

List of Figures

| | | |
|--------------|--|----|
| Figure 2-1. | NFSEG Maximum Active Model Domain and Grid Extent | 3 |
| Figure 2-2. | Land-Surface Elevation (and Upper Limit of the Surficial Aquifer System; based on USGS 3DEP 10-meter DEM, NAVD88 Feet) | 4 |
| Figure 2-3. | Bottom Elevation of the Surficial Aquifer System (NAVD88 Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013) | 5 |
| Figure 2-4. | Thickness of the Surficial Aquifer System (SAS, Feet; after Davis and Boniol, in progress) . | 6 |
| Figure 2-5. | Top Elevation of the Intermediate Confining Unit (NAVD88 Feet)..... | 7 |
| Figure 2-6. | Bottom Elevation of the Intermediate Confining Unit (and/or Top of the Upper Floridan Aquifer; Ft NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013) | 8 |
| Figure 2-7. | Thickness of the Intermediate Confining Unit (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013) | 9 |
| Figure 2-8. | Estimated Leakance Distribution of the Intermediate Confining Unit (ICU, per day; after Bush and Johnston 1988)..... | 10 |
| Figure 2-9. | Intermediate Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2001 (Feet) | 11 |
| Figure 2-10. | Intermediate Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2009 (Feet) | 12 |
| Figure 2-11. | Hydrogeologic Relation between the Floridan Aquifer System and the Southeastern Coastal Plain Aquifer System along a Hypothetical Dip Section in Georgia (after Barker and Pernik 1994) | 13 |
| Figure 2-12. | Elevation of 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/l) Total-Dissolved-Solids Iso-Surface (Williams, digital communication 2013) | 14 |
| Figure 2-13. | Bottom Elevation of Zone 1 (and Top Elevation of Zone 2, Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013)..... | 15 |
| Figure 2-14. | Thickness of Zone 1 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication, 2013)..... | 16 |
| Figure 2-15. | Bottom Elevation Zone 2 (and Top Elevation of Zone 3, Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication, 2013; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 17 |
| Figure 2-16. | Thickness of Zone 2 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 18 |
| Figure 2-17. | Bottom Elevation of Zone 3 (Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication, 2013) | 19 |
| Figure 2-18. | Thickness of Zone 3 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 20 |
| Figure 2-19. | Bottom Elevation of the Floridan Aquifer System within its Freshwater Extent (after Miller 1986; Williams, digital communication 2012; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 21 |
| Figure 2-20. | Top Elevation of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (NAVD88 Feet; after Miller 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 22 |
| Figure 2-21. | Bottom Elevation of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (and Top Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone, Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 23 |
| Figure 2-22. | Thickness of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (Feet; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 24 |
| Figure 2-23. | Top Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ; Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 25 |

| | | |
|---------------|--|----|
| Figure 2–24. | Bottom Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ, Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; Williams, digital communication 2012; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 26 |
| Figure 2–25. | Thickness of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ, Feet; after after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013) | 27 |
| Figure 2–26. | Aquifer-Performance-Test Transmissivity Estimates, Zone 1 (Feet Squared per Day)..... | 28 |
| Figure 2-27. | Estimated Transmissivity, Upper Floridan Aquifer (Feet Squared per Day; after Bush and Johnston 1988)..... | 29 |
| Figure 2-28. | Estimated Potentiometric Surface, Upper Floridan Aquifer, 2001 (Feet NAVD88) | 30 |
| Figure 2-29. | Estimated Potentiometric Surface, Upper Floridan Aquifer, 2009 (Feet NAVD88) | 31 |
| Figure 2-30. | Middle Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2001 (Feet) | 32 |
| Figure 2–31. | Middle Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2009 (Feet) | 33 |
| Figure 2–32. | Locations and Relative Discharge Rates of Springs, 2001..... | 34 |
| Figure 2–33. | Locations and Relative Discharge Rates of Springs, 2009..... | 35 |
| Figure 2–34. | First-Magnitude Spring Locations and Corresponding Discharge Rates, 2009..... | 36 |
| Figure 2-35. | USGS Gages Used for Evaluation of Baseflow-Estimation Approach..... | 37 |
| Figure 2-36. | Cumulative Baseflow Estimates at Selected USGS Gages, 2001..... | 38 |
| Figure 2– 37. | Cumulative Baseflow Estimates at Selected USGS Gages, 2009..... | 39 |
| Figure 2–38. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region A, 2001 | 40 |
| Figure 2–39. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region B, 2001 | 41 |
| Figure 2–40. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone C, 2001 | 42 |
| Figure 2–41. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region A, 2009 | 43 |
| Figure 2–42. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone B, 2009 | 44 |
| Figure 2-43. | Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone C, 2009..... | 45 |
| Figure 2-44. | Distribution of Total Groundwater Withdrawals by County (MGD), 2001 | 46 |
| Figure 2–45. | Distribution of Total Groundwater Withdrawals by County (MGD), 2009 | 47 |
| Figure 2–46. | Groundwater Withdrawals by County and Use Type (MGD), 2001..... | 48 |
| Figure 2-47. | Groundwater Withdrawals by County and Use Type (MGD), 2009..... | 49 |




Figure 2-1. NFSEG Maximum Active Model Domain and Grid Extent




Figure 2-2. Land-Surface Elevation (and Upper Limit of the Surficial Aquifer System; based on USGS 3DEP 10-meter DEM, NAVD88 Feet)




Figure 2-3. Bottom Elevation of the Surficial Aquifer System (NAVD88 Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-4. Thickness of the Surficial Aquifer System (SAS, Feet; after Davis and Boniol, in progress)




Figure 2-5. Top Elevation of the Intermediate Confining Unit (NAVD88 Feet)




Figure 2-6. Bottom Elevation of the Intermediate Confining Unit (and/or Top of the Upper Floridan Aquifer; Ft NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-7. Thickness of the Intermediate Confining Unit (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-8. Estimated Leakage Distribution of the Intermediate Confining Unit (ICU, per day; after Bush and Johnston 1988)




Figure 2-9. Intermediate Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2001 (Feet)





Figure 2-10. Intermediate Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2009 (Feet)



Not to scale

EXPLANATION

- | | |
|--|--|
|  Carbonate aquifer unit |  Clastic confining unit |
|  Clastic aquifer unit |  General direction of regional groundwater flow |

Figure 2-11. Hydrogeologic Relation between the Floridan Aquifer System and the Southeastern Coastal Plain Aquifer System along a Hypothetical Dip Section in Georgia (after Barker and Pernik 1994)




Figure 2-12. Elevation of 10,000 milligrams per liter (mg/l) Total-Dissolved-Solids Iso-Surface (Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-13. Bottom Elevation of Zone 1 (and Top Elevation of Zone 2, Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-14. Thickness of Zone 1 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication, 2013)




Figure 2-15. Bottom Elevation Zone 2 (and Top Elevation of Zone 3, Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication, 2013; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-16. Thickness of Zone 2 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2–17. Bottom Elevation of Zone 3 (Feet NAVD88; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication, 2013)




Figure 2–18. Thickness of Zone 3 (Feet; after Davis and Boniol, digital communication 2013; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2–19. Bottom Elevation of the Floridan Aquifer System within its Freshwater Extent (after Miller 1986; Williams, digital communication 2012; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-20. Top Elevation of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (NAVD88 Feet; after Miller 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-21. Bottom Elevation of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (and Top Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone, Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-22. Thickness of the Lower Semiconfining Unit (Feet; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2-23. Top Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ; Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2–24. Bottom Elevation of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ, Feet NAVD88; after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; Williams, digital communication 2012; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2–25. Thickness of the Fernandina Permeable Zone (FPZ, Feet; after after Miller, 1986; Miller, written communication 1991; and Williams, digital communication 2013)




Figure 2–26. Aquifer-Performance-Test Transmissivity Estimates, Zone 1 (Feet Squared per Day)




Figure 2-27. Estimated Transmissivity, Upper Floridan Aquifer (Feet Squared per Day; after Bush and Johnston 1988)




Figure 2-28. Estimated Potentiometric Surface, Upper Floridan Aquifer, 2001 (Feet NAVD88)




Figure 2-29. Estimated Potentiometric Surface, Upper Floridan Aquifer, 2009 (Feet NAVD88)




Figure 2-30. Middle Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2001 (Feet)




Figure 2-31. Middle Confining Unit Vertical Head Difference, 2009 (Feet)




Figure 2-32. Locations and Relative Discharge Rates of Springs, 2001




Figure 2-33. Locations and Relative Discharge Rates of Springs, 2009




Figure 2-34. First-Magnitude Spring Locations and Corresponding Discharge Rates, 2009




Figure 2-35. USGS Gages Used for Evaluation of Baseflow-Estimation Approach




Figure 2-36. Cumulative Baseflow Estimates at Selected USGS Gages, 2001




Figure 2– 37. Cumulative Baseflow Estimates at Selected USGS Gages, 2009




Figure 2-38. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region A, 2001




Figure 2-39. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region B, 2001




Figure 2-40. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone C, 2001




Figure 2-41. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Region A, 2009




Figure 2-42. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone B, 2009




Figure 2-43. Estimated Baseflow Pickups, Zone C, 2009




Figure 2-4410. Distribution of Total Groundwater Withdrawals by County (MGD), 2001




Figure 2-45. Distribution of Total Groundwater Withdrawals by County (MGD), 2009




Figure 2-46. Groundwater Withdrawals by County and Use Type (MGD), 2001




Figure 2-47. Groundwater Withdrawals by County and Use Type (MGD), 2009