

-- Peer Review of Revised MFL Document--

Minimum Levels Determination: Indian Lake, Volusia County, Florida

By

Sam B. Upchurch, Ph.D., P.G.

August 5, 2009

Overall Impressions

1. The revised MFL document reads well and is a great improvement over the first draft. Jane Mace and other staff are to be complimented.
2. The relationships of the proposed Indian Lake MFLs and the 10 environmental criteria are very well developed in this version of the MFL report. The use of fish and wildlife habitats & passage of fish criterion is well justified in this edition. The new tables dealing with the criteria are very helpful.
3. I note that Robison's hydrologic model report is being revised. Per the comments in the Peer Review Resolution table supplied with this report, I am assuming that much of the hydrologic information (e.g., water budget) I thought should be included in the MFL document will be included in Robison's revised document.
4. I still feel that it is important to provide the reader with a sound background geologic and hydrologic summary, and the one included in this report is still very weak. I hope that the Robison report will fill this need.
5. With the exception of the issues enumerated below, I am satisfied that the MFL document is sufficient and accurately defends the proposed MFLs. This conclusion is based, in part, on my assumption that Robison's revised report will properly set the stage for the physical setting of Indian Lake in terms of geologic and hydrologic conditions, including the need to show a water budget for the lake.

Specific Comments

p. 2, para. 1: This paragraph is clearly intended to explain why a separate document evaluating the 10 statutory MFL criteria does not exist for Indian Lake. I am concerned that the paragraph starts on a negative. Suggest that the paragraph be more assertive and proactive. For example, "Evaluation of these 10 MFL criteria for is straight forward for Indian Lake. Therefore, unlike larger and more complex systems (e.g., St. Johns River at SR 50,...) where a separate document was prepared to evaluate the applicability of each criterion to the MFL, the criteria are discussed in this report."

This same statement can be used at the last paragraph on page 13.

Table 1: I like this table. It lays out why fish and wildlife habitats & passage of fish is the most restrictive criterion.

p. 18, para. 1: Again, please note that the geomorphic subdivisions of Brooks are not widely accepted. If you must use the Brooks geomorphic map, please reference Brooks with the physiographic terminology, not just at the bottom of the paragraph where you state that the soils are well drained. In fact, did Brooks really discuss drainage and stratigraphy in his map?

p. 23, para. 3: This paragraph mentions simulated stage data. How were data simulated?

Figure 7: The labels on this graph are confusing. The legend again mentions simulations and indicates that the stage duration curve is for the period of record (measured plus simulated?) of 1976-2005. Then the line is labeled 2005. Is the stage duration curve for 2005 or the period of record?