

**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 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:** August 1, 13-14, & October 9, 2008

**Project Summary:**

For the third 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 trees planted by spring 2006. For the second year we monitored Phase II of the site. Phase II was completed and all 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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Edward J. Heske  
INHS/IDOT Project Principal Investigator

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**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. On-site monitoring was conducted on August 1, 13-14, & October 9, 2008. 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. 2008). 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). 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 2008 are summarized in ISGS' Annual Report for Active IDOT Wetland Compensation and Hydrologic Monitoring Sites, September 1, 2007 to September 1, 2008 (Fucciolo et al. 2008).

### **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, 2004)] 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	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		4865	822

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). The west and southeast portions of Phase I meet this criteria as all of the dominants are 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 one of the two dominant species rated OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC and hydrophytic. This results in only 50% of the dominants being hydrophytic, which does not meet the minimum project goal of >50%.

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>Elodea canadensis</i>	Herb	OBL
	2. <i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	Herb	OBL
	3. <i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	Herb	OBL
Phase I Northeast	1. <i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Herb	FAC
	2. <i>Poa pratensis</i>	Herb	FAC-

#### 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 clear hydric soil indicators at this time. Table 3 below presents a soil description of a typical pedon located within the west and southeast areas of this site:

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**



0 400 800 Feet scale 1:4800 0 100 200 Meters  
1 inch=400 ft

⊕ Photo station  
Project boundary



01/08

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

c. Presence of wetland hydrology

The ISGS estimated that “the entire mitigation areas of both Phase I and Phase II satisfied jurisdictional wetland hydrology criteria at both 5% and 12.5% of the growing season” (Figure 2) (Fucciolo, et al. 2008). This included 16.7 ha (41.3 ac) of Phase I and 4.3 ha (10.7 ac) of Phase II. 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 is no longer included in monitoring by the ISGS, and therefore we have no data to determine whether this area met the hydrology criteria this year. During our August site visits, both the southeast and west areas were still inundated from a flood event that began June 12.

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 16.7 ha (41.3 ac) of Phase I this year has wetland hydrology.



Figure 2. “Estimated Areal Extent of 2008 Wetland Hydrology” (Fucciolo, et al. 2008).

## 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. 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 74% 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	970	389	40.1
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green ash	970	796	82.1
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	971	753	77.5
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin oak	972	900	92.6
<i>Quercus</i> spp.*	Swamp white, white, and overcup oak	982	802	81.7
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4865</b>	<b>3640</b>	<b>74.8</b>

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

Therefore, there were 3640 live trees counted during the census over 16.88 ha. This results in a trees per hectare number of 216, easily exceeding the stated project goal (>136 trees per hectare).

### b. Native species composition

The west portion of Phase I has 68.0% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. The southeast portion of Phase I has 69.0% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. The northeast portion of Phase I has 47.6% 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

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

These values indicate that the northeast area of Phase I is of fair to good natural quality, while the southeast and west areas are 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

No portion of Phase I meets this criterion, each having one dominant which is non-native and weedy (Table 2). *Phalaris arundinacea*, *Potamogeton crispus*, and *Poa pratensis* are found at the west, southeast, and northeast portions of this site, respectively, and are all non-native, 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 41.3 ac (16.7 ha), corresponding to the west and southeast areas of Phase I. This estimate will be refined in future years as more data are gathered.

With the exception of the northeast area of Phase I, the vegetation is hydrophytic. It also does not meet the dominance criteria for native non-weedy species. The planted trees exhibited excellent 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 concerns for this site are establishing non-weedy, native dominant hydrophytic vegetation. An estimate of current wetland acreage is approximately 41.3 ac (16.7 ha), corresponding to the west and southeast areas of Phase I.

## Results – Phase II

### Project goal 1

#### a. Predominance of hydrophytic vegetation

Dominant plant species for Phase II in 2007 are shown in Table 6. Both of the dominants are rated OBL and are 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>Elodea canadensis</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	Herb	OBL

#### 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:

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 “the entire mitigation areas of both Phase I and Phase II satisfied jurisdictional wetland hydrology criteria at both 5% and 12.5% of the growing season” (Figure 2) (Fucciolo, et al. 2008). This included 16.7 ha (41.3 ac) of Phase I and 4.3 ha (10.7 ac) of Phase II. More information is available in the *Milan Beltway, Green Rock Wetland Compensation Site* report (ibid). This total area includes Phase II, which satisfied the criteria for 5% and 12.5% of the growing season. During our August site visits, Phase II was still inundated from a flood event that began June 12.

Based on field evidence observed during our on-site visits, the majority of the 3.02 ha (7.45 ac) in Phase II exhibits indicators of wetland hydrology. At this time we estimate that this year all 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. Not one living pecan was observed this year, as the floods seem to have preferentially ruined the pecans. 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 71% 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	138	85.2
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	163	163	100.0
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin oak	164	145	88.4
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Swamp white oak	165	145	87.9
TOTAL		822	700	71.9

Therefore, there were 591 live trees counted during the census over 3.02 ha. This results in a trees per hectare number of 196, exceeding the stated project goal (>136 trees per hectare).

### b. Native species composition

This site has 66.7% non-weedy, native, annual and perennial species. Therefore, it meets the requirement for native species composition (>50%).

Two FQI values were also calculated for this site from the species lists included in Appendix C. The first FQI value is calculated from only species which became established on the site naturally; the second FQI value includes the planted trees. The FQI value is 14.0 with a  $\bar{c}$  value of 3.2 when only naturally established vegetation is considered, and 16.9 and 3.5 respectively when the planted trees are included. Therefore this site is of moderate natural quality.

### c. Dominance of vegetation

This site does not meet the performance criteria for dominance of vegetation. One of the two dominant species (*Potamogeton crispus*) is non-native and 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.

All 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 the total site area of 3.02 ha (7.45 ac). This estimate will 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 good 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 concerns for this site are establishing non-weedy, native vegetation. A determination of current wetland acreage is the total site area of 3.02 ha (7.45 ac).

### 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 January 2008].
- 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.

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 January 2008].

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 5)

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

**Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Forbland

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

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies 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-

Percentage of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, FAC+, or FAC: 50%

**Hydrophytic vegetation:** Yes:  No:

**Rationale:** Not 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 5)

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

**Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Forbland

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

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

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes: X (In part)      No:      Depth of standing water: <0.30 m (12 in)

Depth to saturated soil: At surface this year due to large flood event

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 no longer includes this area in their monitoring (Fucciolo et al. 2008). Some portions of this site were inundated during site visits this year.

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

**Rationale:** While some portion of this area may meet the hydrology criterion, field evidence cited above and previous years' ISGS data indicate that the majority of this area is not inundated or saturated for a sufficient duration in most years to satisfy the wetland hydrology criterion.

### DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE:

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

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

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 3 of 5)

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

**Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Forbland

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

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies 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>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>Armoracia aquatica</i>	lake cress	herb	OBL	10
<i>Asclepias incarnata</i>	swamp milkweed	herb	OBL	4
<i>Aster lateriflorus</i>	side-flowered aster	herb	FACW-	2
<i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster pilosus</i>	hairy aster	herb	FACU+	0+
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicked aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bacopa rotundifolia</i>	water hyssop	herb	OBL	5
<i>Bidens connata</i>	purplestem beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	common beggar's ticks	herb	FACW	1+
<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>Catalpa sp.</i>	catalpa	shrub	----	--
<i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i>	coontail	herb	OBL	3
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	lamb's quarters	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Canada thistle	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Commelina communis</i>	common day flower	herb	FAC	*+
<i>Cyperus ferruginescens</i>	rusty nut-sedge	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Cyperus sp.</i>	nut-sedge	herb	----	--
<i>Cyperus strigosus</i>	straw-colored flatsedge	herb	FACW	0+
<i>Digitaria ischaemum</i>	smooth crab grass	herb	FACU	*+
<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>Elodea canadensis</i>	anacharis	herb	OBL	5
<i>Elymus canadensis</i>	Canada wild rye	herb	FAC-	4
<i>Elymus virginicus</i>	Virginia wild rye	herb	FACW-	4
<i>Eragrostis hypnoides</i>	creeping love grass	herb	OBL	5
<i>Erigeron annuus</i>	annual fleabane	herb	FAC-	1+
<i>Eupatorium rugosum</i>	white snakeroot	herb	FACU	2
<i>Eupatorium serotinum</i>	late boneset	herb	FAC+	1+
<i>Festuca arundinacea</i>	tall fescue	herb	FACU+	*+
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	herb	FACW	2

Species list continued next page.

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Northeast area (page 4 of 5)

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

**Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Forbland

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

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies 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>Glechoma hederacea</i>	ground ivy	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	honey locust	herb	FAC	2
<i>Humulus japonicus</i>	Japanese hops	herb	FACU	*+
<i>Impatiens capensis</i>	jewelweed	herb	FACW	2
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lindernia dubia</i>	false pimpernel	herb	OBL	5
<i>Ludwigia palustris americana</i>	marsh purslane	herb	OBL	4
<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>	moneywort	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Mimulus ringens</i>	monkey flower	herb	OBL	5
<i>Morus alba</i>	white mulberry	shrub	FAC	*+
<i>Oxalis stricta</i>	yellow wood sorrel	herb	FACU	0+
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	fog-fruit	herb	OBL	1+
<i>Poa pratensis</i>	Kentucky bluegrass	herb	FAC-	*+
<i>Polygonum amphibium</i>	water smartweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Polygonum cespitosum longisetum</i>	creeping smartweed	herb	UPL	*+
<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 punctatum</i>	dotted smartweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	eastern cottonwood	shrub	FAC+	2
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	beginner's pondweed	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	comb pondweed	herb	OBL	5
<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
<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>Setaria faberi</i>	giant foxtail	herb	FACU+	*+
<i>Setaria glauca</i>	pigeon grass	herb	FAC	*+
<i>Solanum carolinense</i>	horse nettle	herb	FACU-	0+
<i>Solanum ptycanthum</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>Toxicodendron radicans</i>	poison ivy	shrub	FAC+	1+
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	herb	FACW-	5

Species list continued next page.

**ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION**

Northeast area (page 5 of 5)

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

**Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

**Section No.:** 1-3

**State:** Illinois

**County:** Henry

**Applicant:** IDOT Dist. 2

**Area Name:** Forbland

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

**Location:** This non-wetland occupies 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>Urtica dioica</i>	stinging nettle	herb	FAC+	2
<i>Verbena urticifolia</i>	white vervain	herb	FAC+	3
<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

$$FQI = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 141/\sqrt{58} = 18.5 \quad \bar{c} = \sum C/N = 141/58 = 2.4$$

**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

$$FQI^* = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 170/\sqrt{64} = 21.3 \quad \bar{c}^* = \sum C/N = 170/64 = 2.7$$

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

Determined by:

Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
 Brian Wilm 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, and Ketzner                      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)                      **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 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>Elodea canadensis</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	Herb	OBL
3. <i>Potamogeton pectinatus</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: 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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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 west side of Phase I.

### HYDROLOGY

Inundated: Yes:  No:      Depth of standing water: From 0-0.9 m (3 ft)  
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. 2008). This site was inundated during site visit.

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes:  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:  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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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 west side of Phase I.

### 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>Asclepias incarnata</i>	swamp milkweed	herb	OBL	4
<i>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicked aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bacopa rotundifolia</i>	water hyssop	herb	OBL	5
<i>Bidens connata</i>	purplestem beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Eleocharis sp.</i>	spike rush	herb	----	--
<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	anacharis	herb	OBL	5
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Ludwigia palustris americana</i>	marsh purslane	herb	OBL	4
<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>Populus deltoides</i>	eastern cottonwood	shrub, herb	FAC+	2
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	beginner's pondweed	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Potamogeton nodosus</i>	leafy pondweed	herb	OBL	7
<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	comb pondweed	herb	OBL	5
<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

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

$$FQI = \sum C / \sqrt{N} = 79 / \sqrt{24} = 16.1 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C / N = 79 / 24 = 3.3$$

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

Southeast area (page 4 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, and Ketzner **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008

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

$$FQI^* = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 108/\sqrt{30} = 19.7 \quad \bar{c}^* = \sum C/N = 108/30 = 3.6$$

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

Determined by:

Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
Brian Wilm 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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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:  No:      Depth of standing water: From 0-0.9 m (3 ft)  
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. 2008). This site was inundated during site visit.

**Wetland hydrology:** Yes:  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:  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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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>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>Aster ontarionis</i>	Ontario aster	herb	FAC	4
<i>Aster simplex</i>	panicled aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	buttonbush	shrub, herb	OBL	4
<i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i>	coontail	herb	OBL	3
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	anacharis	herb	OBL	5
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	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>Populus deltoides</i>	eastern cottonwood	shrub, herb	FAC+	2
<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	beginner's pondweed	herb	OBL	*+
<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	comb pondweed	herb	OBL	5
<i>Rorippa sylvestris</i>	creeping yellow cress	herb	OBL	*+
<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>Stachys tenuifolia</i>	slenderleaf betony	herb	OBL	5

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

$$FQI = \sum C / \sqrt{N} = 72 / \sqrt{21} = 15.7 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C / N = 72 / 21 = 3.4$$

## ROUTINE ONSITE WETLAND DETERMINATION

West area (page 4 of 4)

**Field Investigators:** Wiesbrook, Wilm, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**Project Name:** FAU 5822 (Milan Beltway Green Rock Phase I)      **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.

### 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

$$FQI^* = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 101/\sqrt{27} = 19.4 \quad \bar{c}^* = \sum C/N = 101/27 = 3.7$$

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

Determined by:      Scott Wiesbrook (soils and hydrology)  
                              Brian Wilm 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 west 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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**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: X    No:  
Has the vegetation, soils, or hydrology been significantly disturbed?    Yes:      No: X

### VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Stratum	Indicator Status
1. <i>Elodea canadensis</i>	Herb	OBL
2. <i>Potamogeton crispus</i>	Herb	OBL

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

**Hydrophytic vegetation:**    Yes: X    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: X  
Is the soil a histosol?      Yes:      No: X  
Histic epipedon present?      Yes:      No: X  
Redox Concentrations?      Yes: X    No:      Color: 7.5YR 4/6 and 10YR 5/6  
Redox Depletions?      Yes: X    No:      Color: 10YR 5/1  
Matrix color:      10YR 2/1 over 10YR 4/2  
Other indicators: None.

**Hydric soils?**    Yes: X    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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**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 0-0.9 m (3 ft)

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. 2008). 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, and Ketzner      **Date:** Aug. 1 & Oct. 9, 2008  
**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>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>	panicled aster	herb	FACW	3
<i>Bacopa rotundifolia</i>	water hyssop	herb	OBL	5
<i>Bidens connata</i>	purplestem beggar's ticks	herb	OBL	2
<i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i>	coontail	herb	OBL	3
<i>Echinochloa muricata</i>	barnyard grass	herb	OBL	0+
<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	needle spike rush	herb	OBL	3
<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	anacharis	herb	OBL	5
<i>Leersia oryzoides</i>	rice cutgrass	herb	OBL	3
<i>Lemna minor</i>	common duckweed	herb	OBL	3
<i>Ludwigia palustris americana</i>	marsh purslane	herb	OBL	4
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	reed canary grass	herb	FACW+	*+
<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>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+

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

$$FQI = \sum C/\sqrt{N} = 61/\sqrt{19} = 14.0 \quad \bar{C} = \sum C/N = 61/19 = 3.2$$



## **Appendix D**

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



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



Picture 2. Facing southeast from photostation 1 (located on east side of east area).