

**TRANSMITTAL**

To: Bureau of Design and Environment  
Attention: Matthew J. Sunderland  
From: Illinois Natural History Survey  
Regarding: Wetland Mitigation Monitoring

**Title and Location**


Title: FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway)  
Location: Green Rock site Phases I and II - 1.6 km (0.74 mi) southwest of Green Rock  
Job Number: P-92-096-84 (BDE Seq. No. 67)  
Section Number: 1-3  
County: Henry  
IDOT District: District 2

**Survey Conducted By:** Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
Brian Wilm, Ian Draheim, and Dave Ketzner  
(vegetation and hydrology)  
Brad Zercher (GIS)  
Illinois Natural History Survey  
1816 South Oak Street  
Champaign, Illinois 61820  
(217) 265-0368 (Wiesbrook)

**Date Conducted:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Summary:**

For the fourth year we monitored Phase I of the site created for wetland impact mitigation for FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway), Green Rock site, in Henry County. Phase I was completed and all original trees planted by spring 2006. For the third year we monitored Phase II of the site. Phase II was completed and all original trees planted by spring 2007. The attached report includes information detailing monitoring methods and results. The status of the created wetland sites is discussed. The areas discussed are marked on the DOQ included within this report.

Signed:   
Dr. Allen E. Plocher  
INHS/IDOT Project Coordinator  
and Principal Investigator

Date: January 26, 2010

**WETLAND MITIGATION SITE MONITORING REPORT**  
**FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway) Henry County – Green Rock Site**  
**Introduction**

This report details monitoring of the wetland mitigation site created to compensate for impacts associated with FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway) in Henry County. Phase I of the site consists of approximately 16.88 ha (41.69 ac) of wetland creation/restoration (IDOT 2002), while Phase II of the site consists of approximately 3.02 ha (7.45 ac) of wetland creation/restoration. The wetland creation site is located 1.6 km (0.74 mi) southwest of Green Rock, IL, north and west of the crossing of I-74 over Mosquito Creek. The legal location is SW/4, NE/4, and SE/4, NW/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E. The project area lies within the United States Geological Survey Mississippi River hydrologic unit 07090007, Green River. Phase I was completed and all trees planted by spring 2006; Phase II was completed by spring 2007. 372 pecan trees were replanted within the eastern field of Phase I and in Phase II on approximately June 4, 2009. On-site monitoring was conducted on June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009. This report discusses the goals, objectives, and performance criteria for the mitigation project, the methods used for monitoring the site, monitoring results, and discussion and recommendations based on the results. Methods and results are discussed by performance criteria for each goal.

**Goals, Objectives, and Performance Standards**

Goals, objectives, and performance standards follow those specified in the Conceptual Wetland Compensation Plan (IDOT, 2002) developed for this site. Performance criteria are based on those specified in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987), *Illinois Wetland Restoration and Creation Guide* (Admiraal et al. 1997), and in *Guidelines for Developing Mitigation Proposals* (USACE 1993). Each goal should be attained by the end of the 5-year monitoring period. Goals, objectives, and performance criteria are listed below.

**Project goal 1:** The created wetland community should be a jurisdictional wetland as defined by current federal standards.

**Objective:** The created wetland should compensate for the loss of 16.73 ha (41.31 ac) of wetland.

**Performance criteria:**

- a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation: More than 50% of the dominant plant species must be hydrophytic.
- b. Occurrence of hydric soils: Hydric soil characteristics should be present, or conditions favorable for hydric soil formation should persist at the site.
- c. Presence of wetland hydrology: The area must be either permanently or periodically inundated at average depths less than 2 m (6.6 ft) or have soils that are saturated to the surface for at least 12.5% of the growing season.

**Project goal 2:** The created wetland plant community should meet standards for planted species survival and floristic composition.

**Objectives:** Planting trees will create a forested wetland. Other herbaceous vegetation will be allowed to colonize the site naturally.

**Performance criteria:**

- a. Planted species survivorship: At least 136 planted trees per hectare should be established and living by the end of the five year monitoring period.
- b. Native species composition: At least 50% of the plants present should be non-weedy, native, perennial species.
- c. Dominance of vegetation: None of the three most dominant plant species may be non-native or weedy species, such as cattails, sandbar willow, or reed canary grass (IDOT 2002).

## Methods

### Project goal 1

#### a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation

The method for determining dominant vegetation at a wetland site is described in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and further explained in the *Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands* (Federal Interagency Committee for Wetland Delineation 1989). It is based on aerial coverage estimates for individual plant species. Each of the dominant plant species is then assigned its wetland indicator status rating (Reed 1988). Any plant rated facultative or wetter (FAC, FAC+, FACW, or OBL) is considered a hydrophyte. A predominance of wetland vegetation in the plant community exists if more than 50% of the dominant species present are hydrophytic. Since the survival of planted hydrophytic trees and shrubs on non-wetlands (e.g. yards) is well documented, these species were excluded from calculations of percentage of dominant hydrophytic species.

#### b. Occurrence of hydric soils

The soil was sampled in order to monitor hydric soil development. Soil profile morphology including horizon color, texture, and structure was described at various points throughout the site. Additionally, the presence, type, size, and abundance of redoximorphic features were noted. Hydric soils may develop slowly, and characteristics may not be apparent during the first several years after project construction. In the absence of hydric soil indicators at the end of the five-year monitoring period, hydrologic data could be used as corroborative evidence that conditions favorable for hydric soil formation persist at the site.

#### c. Presence of wetland hydrology

The extent of wetland hydrology at the Green Rock Wetland Compensation Site was monitored by the Illinois State Geological Survey and is shown on the accompanying figure (Fucciolo et al. 2009). Wetland hydrology occurs when inundation or saturation to land surface is present for greater than 5% of the growing season (10 days at this site) where the soils and vegetation parameters in the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual also are met; if either is lacking, then inundation or saturation must be present for greater than 12.5% of the growing season (25 days at this site) to satisfy wetland hydrology criteria (Environmental Laboratory 1987). Areas satisfying wetland hydrology criteria in the 2008 Midwest Supplement (14 consecutive days during the growing season) are also shown for comparison. Inundation and saturation at the site were monitored using a combination of 14 monitoring wells. Water levels were measured at least biweekly during April and May, and monthly during the remainder of the year. Manual readings were supplemented by a data-logger, which measured surface-water levels at regular intervals to document all hydrologic events. Additional details regarding site conditions and monitoring results

for wetland hydrology in 2009 are summarized in ISGS' Annual Report for Active IDOT Wetland Compensation and Hydrologic Monitoring Sites, September 1, 2008 to September 1, 2009 (Fucciolo et al. 2009).

**Project goal 2**

a. Planted species survivorship

In order to create floodplain forest, tree saplings were planted at the compensation site. The number of trees to be planted within Phase I [Notice to bidders, specifications, proposal, contract and contract bond (IDOT, 2004)] and Phase II [Notice to bidders, specifications, proposal, contract and contract bond (IDOT, 2006)] are listed in Table 1, which follows:

Table 1. Tree species planted in the created wetland (Planting dates spring 2006 and 2007).

Species	Common Name	Phase I (2006)	Phase II (2007)
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	Pecan	970 + 372*	168
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green ash	970	162
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	971	163
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Swamp white oak	982	165
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin oak	972	164
TOTAL		5237	822

\* Seedlings planted by June, 2009.

All of the trees were to be balled and burlapped 4.4-5.1 cm (1.75-2 in) caliper trees, except the *Carya illinoensis*, which were bare root two year old seedlings. Survivorship and density of planted trees were determined through a census of the created wetland. All live trees were counted. Dead trees were counted but not identified by species.

Tree survival was calculated as the number live trees per hectare: Total number of live planted stems counted/total hectares at site (16.88 ha for Phase I, 3.02 ha for Phase II).

b. Native Species Composition

A complete list of plant species present was compiled. This was used to determine the number and percentage of species present that are non-weedy, native perennials.

In addition, the Floristic Quality Assessment (Taft et al. 1997) was applied to the plant community at the site to evaluate floristic quality and nativity. The assessment methodology is used to identify natural areas and facilitate floristic comparisons among sites. This technique is part of the procedure for the long-term monitoring of natural areas and the monitoring of restored or created wetlands (Swink and Wilhelm 1994). The basis of the method is that each native plant species is assigned a conservatism coefficient (C) ranging from 0 to 10. Individual conservatism coefficients are ranks of species behavior and reflect the committee's (Taft et al. 1997) confidence level for a taxon's correspondence to anthropogenic disturbances. Coefficient values range from 0 to 10, with all adventive species given a coefficient of 0. Plant species assigned 0 have low affinities for natural areas, whereas those assigned 10 have very high affinities. When a complete species list is assembled for a wetland site, the overall average conservatism coefficient ( $\bar{c}$ ) and a site floristic quality index (FQI) can be calculated. The  $\bar{c}$  is calculated by summing the coefficients of conservatism ( $\Sigma C$ ) and dividing by the total number of native species (N). The FQI is then calculated by dividing the  $\Sigma C$  by the square root of N. These values provide a measure of site floristic quality. Floristic quality index (FQI) values less than 5 indicate that the area is extremely weedy or in an early successional stage (Swink and

Wilhelm 1994). FQI values between 20 and 35 ( $\bar{c} = 3.0$ ) indicate that the area has evidence of native character and can be considered a botanical asset. FQI values between 35 and 50 ( $\bar{c} = 3.5$ ) indicate that the area has significant native character.

c. Dominance of vegetation

Plant species dominance was determined as in project goal 1, a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation. The method for determining dominant vegetation at a wetland site is described in the *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and further explained in the *Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands* (Federal Interagency Committee for Wetland Delineation 1989).

**Results – Phase I**

**Project goal 1**

a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation

Dominant plant species for Phase I in 2008 are shown in Table 2. Due to differing dominant vegetation, we divided Phase I into three areas for vegetative analyses (Figure 1, page 6). The southeast and northeast areas are different from last year; they have been refined to more accurately reflect actual conditions at the site. The west and southeast portions of Phase I meet this criteria as all of the dominants are hydrophytic or assumed to be hydrophytic. This results in 100% of the dominants being hydrophytic, which exceeds the minimum project goal of >50%. The northeast portion of Phase I has two of the three dominant species rated OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC and hydrophytic. This results in 67% of the dominants being hydrophytic, which also meets the minimum project goal of >50%; therefore, all portions of Phase I meet this criteria this year.

Table 2. Dominant plant species by area, stratum, and wetland indicator status.

Area	Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
Phase I West	1. <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Herb	FACW+
	2. <i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	Herb	OBL
Phase I Southeast	1. <i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	Herb	OBL
	2. <i>Polygonum</i> sp.	Herb	None*
Phase I Northeast	1. <i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Herb	FAC
	2. <i>Poa pratensis</i>	Herb	FAC-
	3. <i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	Herb	OBL

\* These dominant unidentified seedlings are assumed to be hydrophytic, as all identifiable *Polygonums* at this project area are hydrophytes.

b. Occurrence of hydric soils

Soils examined were found to be relatively undisturbed and hydric soil indicators are present at the west and southeast areas of Phase I (Figure 1); however, the northeast area shows evidence of disturbance and lacks hydric soil indicators at this time. Table 3 (page 6) presents a soil description of a typical pedon located within the west and southeast areas of this site. The west and southeast portions of this site meet the hydric soil criterion; the northeast area does not.

Table 3. Description of the soils at the site.

Depth	Matrix Color	Concentrations	Depletions	Texture	Structure
0-23 cm (0-9 in)	10YR 3/1	Few 10YR 4/6 and common 7.5YR 4/4	None	Silty clay loam	Medium granular
23-91 cm (9-36+ in)	10YR 3/1 with 10YR 6/1 strata	Common 7.5YR 4/4 and common 10YR 4/4	None	Silty clay loam	Medium granular and blocky

**FAU 5822, Green Rock  
Mitigation Site Monitoring  
Henry County**




Figure 1. Site, Phase I areas, Phase II, and photo station location map.

c. Presence of wetland hydrology

The ISGS estimated that “15.9 ha (39.4 ac) of Phase I, out of a total area of 16.7 ha (41.3 ac) satisfied jurisdictional wetland hydrology criteria at both 5% and 12.5% of the growing season” (Figure 2) (Fucciolo, et al. 2009). More information is available in the *Milan Beltway, Green Rock Wetland Compensation Site* report (ibid). This total area includes the west and southeast areas of Phase I, which satisfied the criteria for 5% and 12.5% of the growing season. The northeast area did not meet the hydrology criteria this year. During our site visits, both the southeast and west areas were inundated and saturated to the surface.

Based on ISGS data and field evidence observed during our on-site visits, all of the southeast and west areas of Phase I exhibited wetland hydrology. At this time we estimate that approximately 15.9 ha (39.4 ac) of Phase I this year has wetland hydrology.

**Milan Beltway, Green Rock Wetland Compensation Site (FAU 5822)**

**Estimated Areal Extent of 2009 Wetland Hydrology**

September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009

Map based on USGS digital orthophotograph, Coal Valley NE quarter quadrangle produced from 4/14/98 aerial photography (ISGS 2006)



Figure 2. “Estimated Areal Extent of 2009 Wetland Hydrology” (Fucciolo, et al. 2009).

## Project goal 2

### a. Planted species survivorship

Table 4 shows the results of the census. There were some discrepancies between the numbers of trees reported as planted and the number of live trees counted. The major discrepancy was the extreme mortality witnessed with the pecans. There were 372 pecans planted by June, 2009; we found fewer than 5 of them to be alive during our field visits. Again this year we noticed that the number of swamp white oaks found was about one-quarter of those reported as planted. However, many overcup and white oak were found which were not reported as planted, and we feel this was simply a result of confusion at the nursery. These trees can look similar when small and immature, and were probably simply mistaken for swamp white oaks. When we group all of the oaks that were not pin oaks into a *Quercus* spp. category (Table 4), we arrive at much more reasonable numbers in terms of survival. Table 4 also shows the percent survival for the trees. These figures were calculated both by species and overall for all species in the entire site. More than 56% of the trees reported planted were counted as alive.

Table 4. Number of trees counted and percent tree survival (by species).

Species	Common Name	Number Planted	Number Surviving	% Survival
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	Pecan	1342	290	21.6
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green ash	970	495	51.0
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	971	574	59.1
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin oak	972	883	90.8
<i>Quercus</i> spp.*	Swamp white, white, and overcup oak	982	730	74.3
TOTAL		5090	2972	56.8

\* For survival analysis, we grouped all of the oak species that were not pin oaks.

Therefore, there were 2972 live trees counted during the census over 16.88 ha. This results in a trees per hectare number of 176, still exceeding the stated project goal (>136 trees per hectare).

### b. Native species composition

The west portion of Phase I has 55.1% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. The southeast portion of Phase I has 60.0% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. The northeast portion of Phase I has 41.5% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. Therefore, both the southeast and west portions meet the requirement for native species composition (>50%), while the northeast portion does not. It is normal, however, for a site to begin very weedy and develop more native character over time, so this portion may be expected to increase in native species composition over time and may exceed the stated project goal.

Two FQI and  $\bar{c}$  values were also calculated for each area of Phase I from the species lists included in Appendix A. The first values are calculated from only species which became established on the site naturally; the second values include the planted trees. The values are reported in Table 5, which follows:

Table 5. FQI and  $\bar{c}$  values with and without planted trees, by year and area of Phase I.

Year	West Area				Southeast Area				Northeast Area			
	Without planted species		With planted species		Without planted species		With planted species		Without planted species		With planted species	
	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$
2006*	9.1	1.5	13.0	2.0	9.1	1.5	13.0	2.0	9.1	1.5	13.0	2.0
2007	11.7	1.9	15.2	2.3	6.5	1.2	10.8	1.8	7.6	1.7	12.4	2.4
2008	15.7	3.4	19.4	3.7	16.1	3.3	19.7	3.6	18.5	2.4	21.3	2.7
2009	17.0	2.7	20.1	2.9	15.0	3.1	18.8	3.5	18.9	2.2	21.4	2.4

\* In 2006, Phase I was not differentiated; therefore the calculated value was used for each of the three areas.

These values indicate that all three areas of Phase I are of fair to good natural quality. These values should continue to increase over time in each of the areas, as higher quality vegetation becomes established.

c. Dominance of vegetation

No portion of Phase I meets this criterion, each having one dominant which is weedy (Table 2). *Phalaris arundinacea*, *Echinochloa muricata*, and *Poa pratensis* are found at the west, southeast, and northeast portions of this site, respectively, and are all weedy species. Therefore, this site does not meet the performance criterion for dominance of vegetation.

Photography stations were established in areas chosen to give maximum representation of the site. Locations of the photography stations can be seen in Figure 1 (page 6). Photographs were taken from the permanent photography stations established in 2006 and are in Appendix B of this report.

**Discussion – Phase I**

After this third monitoring season, Phase I shows good progress toward forested wetland establishment. All standards for Project Goal 1 have been met for portions of this site, as there is a large area of jurisdictional wetland. Two of the three standards for Project Goal 2 have been met in portions of the site (tree survival and native species composition), and as the vegetative succession proceeds, the entire site may comply with that goal by the end of the monitoring period.

The northeast area of Phase I does not satisfy all the wetland criteria; therefore, we believe this area is not a wetland. All of the southeast and west areas of Phase I satisfy all the wetland criteria; therefore, we believe these areas are wetlands. Current wetland acreage at this site is estimated to be approximately 39.4 ac (15.9 ha) of the total 41.3 ac (16.7 ha), corresponding to the west and southeast areas of Phase I. This estimate will continue to be refined in future years as more data are gathered.

With the exception of the northeast area of Phase I, the vegetation is hydrophytic and meets the native species composition requirement. The planted trees exhibited satisfactory survival, and

should meet the planted species performance criterion at the end of the monitoring period. There are still a large number of species at each site that have very low coefficients of conservatism (C). This is common on disturbed and early successional sites and is not a cause for concern at this time. It is likely that as succession progresses, more conservative species will become established on the site.

Currently, the primary concern for this site is establishing non-weedy, native dominant hydrophytic vegetation. Each area has one dominant that is weedy and may need to be controlled for this site to be successful. However, none of these species are likely to remain dominant after the trees at this site close the canopy in the future.

## Results – Phase II

### Project goal 1

#### a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation

Dominant plant species for Phase II in 2009 are shown in Table 6. One of the dominants is rated OBL and is hydrophytic, while the other was too small to be identified to the specific level, but is assumed to be hydrophytic. This results in 100% of the dominants being hydrophytic, which meets the minimum project goal of >50%.

Table 6. Dominant plant species by stratum and wetland indicator status.

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Polygonum</i> sp.	Herb	None*

\* These dominant unidentified seedlings are assumed to be hydrophytic, as all identifiable *Polygonums* at this project area are hydrophytes.

#### b. Occurrence of hydric soils

Soils examined were found to be relatively undisturbed and hydric soil indicators are present in the majority of Phase II. Table 7 below presents a soil description of a typical pedon located within Phase II of this site. This site meets the hydric soil criterion.

Table 7. Description of the soils at Phase II.

Depth	Matrix Color	Concentrations	Depletions	Texture	Structure
0-25 cm (0-10 in)	10YR 2/1	Common 10YR 4/6	None	Silty clay loam	Medium granular
25-58 cm (10-23+ in)	10YR 4/2	Common 7.5YR 4/6 and common 10YR 5/6	10YR 5/1	Silty clay loam	Medium granular and blocky

#### c. Presence of wetland hydrology

The ISGS estimated that “3.3 ha (8.2 ac) of Phase II, out of a total area of 4.3 ha (10.7 ac) satisfied jurisdictional wetland hydrology criteria at both 5% and 12.5% of the growing season” (Figure 2, page 7) (Fucciolo, et al. 2009). More information is available in the *Milan Beltway, Green Rock Wetland Compensation Site* report (ibid). This area includes most of Phase II, which satisfied the criteria for 5% and 12.5% of the growing season. Phase II was inundated during our site visits.

Based on field evidence observed during our on-site visits, the majority of Phase II exhibits indicators of wetland hydrology. At this time we estimate that this year 3.3 ha (8.2 ac) of Phase II has wetland hydrology.

**Project goal 2**

a. Planted species survivorship

Table 8 shows the results of the census. There were minor discrepancies between the numbers of trees planted and the number of live trees counted, with the exception of the pecans and green ash. Two living green ash and no pecans were observed this year, as the floods seem to have preferentially destroyed these species. Table 8 also shows the percent survival for the trees. These figures were calculated both by species and overall for all species in the entire site. More than 53% of the trees reported planted were counted as alive.

Table 8. Number of trees counted and percent tree survival (by species).

Species	Common Name	Number Planted	Number Surviving	% Survival.
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	Pecan	168	0	0.0
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green ash	162	2	1.2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	163	162	99.4
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin oak	164	126	76.8
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Swamp white oak	165	147	89.1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>822</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>53.2</b>

Therefore, there were 437 live trees counted during the census over 3.02 ha. This results in a trees per hectare number of 145, exceeding the stated project goal (>136 trees per hectare).

b. Native species composition

This site has 63.4% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. Therefore, it meets the requirement for native species composition (>50%).

Two FQI and  $\bar{c}$  values were also calculated for each area of Phase I from the species lists included in Appendix A. The first values are calculated from only species which became established on the site naturally; the second values include the planted trees. The values are reported in Table 9, which follows:

Table 9. FQI and  $\bar{c}$  values with and without planted trees, by year at Phase II.

Year	Phase II			
	Without planted species		With planted species	
	FQI	$\bar{c}$	FQI	$\bar{c}$
2008	14.0	3.2	16.9	3.5
2009	16.7	2.9	19.1	3.1

These values indicate that all Phase II is of fair natural quality. These values should continue to increase over time in each of the areas, as higher quality vegetation becomes established.

c. Dominance of vegetation

This site does not meet the performance criteria for dominance of vegetation. One of the two dominant species (*Echinochloa muricata*) is weedy (Table 6).

Photography stations were established in areas chosen to give maximum representation of the site. Locations of the photography stations can be seen in Figure 1 (page 6). Photographs were taken from the permanent photography station established in 2006 and are in Appendix D of this report.

### **Discussion – Phase II**

After this second monitoring season, Phase II shows much progress toward forested wetland establishment. All standards for Project Goal 1 have been met, as this site is a jurisdictional wetland. Two of the three standards for Project Goal 2 have been met, and as the vegetative succession proceeds, this site may comply with that goal by the end of the monitoring period.

Most of Phase II satisfies all the wetland criteria; therefore, we believe this site is a wetland. Current wetland acreage at this site is determined to be 3.3 ha (8.2 ac). This estimate will continue to be refined in future years as more hydrologic data is gathered.

The vegetation is hydrophytic, but it does not meet the dominance criteria for native non-weedy species. The planted trees exhibited barely adequate survival, and could meet the planted species performance criterion at the end of the monitoring period. There are still a large number of species at each site that have very low coefficients of conservatism (C). This is common on disturbed and early successional sites and is not a cause for concern at this time. It is likely that as succession progresses, more conservative species will become established on the site.

Currently, the primary concern for this site is establishing non-weedy, native dominant hydrophytic vegetation. This site has one dominant that is weedy and may need to be controlled for this site to be successful. However, this species is not likely to remain dominant after the trees at this site close the canopy in the future. One other possible area of concern is tree survival. More trees may need to be planted to meet the survivorship criterion in future years.

## References

- Admiraal, A.N., M.J. Morris, T.C. Brooks, J.W. Olson, and M.V. Miller. 1997. Illinois wetland restoration and creation guide. Illinois Natural History Survey Special Publication 19. viii+188pp.
- Elmer, S.L. 2004. Soil survey of Henry County, Illinois. United States Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service in cooperation with Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station. 527 pp. + maps
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi. Technical Report Y-87-1. [Online WWW]. Available URL: "<http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/wetlands/pdfs/wlman87.pdf>" [Accessed December 2009 - January 2010].
- ESRI. 2002. ArcView GIS, version 3.3. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, CA, USA.
- Federal Interagency Committee for Wetland Delineation. 1989. Federal manual for identifying and delineating jurisdictional wetlands. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C. Cooperative technical publication.
- Fucciolo, C.S., S.E. Benton, K.W. Carr, C.W. Knight, J.J. Miner, E.T. Plankell, G.E. Pociask, and B.J.R. Sperling. 2006. Annual report for active IDOT wetland compensation and hydrologic monitoring sites. Report submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Design and Environment, Wetlands Unit.
- Fucciolo, C.S., S.E. Benton, K.W. Carr, C.W. Knight, J.J. Miner, E.T. Plankell, G.E. Pociask, and B.J.R. Sperling. 2007. Annual report for active IDOT wetland compensation and hydrologic monitoring sites. Report submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Design and Environment, Wetlands Unit.
- Fucciolo, C.S., S.E. Benton, K.E. Bryant, K.W. Carr, C.W. Knight, J.J. Miner, E.T. Plankell, and G.E. Pociask. 2008. Annual report for active IDOT wetland compensation and hydrologic monitoring sites. Report submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Design and Environment, Wetlands Unit.
- Fucciolo, C.S., S.E. Benton, K.E. Bryant, M.C. Campbell, K.W. Carr, C.W. Knight, A.K.M. Knight, J.J. Miner, E.T. Plankell, and G.E. Pociask. 2009. Annual report for active IDOT wetland compensation and hydrologic monitoring sites. Report submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Design and Environment, Wetlands Unit.
- IDOT. 2002. Conceptual Wetland Compensation Plan for FAU 5822 Section 1-3 Milan Beltway Extension (West Rock River Crossing) Rock Island County, P92-096-84. 10p. + attachments.
- IDOT. 2004. Notice to bidders, specifications, proposal, contract and contract bond. Contract No.64646. Rock Island County. Section (33NRS)R-1. Letting July 30, 2004.

IDOT. 2006. Notice to bidders, specifications, proposal, contract and contract bond. Contract No.64B01. Rock Island County. Section 1-3-LS. Letting August 4, 2006.

Reed, P. B., Jr. 1988. National list of plant species that occur in wetlands: Illinois. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory. NERC-88/18.13.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey [Online WWW]. Available URL: "<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>" [Accessed December 2009 -January 2010].

Swink, F., and G. Wilhelm. 1994. Plants of the Chicago region. Indiana Academy of Science, Indianapolis.

Taft, J. B., G.S. Wilhelm, D. M. Ladd, and L.A. Masters. 1997. Floristic quality assessment for vegetation in Illinois - a method for assessing vegetation integrity. *Erigenia* 15:3-95.

Wicker, T.L., J.K. LaTour, and J.C. Maurer. 1996. Water resources data, Illinois - water year 1995. Volume 1 - Illinois except Illinois River Basin. U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Urbana, IL. USGS-WDR-IL-95-1. 249 pp.

US Army Corps of Engineers. 1993. Guidelines for developing mitigation proposals. Chicago District. September 1.

**Appendix A**

**Wetland Determination Forms of Wetland Mitigation Site:  
Green Rock Phase I**

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 1 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at this area? Yes:  No:

Has the vegetation, soils, or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes:  No:

### VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Herb	FAC
2. <i>Poa pratensis</i>	Herb	FAC-
3. <i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	Herb	OBL

Percentage of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC: 66%

**Hydrophytic vegetation:** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** More than 50% of the dominants are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC.

### SOILS

Series and phase: NRCS mapped as Sawmill and Radford;

Revised to Radford silt loam (Fluvaquentic Hapludoll)

On county hydric soils list? Yes:  No:

Is the soil a histosol? Yes:  No:

Histic epipedon present? Yes:  No:

Redox Concentrations? Yes:  No:  Color: N/A

Redox Depletions? Yes:  No:  Color: N/A

Matrix color: 10YR 3/2 over strata of 10YR 3/2 and 4/2

Other indicators: None.

**Hydric soils?** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** The Natural Resources Conservation Service identifies Radford silt loam as a Fluvaquentic Hapludoll which is somewhat poorly drained. This soil lacks redox concentrations or depletions and possesses a medium chroma matrix, which indicates saturated or reduced conditions for only brief duration. Therefore, the soil at this site does not meet the hydric soil criterion. This soil meets none of the NRCS hydric soil indicators.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 2 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes:            No: X            Depth of standing water: N/A

Depth to saturated soil: > 0.30 m (12 in)

Overview of hydrological flow through the system: This area is hydrologically influenced by overflow from the Green River and Mosquito Creek, sheet flow from surrounding uplands, and precipitation. Water leaves the area via evapotranspiration, sheet flow, and drainage into the river.

Size of watershed: 2596 km<sup>2</sup> (1003 mi<sup>2</sup>) for the Green River at Geneseo, IL (Wicker, et al. 1996)

Other field evidence observed: The ISGS estimated that this area did not meet the wetland hydrology criterion (Fucciolo et al. 2009)

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes:            No: X

**Rationale:** Field evidence cited above and ISGS data indicate that this area is not inundated or saturated for a sufficient duration to satisfy the wetland hydrology criterion.

### DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE:

**Is the area a wetland?** Yes:            No: X

**Rationale:** While dominant hydrophytic vegetation is present at this area, hydric soils and wetland hydrology are absent; therefore, we determined that this area is not a wetland.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 3 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Abutilon theophrasti</i>	velvet-leaf	herb	FACU-	*+
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	silver maple	shrub, herb	FACW	1+
<i>Agropyron repens</i>	quack grass	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Agrostis alba</i>	red top	herb	FACW	0+
<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i>	broad-leaf water-plantain	herb	OBL	2
<i>Amaranthus tuberculatus</i>	tall waterhemp	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	common ragweed	herb	FACU	0+
<i>Ambrosia trifida</i>	giant ragweed	herb	FAC+	0+
<i>Ammannia coccinea</i>	long-leaved ammannia	herb	OBL	5
<i>Apocynum cannabinum</i>	dogbane	herb	FAC	2
<i>Armoracia aquatica</i>	lake cress	herb	OBL	10
<i>Asclepias incarnata</i>	swamp milkweed	herb	OBL	4
<i>Asclepias syriaca</i>	common milkweed	herb	UPL	0+
<i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster pilosus</i>	hairy aster	herb	FACU+	0+
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicled aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	common beggar's ticks	herb	FACW	1+
<i>Bidens tripartita</i>	beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Brassica nigra</i>	black mustard	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Bromus commutatus</i>	hairy brome	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Bromus inermis</i>	awnless brome grass	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Carex cristatella</i>	sedge	herb	FACW+	3
<i>Catalpa</i> sp.	cigar tree	shrub	----	--
<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	hackberry	herb	FAC-	3
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	lamb's quarters	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Cicuta maculata</i>	water hemlock	herb	OBL	4
<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Canada thistle	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Commelina communis</i>	common day flower	herb	FAC	*+
<i>Conium maculatum</i>	poison hemlock	herb	FACW	*+
<i>Conyza canadensis</i>	horseweed	herb	FAC-	0+
<i>Cynanchum laeve</i>	blue vine	herb	FAC	1+
<i>Cyperus aristatus</i>	bearded flat sedge	herb	OBL	2
<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>	yellow nut-sedge	herb	FACW	0+
<i>Cyperus</i> sp.	flatsedge	herb	----	--
<i>Dipsacus laciniatus</i>	cut-leaved teasel	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Echinocystis lobata</i>	wild balsam-apple	herb	FACW-	4
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3

Species list continued next page.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 4 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST (Continued)

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Eleocharis erythropoda</i>	spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eleocharis obtusa</i>	blunt spike rush	herb	OBL	2
<i>Elymus canadensis</i>	Canada wild rye	herb	FAC-	4
<i>Elymus virginicus</i>	Virginia wild rye	herb	FACW-	4
<i>Eragrostis cilianensis</i>	stink grass	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Eragrostis hypnoides</i>	creeping love grass	herb	OBL	5
<i>Eragrostis pectinacea</i>	carolina love grass	herb	FAC	0+
<i>Erigeron annuus</i>	annual fleabane	herb	FAC-	1+
<i>Eupatorium serotinum</i>	late boneset	herb	FAC+	1+
<i>Festuca arundinacea</i>	tall fescue	herb	FACU+	*+
<i>Glechoma hederacea</i>	ground ivy	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Helianthus tuberosus</i>	Jerusalem artichoke	herb	FAC	3
<i>Hordeum jubatum</i>	squirrel-tail	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Leucospora multifida</i>	leucospora	herb	FACW+	3
<i>Lindernia dubia</i>	false pimpernel	herb	OBL	5
<i>Ludwigia palustris americana</i>	marsh purslane	herb	OBL	4
<i>Melilotus alba</i>	white sweet clover	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Melilotus officinalis</i>	yellow sweet clover	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Mimulus ringens</i>	monkey flower	herb	OBL	5
<i>Morus alba</i>	white mulberry	shrub	FAC	*+
<i>Myosoton aquaticum</i>	giant chickweed	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Oenothera biennis</i>	evening primrose	herb	FACU	1+
<i>Oxalis stricta</i>	yellow wood sorrel	herb	FACU	0+
<i>Pastinaca sativa</i>	parsnip	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Penthorum sedoides</i>	ditch stonecrop	herb	OBL	2
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Phleum pratense</i>	Timothy	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	fog-fruit	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Physalis subglabrata</i>	smooth ground cherry	herb	UPL	0+
<i>Pilea pumila</i>	Canada clearweed	herb	FACW	3
<i>Plantago rugelii</i>	red-stalked plantain	herb	FAC	0+
<i>Poa pratensis</i>	Kentucky bluegrass	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	water smartweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Polygonum arenastrum</i>	knotweed	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Polygonum lapathifolium</i>	curttop lady's thumb	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Polygonum pensylvanicum</i>	giant smartweed	herb	FACW+	1+

Species list continued next page.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 5 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST (Continued)

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Polygonum persicaria</i>	spotted lady's thumb	herb	FACW	*+
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	eastern cottonwood	shrub, herb	FAC+	2
<i>Ranunculus sceleratus</i>	cursed crowfoot	herb	OBL	3
<i>Rorippa islandica</i>	marsh yellow cress	herb	OBL	4
<i>Rorippa sylvestris</i>	creeping yellow cress	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Rosa multiflora</i>	multiflora rose	shrub	FACU	*+
<i>Rumex altissimus</i>	pale dock	herb	FACW-	2
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	curly dock	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>	arrowhead	herb	OBL	4
<i>Salix exigua</i>	sandbar willow	shrub	OBL	1+
<i>Scirpus tabernaemontanii</i>	great bulrush	herb	OBL	4
<i>Sisymbrium loeselii</i>	tall hedge mustard	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Sium suave</i>	water parsnip	herb	OBL	5
<i>Solanum carolinense</i>	horse nettle	herb	FACU-	0+
<i>Solanum pycnanthum</i>	black nightshade	herb	FACU-	0+
<i>Solidago canadensis</i>	Canada goldenrod	herb	FACU	1+
<i>Solidago gigantea</i>	late goldenrod	herb	FACW	3
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	common dandelion	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Teucrium canadense</i>	American germander	herb	FACW-	3
<i>Toxicodendron radicans</i>	poison ivy	herb	FAC+	1+
<i>Trifolium hybridum</i>	alsike clover	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	red clover	herb	FACU+	*+
<i>Trifolium repens</i>	white clover	herb	FACU+	*+
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	shrub, herb	FACW-	5
<i>Urtica dioica</i>	stinging nettle	herb	FAC+	2
<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>	woolly mullein	herb	UPL	*+
<i>Verbena hastata</i>	blue vervain	herb	FACW+	3
<i>Verbena urticifolia</i>	white vervain	herb	FAC+	3
<i>Veronica peregrina</i>	purslane speedwell	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Vitis riparia</i>	riverbank grape	herb	FACW-	2
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i>	cocklebur	herb	FAC	0+

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) + weedy native or non-native species, \*non-native species

$$FQI = \sum C / \sqrt{N} = 160 / \sqrt{72} = 18.9 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C / N = 160 / 72 = 2.2$$

**ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION**

Northeast area (page 6 of 6)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Non-native grassland

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies approximately the eastern half of the area north of the pipeline on the east side of Phase I.

**Planted Saplings  
SPECIES LIST**

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	pecan	sapling(p)	FACW	6
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	sapling(p)	FACW	2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	sycamore	sapling(p)	FACW	3
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	swamp white oak	sapling(p)	FACW+	7
<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	overcup oak	sapling(p)	OBL	7
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	pin oak	sapling(p)	FACW	4

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) (p) planted species

$$FQI^* = \sum C / \sqrt{N} = 189 / \sqrt{78} = 21.4 \quad \bar{C}^* = \sum C / N = 189 / 78 = 2.4$$

\*These calculations include the complete species list above, as well as the planted trees.

Determined by: Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
 Brian Wilm, Ian Draheim, and Dave Ketzner (vegetation and hydrology)  
 Brad Zercher (GIS)  
 Illinois Natural History Survey  
 1816 South Oak Street  
 Champaign, Illinois 61820  
 (217) 265-0368 (Wiesbrook)

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Southeast area (page 1 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the east side of Phase I.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at this area? Yes:  No:

Has the vegetation, soils, or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes:  No:

### VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Polygonum</i> sp.	Herb	None

Percentage of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC: 100%

**Hydrophytic vegetation:** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** More than 50% of the dominants are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC.

### SOILS

Series and phase: NRCS mapped as Sawmill, Radford, and Tice;

Revised to Sawmill silty clay loam (Cumulic Endoaquoll)

On county hydric soils list? Yes:  No:

Is the soil a histosol? Yes:  No:

Histic epipedon present? Yes:  No:

Redox Concentrations? Yes:  No:  Color: 7.5YR 4/4, 10YR 4/6, and 4/4

Redox Depletions? Yes:  No:  Color: N/A

Matrix color: 10YR 3/1 over strata of 10YR 3/1 and 6/1

Other indicators: None.

**Hydric soils?** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** The Natural Resources Conservation Service identifies Sawmill silty clay loam as a Cumulic Endoaquoll which is poorly drained. This soil possesses redox concentrations within a low chroma matrix, which indicates saturated or reduced conditions for extended duration. Therefore, the soil at this site meets the hydric soil criterion. This soil meets NRCS hydric soil indicator F6 – Redox dark surface.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Southeast area (page 2 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the east side of Phase I.

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes: X No:

Depth of standing water: From 0-0.1 m (4 in)

Depth to saturated soil: At surface

Overview of hydrological flow through the system: This area is hydrologically influenced by overflow from the Green River and Mosquito Creek, sheet flow from surrounding uplands, some directed drainage from Interstate 280/74, and precipitation. Water leaves the area via evapotranspiration, possible groundwater recharge, and drainage into the creek and river.

Size of watershed: 2596 km<sup>2</sup> (1003 mi<sup>2</sup>) for the Green River at Geneseo, IL (Wicker, et al. 1996)

Other field evidence observed: The ISGS estimated that this area met the wetland hydrology criterion (Fucciolo et al. 2009). This site was inundated during site visit.

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Field evidence cited above and ISGS data indicate that this area is inundated or saturated for a sufficient duration to satisfy the wetland hydrology criterion.

### DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE:

**Is the area a wetland?** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Hydric soil, dominant hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology are present at this area; therefore, we determined that this area is a wetland.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Southeast area (page 3 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the east side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i>	broad-leaf water-plantain	herb	OBL	2
<i>Ammannia coccinea</i>	long-leaved ammannia	herb	OBL	5
<i>Armoracia aquatica</i>	lake cress	herb	OBL	10
<i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicled aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bidens cernua</i>	nodding beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	common beggar's ticks	herb	FACW	1+
<i>Bidens tripartita</i>	beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Carex</i> sp.	sedge	herb	----	--
<i>Cyperus</i> sp.	flatsedge	herb	----	--+
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eleocharis erythropoda</i>	spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lindernia dubia</i>	false pimpernel	herb	OBL	5
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	fog-fruit	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	water smartweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Polygonum aviculare</i>	knotweed	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Polygonum lapathifolium</i>	curttop lady's thumb	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Polygonum pensylvanicum</i>	giant smartweed	herb	FACW+	1+
<i>Polygonum persicaria</i>	spotted lady's thumb	herb	FACW	*+
<i>Polygonum</i> sp.	smartweed	herb	----	--
<i>Potamogeton nodosus</i>	leafy pondweed	herb	OBL	7
<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	comb pondweed	herb	OBL	5
<i>Rorippa islandica</i>	marsh yellow cress	herb	OBL	4
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	curly dock	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>	arrowhead	herb	OBL	4
<i>Scirpus tabernaemontanii</i>	great bulrush	herb	OBL	4
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	narrow-leaved cattail	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Veronica peregrina</i>	purslane speedwell	herb	FACW+	0+

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) + weedy native or non-native species, \*non-native species

$$FQI = \sum C/N = 72/23 = 3.1 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C/N = 72/23 = 3.1$$

**ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION**  
Southeast area (page 4 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois **County:** Henry **Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the east side of Phase I.

**Planted Saplings**  
**SPECIES LIST**

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	pecan	sapling(p)	FACW	6
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	sapling(p)	FACW	2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	sycamore	sapling(p)	FACW	3
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	swamp white oak	sapling(p)	FACW+	7
<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	overcup oak	sapling(p)	OBL	7
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	pin oak	sapling(p)	FACW	4

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) (p) planted species

$$FQI^* = \sum C / \sqrt{N} = 101 / \sqrt{29} = 18.8 \quad \bar{c}^* = \sum C / N = 101 / 29 = 3.5$$

\*These calculations include the complete species list above, as well as the planted trees.

Determined by: Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
Brian Wilm, Ian Draheim, and Dave Ketzner (vegetation and hydrology)  
Brad Zercher (GIS)  
Illinois Natural History Survey  
1816 South Oak Street  
Champaign, Illinois 61820  
(217) 265-0368 (Wiesbrook)

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

West area (page 1 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Wet meadow

**Legal Description:** SE/4, NW/4, Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the west side of Phase I.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at this area? Yes:  No:

Has the vegetation, soils, or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes:  No:

### VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Herb	FACW+
2. <i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	Herb	OBL

Percentage of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC: 100%

**Hydrophytic vegetation:** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** More than 50% of the dominants are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC.

### SOILS

Series and phase: Sawmill silty clay loam (Cumulic Endoaquoll)

On county hydric soils list? Yes:  No:

Is the soil a histosol? Yes:  No:

Histic epipedon present? Yes:  No:

Redox Concentrations? Yes:  No:  Color: 7.5YR 4/4, 10YR 4/6, and 4/4

Redox Depletions? Yes:  No:  Color: N/A

Matrix color: 10YR 3/1 over strata of 10YR 3/1 and 6/1

Other indicators: None.

**Hydric soils?** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** The Natural Resources Conservation Service identifies Sawmill silty clay loam as a Cumulic Endoaquoll which is poorly drained. This soil possesses redox concentrations within a low chroma matrix, which indicates saturated or reduced conditions for extended duration. Therefore, the soil at this site meets the hydric soil criterion. This soil meets NRCS hydric soil indicator F6 – Redox dark surface.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

West area (page 2 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Wet meadow

**Legal Description:** SE/4, NW/4, Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the west side of Phase I.

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes: X No:

Depth of standing water: From 0-0.5 m (19 in)

Depth to saturated soil: At surface

Overview of hydrological flow through the system: This area is hydrologically influenced by overflow from the Green River and Mosquito Creek, sheet flow from surrounding uplands, some directed drainage from Interstate 280/74, and precipitation. Water leaves the area via evapotranspiration, possible groundwater recharge, and drainage into the creek and river.

Size of watershed: 2596 km<sup>2</sup> (1003 mi<sup>2</sup>) for the Green River at Geneseo, IL (Wicker, et al. 1996)

Other field evidence observed: The ISGS estimated that this area met the wetland hydrology criterion (Fucciolo et al. 2009). This site was inundated during site visit.

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Field evidence cited above and ISGS data indicate that this area is inundated or saturated for a sufficient duration to satisfy the wetland hydrology criterion.

### DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE:

**Is the area a wetland?** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Hydric soil, dominant hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology are present at this area; therefore, we determined that this area is a wetland.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

West area (page 3 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Wet meadow

**Legal Description:** SE/4, NW/4, Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the west side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	silver maple	shrub, herb	FACW	1+
<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i>	broad-leaf water-plantain	herb	OBL	2
<i>Amaranthus tuberculatus</i>	tall waterhemp	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	common ragweed	herb	FACU	0+
<i>Ambrosia trifida</i>	giant ragweed	herb	FAC+	0+
<i>Ammannia coccinea</i>	long-leaved ammannia	herb	OBL	5
<i>Apocynum cannabinum</i>	dogbane	herb	FAC	2
<i>Armoracia aquatica</i>	lake cress	herb	OBL	10
<i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicled aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bidens cernua</i>	nodding beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	common beggar's ticks	herb	FACW	1+
<i>Bidens tripartita</i>	beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	buttonbush	shrub, herb	OBL	4
<i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i>	coontail	herb	OBL	3
<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>	yellow nut-sedge	herb	FACW	0+
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eragrostis hypnoides</i>	creeping love grass	herb	OBL	5
<i>Hordeum jubatum</i>	squirrel-tail	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Leucospora multifida</i>		herb	FACW+	3
<i>Lindernia dubia</i>	false pimpernel	herb	OBL	5
<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>	moneywort	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Mimulus ringens</i>	monkey flower	herb	OBL	5
<i>Penthorum sedoides</i>	ditch stoncrop	herb	OBL	2
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	fog-fruit	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	water smartweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Polygonum lapathifolium</i>	curttop lady's thumb	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Polygonum pennsylvanicum</i>	giant smartweed	herb	FACW+	1+
<i>Polygonum persicaria</i>	spotted lady's thumb	herb	FACW	*+
<i>Polygonum sp.</i>	smartweed	herb	----	--
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	beginner's pondweed	herb	OBL	*
<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	comb pondweed	herb	OBL	5
<i>Ranunculus sceleratus</i>	cursed crowfoot	herb	OBL	3
<i>Rorippa islandica</i>	marsh yellow cress	herb	OBL	4
<i>Rorippa sylvestris</i>	creeping yellow cress	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Rumex altissimus</i>	pale dock	herb	FACW-	2

Species list continued on next page.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

West area (page 4 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Wet meadow

**Legal Description:** SE/4, NW/4, Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland occupies the area on the west side of Phase I.

### SPECIES LIST (Continued)

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	curly dock	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>	arrowhead	herb	OBL	4
<i>Salix exigua</i>	sandbar willow	shrub, herb	OBL	1+
<i>Scutellaria lateriflora</i>	mad-dog skullcap	herb	OBL	4
<i>Solanum ptycanthum</i>	black nightshade	herb	FACU-	0+
<i>Sparganium eurycarpum</i>	burreed	herb	OBL	5
<i>Stachys tenuifolia</i>	slenderleaf betony	herb	OBL	5
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	narrow-leaved cattail	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	shrub, herb	FACW-	5
<i>Veronica peregrina</i>	purslane speedwell	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i>	cocklebur	herb	FAC	0+

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) + weedy native or non-native species, \*non-native species

$$FQI = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 109/\sqrt{41} = 17.0 \quad \bar{c} = \sum C/N = 109/41 = 2.7$$

### Planted Saplings

#### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	pecan	sapling(p)	FACW	6
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	sapling(p)	FACW	2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	sycamore	sapling(p)	FACW	3
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	swamp white oak	sapling(p)	FACW+	7
<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	overcup oak	sapling(p)	OBL	7
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	pin oak	sapling(p)	FACW	4

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) (p) planted species

$$FQI^* = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 138/\sqrt{47} = 20.1 \quad \bar{c}^* = \sum C/N = 138/47 = 2.9$$

\*These calculations include the complete species list above, as well as the planted trees.

Determined by: Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
 Brian Wilm, Ian Draheim, and Dave Ketzner (vegetation and hydrology)  
 Brad Zercher (GIS)  
 Illinois Natural History Survey  
 1816 South Oak Street  
 Champaign, Illinois 61820  
 (217) 265-0368 (Wiesbrook)

**Appendix B**

**Photographs of Wetland Mitigation Site:  
Green Rock Phase I**



Picture 1. Facing northwest from photostation 1 (located on eastern side of east area).



Picture 2. Facing southwest from photostation 2 (located on northern side of east area).



Picture 3. Facing north from photostation 3 (located on southwest corner of east area).



Picture 4. Facing northwest from photostation 4 (located on southeast corner of west area).



Picture 5. Facing east from photostation 5 (located on west side of west area).



Picture 6. Facing southwest from photostation 6 (located on northeast corner of west area).

**Appendix C**

**Wetland Determination Forms of Wetland Mitigation Site:  
Green Rock Phase II**

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Site 1 (page 1 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland includes the entire Phase II area.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at this area? Yes:  No:

Has the vegetation, soils, or hydrology been significantly disturbed? Yes: No:

### VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Polygonum</i> sp.	Herb	None

Percentage of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC: 100%

**Hydrophytic vegetation:** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** More than 50% of the dominants are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC.

### SOILS

Series and phase: NRCS mapped as Sawmill, Radford, Tice, and Plano;

Revised to Sawmill silty clay loam (Cumulic Endoaquoll)

On county hydric soils list? Yes: No:

Is the soil a histosol? Yes: No:

Histic epipedon present? Yes: No:

Redox Concentrations? Yes:  No: Color: 7.5YR 4/6 and 10YR 5/6

Redox Depletions? Yes:  No: Color: 10YR 5/1

Matrix color: 10YR 2/1 over 10YR 4/2

Other indicators: None.

**Hydric soils?** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** The Natural Resources Conservation Service identifies Sawmill silty clay loam as a Cumulic Endoaquoll which is poorly drained. This soil possesses redox concentrations within a low chroma matrix, which indicates saturated or reduced conditions for extended duration. Therefore, the soil at this site meets the hydric soil criterion. This soil meets NRCS hydric soil indicator F6 – Redox dark surface.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Site 1 (page 2 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland includes the entire Phase II area.

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes: X No:

Depth of standing water: From 0-0.20 m (8 in)

Depth to saturated soil: At surface

Overview of hydrological flow through the system: This area is hydrologically influenced by overflow from the Green River and Mosquito Creek, sheet flow from surrounding uplands, some directed drainage from Interstate 280/74, and precipitation. Water leaves the area via evapotranspiration, possible groundwater recharge, and drainage into the creek and river.

Size of watershed: 2596 km<sup>2</sup> (1003 mi<sup>2</sup>) for the Green River at Geneseo, IL (Wicker, et al. 1996)

Other field evidence observed: The ISGS estimated that this area met the wetland hydrology criterion (Fucciolo et al. 2009). This site was inundated during site visit.

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Field evidence cited above and ISGS data indicate that this area is inundated or saturated for a sufficient duration to satisfy the wetland hydrology criterion.

### DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE:

**Is the area a wetland?** Yes: X No:

**Rationale:** Hydric soil, dominant hydrophytic vegetation, and wetland hydrology are present at this area; therefore, we determined that this area is a wetland.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Site 1 (page 3 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland includes the entire Phase II area.

### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	silver maple	herb	FACW	1+
<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i>	broad-leaf water-plantain	herb	OBL	2
<i>Ammannia coccinea</i>	long-leaved ammannia	herb	OBL	5
<i>Armoracia aquatica</i>	lake cress	herb	OBL	10
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicked aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bidens cernua</i>	nodding beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	common beggar's ticks	herb	FACW	1+
<i>Carex</i> sp.	sedge	herb	----	--
<i>Cyperus aristatus</i>	bearded flat sedge	herb	OBL	2
<i>Cyperus</i> sp.	flatsedge	herb	----	--
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Eclipta prostrata</i>	yerba de tajo	herb	FACW	2
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eleocharis erythropoda</i>	spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eleocharis obtusa</i>	blunt spike rush	herb	OBL	2
<i>Eragrostis hypnoides</i>	creeping love grass	herb	OBL	5
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Leucospora multifida</i>	leucospora	herb	FACW+	3
<i>Lindernia dubia</i>	false pimpernel	herb	OBL	5
<i>Ludwigia palustris americana</i>	marsh purslane	herb	OBL	4
<i>Mimulus ringens</i>	monkey flower	herb	OBL	5
<i>Mollugo verticillata</i>	carpetweed	herb	FAC	*+
<i>Penthorum sedoides</i>	ditch stoncrop	herb	OBL	2
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	fog-fruit	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Polygonum hydropiper</i>	common smartweed	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Polygonum lapathifolium</i>	curttop lady's thumb	herb	FACW+	0+
<i>Polygonum pensylvanicum</i>	giant smartweed	herb	FACW+	1+
<i>Polygonum persicaria</i>	spotted lady's thumb	herb	FACW	*+
<i>Polygonum</i> sp.	smartweed	herb	----	--
<i>Portulaca oleracea</i>	purslane	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Potamogeton nodosus</i>	leafy pondweed	herb	OBL	7
<i>Ranunculus sceleratus</i>	cursed crowfoot	herb	OBL	3
<i>Rorippa islandica</i>	marsh yellow cress	herb	OBL	4
<i>Rorippa sessiliflora</i>	sessile-flowered cress	herb	OBL	3

Species list continued on next page.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Site 1 (page 4 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, Draheim, and Ketzner

**Date:** June 30, July 20-21, & September 1, 2009

**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase II) **Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Aquatic bed

**Legal Description:** SW/4, NE/4 Section 16, T. 17 N., R. 1 E

**Location:** This wetland includes the entire Phase II area.

### SPECIES LIST (Continued)

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Rumex altissimus</i>	pale dock	herb	FACW-	2
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	curly dock	herb	FAC+	*+
<i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>	arrowhead	herb	OBL	4
<i>Salix exigua</i>	sandbar willow	shrub, herb	OBL	1+
<i>Scirpus tabernaemontanii</i>	great bulrush	herb	OBL	4
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	narrow-leaved cattail	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Veronica peregrina</i>	purslane speedwell	herb	FACW+	0+

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) + weedy native or non-native species, \*non-native species

$$FQI = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 96/\sqrt{33} = 16.7 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C/N = 96/33 = 2.9$$

### Planted Saplings

#### SPECIES LIST

Scientific name	Common name	Stratum	Wetland indicator status	Coefficient of conservatism#
<i>Carya illinoensis</i>	pecan	sapling(p)	FACW	6
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	sapling(p)	FACW	2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	sycamore	sapling(p)	FACW	3
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	swamp white oak	sapling(p)	FACW+	7
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	pin oak	sapling(p)	FACW	4

# Coefficient of Conservatism (Taft et al. 1997) (p) planted species

$$FQI^* = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 118/\sqrt{38} = 19.1 \quad \bar{C}^* = \sum C/N = 118/38 = 3.1$$

\*These calculations include the complete species list above, as well as the planted trees.

Determined by: Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
Brian Wilm, Ian Draheim, and Dave Ketzner (vegetation and hydrology)

Brad Zercher (GIS)

Illinois Natural History Survey

1816 South Oak Street

Champaign, Illinois 61820

(217) 265-0368 (Wiesbrook)

**Appendix D**

**Photographs of Wetland Mitigation Site:  
Green Rock Phase II**



Picture 1. Facing northeast from photostation 1 (located on west side).



Picture 2. Facing southeast from photostation 1 (located on west side).