was experiencing significant growth and was projected to reach
9 33 million people by 2070, and he showed images with protected and developed areas. He
10 mentioned that three scenarios were modeled, and that there was a statewide alternative model
11 where if they incentivized protection of natural lands, they could still fit the development need and
12 the growth within the state in a way that did not necessary develop environmentally sensitive areas
13 and working lands. He then remarked that the mission of the Florida Wildlife Corridor Foundation
14 was to champion a collaborative campaign to permanently connect, protect and restore the Florida
15 Wildlife Corridor in a number of different ways. He said that they had a team working on
16 expeditions that also did art, murals, photography, movies, etc., and he showed a collection of
17 items which had been done. He said that they were looking at using the best available science to
18 find out which portions of the corridor were most vulnerable due to the geometry. He stated that
19 they also looked at development pressures to prioritize areas within the corridor, and that
20 connections included bottlenecks or pieces that connected two of the large ecological hubs to create
21 a more resilient system. He displayed a map of Lake County, noting that there were two
22 unconnected pieces of the corridor within it and that they had two large ecological hubs of the
23 Ocala National Forest and the Green Swamp at the north and south. He stated that one of the most
24 crucial locations in the corridor was in South Lake and went into Lake Louisa State Park, and that
25 they also had a number of trails which ran through this including the Florida Trail foot trail. He
26 pointed out conserved and opportunity areas on a map, and said that the light pink areas ran north
27 from the Green Swamp through the City of Groveland up to Lake Harris, and then to the Ocala
28 National Forest, noting that it was a local corridor identified within the Florida Ecological
29 Greenways Network which defined the Florida Wildlife Corridor but was not delineated within it.
30 He also mentioned that the red areas regarded one of the development models where they thought
31 development was coming. He commented that North Lake was the connection between the Ocala
32 National Forest and the Wekiva area, and that there was elevated urgency around a red location,
33 noting that his organization was looking at ensuring good connectivity between the two areas and
34 ensuring that there were not any isolated areas for resilient ecosystems. He displayed the model
35 panther pathways, and said that this area had the potential and benefit of facilitating large mammal
36 movement, noting that protecting this was also protecting it for the smaller mammals and bears.
37 He relayed that most of this area was within the boundaries of the Florida Forever project, and that
38 some of it had been conserved through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's
39 (FDEP) land acquisition program, though portions of the boundary had not been finished. He
40 commented that there was more attention on bringing these pieces, particularly the ones under high

1 development pressure, into conservation and creating lasting value in this region. He commented
2 that the critical connection in South Lake was through Wellness Way from Orange County into
3 Lake Louisa, and that this was one of the few connections into the Green Swamp from the
4 headwaters of the Florida Everglades, noting that it was already being developed. He relayed that
5 this area was also within Florida Forever's boundaries, and that it was a matter of acquiring those
6 lands. He said that at the border of the connection between Orange and Lake Counties was
7 Wellness Way, and that the portion of Wellness Way was a conservation subdivision, and he
8 mentioned that it was critical to ensure that this corridor was linked to the connectivity within the
9 Orange County piece. He remarked that Lake County was a crucial connector piece between the
10 east and west sides of the corridor, and that for Lake County they were discussing how to facilitate
11 wildlife movement from the headwaters of the Florida Everglades to the Nature Coast, noting that
12 the last two pinch points were The Last Green Thread and Ridge Manor.

13 Commr. Parks mentioned that he would be participating in a trek, and opined that these
14 were not ideal situations with how the county was growing; however, they tried to make the best
15 of it. He said that in Wellness Way, it was important for the landscaping criteria to be corridor
16 compatible, and he opined that there were some things that Cities could do to address the built
17 environment.

18 Mr. Carter opined that the Board in Lake County was trying to do something similar on a
19 local level.

20 Mr. Daniel Whitehouse recalled a parcel of about two square miles which was the
21 connection between the Wekiva area and the Ocala National Forest, and he asked if this parcel had
22 not been acquired by Florida Forever.

23 Mr. Rigsby confirmed this.

24 Mr. Whitehouse relayed his understanding that if any willing landowner in this area came
25 forward, there could possibly be some matching funds from Florida Forever eligible for any of the
26 parcels within it. He then asked how many landowners were in this area.

27 Mr. Rigsby relayed that he could provide this information.

28 Ms. Harrold related that at the previous meeting they had discussed the Ocala to Wekiva
29 Florida Forever program, and that staff had identified parcels within Lake County that they sent
30 localized cards to in order to see if those landowners were interested.

31 Ms. Donna Bosold inquired how data was being collected for the Florida Ecological
32 Greenways Network (FEGN), as well as what kind of data was being collected. She mentioned
33 that she lived in one and that she had an unusual piece of property which seemed to attract many
34 things, including panther movement.

35 Mr. Rigsby responded that the FEGN was broken up into five priority zones, though he
36 was unsure which indicators they used to prioritize different areas. He relayed his understanding
37 that part of it was that larger pieces would usually be more in priority one, especially if they were
38 connected to existing conservation lands and offered high ecological quality. He clarified that the
39 low priority areas were still important, and that it was likely due to how constricted it was and how
40 long the piece was which was connecting to an ecological hub. He also commented that there was

1 an upcoming revision to the FEGN priority, and that this could have an impact on the total footprint
2 of the corridor and landscape planning for the next couple years.

3 OLD BUSINESS

4 Ms. Harrold provided an update on some items that the Board had approved at the previous
5 meeting. She recalled that she had taken the acquisition workflow chart, the public lands property
6 scorecard, and the greenways and trails property scorecard to the BCC for their approval on
7 February 10, 2026, which they approved; therefore, staff began moving forward and shortly
8 thereafter opened the next window of the application process which would run until the following
9 day.

10 NEW BUSINESS

11 Ms. Harrold said that during the previously mentioned meeting, the BCC had directed staff
12 to utilize conservation or lesser interest easements or purchases as an additional tool to protect
13 open spaces. She pointed out that the PLTAAC was provided with a conservation easement
14 request to retain rights questionnaire that staff developed with some outside help to be specific to
15 Lake County, noting that this was being used for anyone who would like to have a conservation
16 easement nominated. She then relayed that staff had worked with the Office of Communications
17 to create a brochure for the program, which had also been provided to the PLTAAC, noting that
18 they would be used at events to provide an educational snapshot on what the PLTAAC was doing
19 and how the program worked. She said that staff had been working on the optimal boundaries for
20 the vacant parcels or parcels that connected to current conservation and wildlife properties under
21 the County or the Lake County Water Authority (LCWA), and that staff could reach out to those
22 property owners to see if they were interested in selling; furthermore, the mailer card had been
23 provided to the PLTAAC and had been sent to those property owners. She also relayed her
24 understanding that two or three responses may have been received.

25 Mr. Sallin asked if the optimal boundary maps were available.

26 Ms. Harrold replied that staff could provide them. She then indicated that the window for
27 applications was February 13, 2026 through April 17, 2026, and that currently they received a total
28 of 11 nominations. She specified that this included one conservation easement application and
29 one combination application with a fee simple portion and a conservation easement rights portion;
30 furthermore, staff would be reviewing these. She stated that June 30, 2026 would be the first
31 meeting where staff-reviewed properties would be presented to the PLTAAC to review and
32 discuss, and that the following meeting would be on July 30, 2026 if they could not address every
33 property on June 30, 2026. She added that staff planned to reach out to the property nominators
34 and owners to let them know to attend, and that the PLTAAC would receive information several
35 weeks before the meeting if they wanted to visit the properties. She added that depending on what
36 the PLTAAC saw, they may want to discuss the amount of the bond that they would like to see
37 taken out.

38 Mr. AJ Rohe indicated his understanding that the County had solicited to properties
39 adjacent to those which were already owned by the County, and he asked if anything had been sent
40 to people who did not have connected lands.

1 Ms. Harrold relayed that staff provided social media and press releases leading up to the
2 window being opened, as well as another reminder a few weeks prior. She commented that most
3 of the applications received were those types of properties.

4 Mr. Rohe inquired why there was a closing on people making applications.

5 Ms. Harrold responded that it was so staff had about 60 days to do due diligence and
6 provide a ranking before bringing it back to the PLTAAC, noting that it also gave the PLTAAC
7 around 30 days to review those properties before they met. She clarified that staff would open it
8 back up once they were through this first review if the PLTAAC determined that they were ready
9 for this.

10 Mr. Rohe questioned why they could not leave it open and have the next applications go to
11 a subsequent meeting.

12 Ms. Harrold responded that a rolling window would be never-ending, noting that staff had
13 other responsibilities.

14 Mr. Rohe relayed his understanding that they were only considering properties adjacent to
15 those owned by the County.

16 Ms. Harrold stated that only two applications were for adjacent properties, and that
17 everything else was for independent properties submitted by property owners.

18 Mr. Rohe asked if staff would want the PLTAAC to post this.

19 Ms. Harrold said that they could do this, and that they could provide the informational card
20 and brochure so that anyone interested in selling their property could apply.

21 Mr. Sallin indicated his understanding that if the application period closed, people could
22 no longer apply.

23 Ms. Harrold clarified that they could apply, but they would have to wait until the next
24 window.

25 Mr. Sallin asked if the County could build up a backlog of applications.

26 Ms. Harrold confirmed that the applications could keep coming, though staff may not
27 review them until they reviewed the first section; additionally, she confirmed that the application
28 would still be on the website and there would be no indication that it was closed. She relayed that
29 staff would not turn any application away which came in after the following day, and that it would
30 just go into a folder for the next round after they addressed the first 11 applications. She said that
31 staff had reached back out to those people as well, and that they had not discounted anyone if they
32 applied in the first round; rather, everyone was eligible, and if anything came in after the window
33 closed, staff would hold onto it until they addressed the first batch and started the second. She
34 remarked that the window had been open for 60 days and that staff had done many social media
35 posts and press releases, along with reaching out to people. She added that they could also
36 schedule another meeting before October 2026 if they felt they needed another.

37 Ms. Bosold thanked staff.

38 Commr. Parks said that the County wanted to maintain the posture that they were open,
39 though they would process the first batch and then staff could indicate when they wanted to open

1 it again to process another batch. He also mentioned that the PLTAAC could consider the time
2 value of money and how much to bond in the first part.

3 Ms. Harrold relayed that this would move applications to the BCC, and that if it was
4 approved by the BCC, staff would move to surveys, boundaries and due diligence.

5 Mr. Whitehouse asked if the PLTAAC would have the applications which made the cut
6 before the June 30, 2026 meeting.

7 Ms. Harrold clarified that the PLTAAC would have everything, even if an application did
8 not make the cut, and that those which scored higher would be notated.

9 Mr. Whitehouse said that he thought they would receive more than 11 applications, and
10 opined that if the final list was not as desirable as anticipated, then the PLTAAC's message could
11 be to open the next batch almost immediately and have another set to review.

12 Mr. Carter relayed his understanding that the PLTAAC were welcome to solicit the
13 program broadly, and he asked about them approaching specific property owners in their position
14 as PLTAAC members.

15 Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, replied that they could solicit the program and let
16 people know about it generally, though she would not go to individual property owners and solicit
17 them because it gave the appearance that a PLTAAC member would promote their property.

18 Mr. Carter inquired if they could broadly share the program and staff contact information
19 with property owners.

20 Ms. Marsh confirmed this.

21 On a motion by Mr. Sallin, seconded by Mr. Whitehouse and carried unanimously by a
22 vote of 8-0, the PLTAAC approved to adjourn the meeting.

23 ADJOURNMENT

24 There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the PLTAAC, the meeting
25 was adjourned at 9:47 a.m.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 _____
34 TIM SALLIN, CHAIRMAN

35
36 ATTEST:

37
38
39 _____
40 GARY J COONEY, CLERK

Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee Property Submissions Overview

Submissions With Site Visit

Property Nomination Type	Purchase Type	Acreage	AltKey	Owner/Location	Optimal Boundary	Site Visit Completed	Asking Price	per acre cost est	Desktop Scorecard PL 15 possible	Desktop Scorecard GT 100 possible	Significant Structures (home, barn)	Species or Plant Communities of Note	Other notes
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	522	3821669, 1064767, 3786321, 1643660	Sunderman - Eden Lane and Lake Erie Rd, Groveland	Yes - Pasture Reserve	Yes	\$ 10,436,600.00	\$ 19,993.00	11	20	old Florida style home, pecky cypress exterior	rare intact sandhill LLP and xeric oak habitats	adjacent to Pasture,not historically grove
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	29.7	1593409	Sharp - Clermont	Yes - PAL Park Boat Ramp	Yes	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$ 117,845.00	9	9	multiple homes/buildings	rare plants and skink habitat	adjacent to PAL park and Crooked River LCWA property across creek
Public Lands	Fee Simple	2.3	1311322	Holloway - Paisley	Yes - Ellis Acres	Yes	\$ 145,000.00	\$ 63,043.00	8	N/A	none	xeric pine	adjacent to Ellis, along 42 future trail?
Public Lands	Fee Simple	90	1781027, 2810921	Shelley/Chasteen - East Dewey Robbins Rd, Howey in the Hills	No	Yes	\$ 1,910,000.00	\$ 21,222.00	7	N/A	home	xeric pine and oak, skink habitat, Bald Eagle nest	not historically grove
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	289	1108896++	Rebecca Rood/National Developers LLC - Ferndale	No	Yes	\$ 20,000,000.00	\$ 69,204.00	7	20	historic aerials show citrus grove cultivation		
Public Lands and Conservation Easement	Fee Simple and Conservation Easement	196	3870977, 1123259, 1123241	King Grove Farm - 19714 County Road 44A, Eustis	No	Yes	TBD	TBD	4	10	residences and outbuildings		Site Visit requested by owner and Committee members, Over the CE portion - The right to limit and control access except as granted for the inspection of the property under the easement
Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	N/A	Various	Wekiva Trail - Mount Dora, Tavares and Eustis	N/A	Scheduled for 6/25, will be reviewed at the 7/30 meeting	TBD	TBD	N/A	49			Wekiva Trail connection

Submissions Without Site Visit

Property Nomination Type	Purchase Type	Acreage	AltKey	Owner/Location	Optimal Boundary	Site Visit Completed	Asking Price	per acre cost est	Desktop Scorecard PL 15 possible	Desktop Scorecard GT 100 possible	Significant Structures (home, barn)	Species or Plant Communities of Note	Other notes
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	3.4	1444519	JAC Family Partnership LLLP-David A Croson - 18741 SR 44, Eustis	No	No	TBD	TBD	2	0			
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	504	1095239 ++	Hurley Farm/Barge Design - Lake Jem, Mount Dora	No	No	\$ 10,000,000.00	\$ 19,841.00	3	-4	sod farm		

Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee Property Submissions Overview

Property Nomination Type	Purchase Type	Acreage	AltKey	Owner/Location	Optimal Boundary	Site Visit Completed	Asking Price	per acre cost est	Desktop Scorecard PL 15 possible	Desktop Scorecard GT 100 possible	Significant Structures (home, barn)	Species or Plant Communities of Note	Other notes
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	3.7	3801483	Robert Vincent Sims/Jimmy Crawford Esq - SR 44, Sorrento	No	No	\$ 1,200,000.00	\$ 324,324.00	3	5	historic aerials show clearing, GIS scores high because layers think it is intact LLP sandhill which it is not.		
Public Lands	Fee Simple	177	1211212, 1211492, 3784974	Ladd Dev-Wilson Island/City of Groveland , Andrew Landis - Cherry Lake Rd, Groveland	No	No	\$ 18,000,000.00	\$ 101,695.00	4	N/A	historic aerials show citrus grove cultivation		
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	0.5	1181224	Wilkins - Clay St, Leesburg	No	No	TBD	TBD	5	5			no access, was owned by county and sold for taxes
Public Lands, Greenways and Trails and Conservation Easement	Fee Simple and Conservation Easement	84	3880866, 1411939, 3910151, 3906820, 3880864	Mary Black/Jimmy Crawford Esq - Montrose St, Clermont	No	No	Appraised-10%		5	N/A	historic aerials show citrus grove cultivation		Trail already exists in the area
Public Lands and Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	35.6	1024927, 1046874, 1108039, 1024862	26 Maple LLC/Bret Jones PA - Clermont, near industrial park	No	No	\$ 5,850,000.00	\$ 164,326.00	6	0	historic aerials show citrus grove cultivation		on Groveland's Trail
Greenways and Trails	Fee Simple	1.7	3911076, 3931718, 3931719	CC Realty - SR 19, Umatilla	No	No	\$ 900,000.00	\$ 529,412.00	N/A	40			

Conservation Easement Submissions

Property Nomination Type	Purchase Type	Acreage	AltKey	Owner/Location	Optimal Boundary	Site Visit Completed	Asking Price	per acre cost est	Desktop Scorecard PL 15 possible	Desktop Scorecard GT 100 possible	Significant Structures (home, barn)	Species or Plant Communities of Note	Other notes
Conservation Easement	Conservation Easement	2,478		Rogers Ranch/Jeremiah Thompson, Saunders Real Estate - CR 33 , Northwest of Groveland	No	No	TBD	TBD	3	11			No public access
Conservation Easement	Conservation Easement	410		Smith Ranch/Jeremiah Thompson, Saunders Real Estate - 6200 Calvin Lee Rd, Groveland	No	No	TBD	TBD	3	0			No public access
Conservation Easement	Conservation Easement	491	3786420+	Weekley /Robby Doyle - 13240 Carter Island Rd, Groveland	No	No	TBD	TBD	3	N/A			The right to limit and control access except as granted for the inspection of the property under the easement

Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee Property Submissions Overview

[illegible]

Purpose of Program:

- 1) To protect drinking water sources;
- 2) Improve the water quality of naturally occurring bodies of water and their floodplains (i.e. rivers, lakes and streams);
- 3) Protect open space from overdevelopment;
- 4) Provide for connectivity between habitat and corridors through which wildlife can travel and proliferate;
- 5) Provide for the Greenway System;
- 6) Provide for parks and trails; and
- 7) Provide support facilities on properties acquired meeting the above listed uses

Accomplishing Purpose and Meeting Criteria (48 Total Points)

Supports Purpose 1 & 2 (this section has a total maximum score of 7 points): To protect drinking water sources; Improve the water quality of rivers, lakes, streams;

Existence of important water resources, including whether the property protects or recharges groundwater, enhances the water quality, provides flood protection, protects the aquifer, or has high functioning wetlands

A. Groundwater Recharge and Unique Ecological Features (2 points maximum)

Flow-ways and Floodplain

The property includes or is adjacent to a lake, creek, or river and/or is within the natural waterbody's 100-year floodplain. Man-made water bodies are not included.

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

B. Groundwater Recharge (3 points maximum)

More than 25% of the property is characterized by medium or high groundwater recharge as depicted by the St. Johns River Water Management District Upper Floridan Aquifer Groundwater Recharge Map.

- Less than 25% (0 points)
- 25%-49% (1 point)
- 50%-74% (2 points)
- Greater than 75% (3 points)



PUBLIC LANDS EVALUATION

Lake County Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

C. Wetlands (2 points maximum)

- On-site wetlands are degraded due to changes in vegetation or hydrology and cannot be effectively restored. **(0 points)**
- On-site wetlands are degraded due to changes in vegetation or hydrology, but they can be effectively restored. **(1 point)**
- On-site wetlands generally have intact hydrology and vegetation consistent with their historical characteristics. **(2 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

TOTAL SCORE for Section (1 & 2):

Comments related to the assigned score:

Supports Purpose 3 (this section has a total maximum score of 11 points): Protect open space from overdevelopment;

A. Size of the Parcel (5 points maximum)

The parcel is of sufficient size or configuration to be of substantial ecological or recreational value by itself or in the context of other natural lands in the vicinity.

- Greater than 1000 acres **(5 points)**
- 750 - 1000 acres **(4 points)**
- 500 - 749 acres **(3 points)**
- 200 - 499 acres **(2 points)**
- 100 - 199 acres **(1 points)**
- Less than 100 acres **(0 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

B. Vulnerability to development (6 points maximum)

- I. Future Land Use - Proposed categories of uses for lands in Lake County such as residential, commercial, agriculture, recreation, conservation, and education are depicted on a map that depicts Future Land Use designations and allowable intensities for unincorporated portions of the county ([Lake County FLU pdf map](#)). Rural land uses are those with one or fewer dwelling units per acre; all others are Urban.

- The property has a Future Land Use designated as Urban. **(3 points)**
- The property has a Future Land Use designated as Rural Residential or Country Estates. **(2 points)**
- The property has a Future Land Use designated as Rural or Agriculture. **(1 point)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

PUBLIC LANDS EVALUATION

Lake County Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

II. Adjacent Development Pressure

- Existing infrastructure including roads, sewer, or utilities are available for development of the property. **(2 points)**
- The property is within the urban development boundary of a municipality. **(1 point)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

TOTAL SCORE for Section (3):

Comments related to the assigned score:

Supports Purpose 4 & 5 (this section has a total maximum score of 21 points): Provide for connectivity between habitat and corridors through which wildlife can travel and proliferate and provide for the Greenway System;

A. Diversity of species and habitats (15 points)

- I. Listed Species - Species determined to be Threatened or Endangered by the state of Florida (per Rule 68A-27.003, Florida Administrative Code for animals, and Rule 5B-40 FAC for plants), or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (per the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended). ([FWC and USFWS Listed Species](#)).
- II. Umbrella Species - A species whose conservation protects many other species in the ecosystem. The 2019 Florida Black Bear Management Plan ([Management Plan](#)) states that Florida black bears are recognized as an umbrella species because conserving large areas for bears also conserves habitat for many other species.
 - The property is not conducive for Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species such as the Florida black bear. **(0 points)**
 - The property has potential for Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, including after restoration, but the value of the habitat is low. **(1 point)**
 - The property has moderate potential for Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, including after restoration. **(2 points)**
 - The property has high potential for Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, including after restoration. **(3 points)**
 - The property has high potential for Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, without the need for restoration. **(4 points)**
 - The property has excellent habitat for several Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, or ideal habitat for a few Listed Species or notable Umbrella Species, without the need for restoration. **(5 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

- III. Community Rarity – the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) has assigned a ranking for natural communities in Florida to depict their relative rarity. Rankings are based on the total area represented by the community in the state, the geographic range, ecological fragility, relative threat of destruction, etc. The

PUBLIC LANDS EVALUATION

Lake County Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

rankings range from Critically Impaired (S1, which do not occur in Lake County), to demonstrably secure in Florida (S5). ([2010 FNAI Communities Guide](#)).

- At least 25% of the property contains natural communities ranked by the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) as S4, S3, or S2. **(1 point)**
- At least 25% of the property contains natural communities ranked by the FNAI as S3 or S2. **(2 points)**
- At least 25% of the property contains natural communities ranked by the FNAI as S2 or there is a sinkhole, seepage slope, spring, or limestone outcrop on the property. **(3 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

IV. Native Plant Cover – the FNAI Guide to the Natural Communities of Florida ([2010 FNAI Communities Guide](#)) provides a general summary of the plants expected to occur in the natural communities of Florida. This metric assesses the coverage of expected plant assemblages in the natural communities of the parcel under review.

- FNAI native plant communities are not vegetated by the expected plant species (e.g. infiltrated by invasive plants, have relatively low species diversity, missing key species, etc.) or constitute < 25% of the property. **(0 points)**
- FNAI native plant communities are vegetated by the expected plant species and constitute 25% to 50% of the property. **(1 point)**
- FNAI native plant communities are vegetated by the expected plant species and constitute 50% to 75% of the property. **(2 points)**
- FNAI native plant communities are vegetated by the expected plant species and exceed 75 % of the property. **(3 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

- V. Biological Diversity: FNAI Strategic Habitat Conservation Areas (SHCA) - developed by FWC to identify the minimum amount of land needed to ensure protection of Florida's biological diversity. SHCAs include habitat data for 62 terrestrial vertebrate species and are prioritized into five classes based on the rarity of the species predicted to occur. ([FNAI Summary of FL Forever Maps](#)).
- The property has no Priority SHCA. **(0 points)**
 - The property predominantly consists of Priority 5 SHCA. **(1 point)**
 - The property predominantly consists of Priority 4 SHCA. **(2 points)**
 - The property includes some Priority 3 SHCA. **(3 points)**
 - The property includes some Priority 2 SHCA or lies adjacent to a Priority 1 SHCA. **(4 points)**

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

B. Connectedness to other conservation lands (section has a total max score of 7 points)

The Florida Ecological Greenways Network (FEGN) is a statewide database that identifies an ecological network of public and private conservation lands across the state. The FEGN identifies opportunities for protecting areas that would maintain priority species habitat and ecosystem services. The values in the data layer represent priority levels 1 – 5, where Priority 1 is the highest. ([FNAI summary of FEGN](#)).

- The property is isolated from other natural communities or working landscapes, such as agriculture or silviculture. **(0 points)**
- The property is functionally connected to other natural communities or conservation landscapes in public ownership. **(1 point)**
- The property includes FEGN Priority 5 habitats. **(2 points)**
If adjacent to FEGN Priority 5, **(1 point)**
- The property includes FEGN Priority 4 habitats. **(4 points)**
If adjacent to FEGN Priority 4, **(3 points)**
- The property is included in the FNAI Florida Wildlife Corridor (FEGN Priority 1 – 3). **(6 points)**
If adjacent to FEGN Priority 1-3, **(5 points)**



PUBLIC LANDS EVALUATION

Lake County Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

TOTAL SCORE for Section (4 & 5):

Comments related to the assigned score:

Supports Purpose 5, 6 & 7 (this section has a total maximum score of 9 points): Provide for the Greenway System; Provide for parks and trails; and Provide support facilities on properties acquired meeting the above listed uses. Potential uses for passive recreation or environmental education.

A. Accessibility (minus 4 to 4 points maximum)

After acquisition, the property will have legal and public access for environmental education; resource-based passive recreation such as fishing, hiking, equestrian, photography, nature study, canoeing, paddleboarding, and kayaking; or passive recreation including walking trails, picnic. *(Points depend on the extent and quality of the potential recreation or environmental education experience)*

- Site has full public access **(4 points)**
- Site has limited public access and/or access restricted by easements or on site activities or facilities **(0 points)**
- Site has no public access **(minus 4 points)**

B. Cultural Resources (2 points maximum)

The property contains an archeological site or significant historical resources, defined by DHR.



PUBLIC LANDS EVALUATION

Lake County Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee

C. Potential for Matching Funds or Partnerships (1 point maximum)

There is a reasonable expectation of matching funds or partnerships from other sources to assist in the acquisition or management of the property.

D. Management Considerations (minus points to 2 points maximum)

Characteristics of the property (utility easements/land use legacies/degradation/altered hydrology/fire suppression/pollution/invasive species/unusable infrastructure) make it particularly efficient or difficult to manage natural resources, including restoration, or maintain and secure the property for its intended purposes.

- No issues (**2 points**)
- Issues with site that don't allow safe public access, restricts access or delays public access (**minus 1 point for each issue**)

AREA SCORE:

Comments related to the assigned score:

TOTAL SCORE for Section (5, 6 & 7):

Comments related to the assigned score:

FINAL SCORE: