

EXHIBIT F

On Nov 8, 2017, at 4:28 PM, Krenz, Daniel A CIV USARMY CENWS (US) <Daniel.A.Krenz@usace.army.mil> wrote:

Bill,

Your two statements in the email below concerning mitigation are correct. The Corps has a preference for in-lieu-fee mitigation over permittee responsible mitigation. If an applicant deviates from the hierarchy, then the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the PRM is as good as or better than what the in-lieu-fee can provide.

Dan Krenz
Seattle District Regulatory
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Summers [<mailto:bill@summersdevelopment.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 3:29 PM
To: Krenz, Daniel A CIV USARMY CENWS (US) <Daniel.A.Krenz@usace.army.mil>
Cc: Ed Sewall <edsewall@hotmail.com>; Printz, Jacalen M CIV USARMY CENWS (US) <Jacalen.M.Printz@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 5637 E. Mercer Way, Mercer Island, (Permit NWS-2015-0650)

Thanks for speaking with me yesterday regarding the above permit required in connection with the construction of a small single-family residence, having a footprint of only 1,600 square feet on the above property, which impacts approximately 2,000 sq. ft. of Category III wetlands. This permit application, which is currently inactive, had previously been assigned to Kaitlyn White.

As indicated to you, this project has been delayed due to land use issues raised by the City of Mercer Island. I believe that we finally are close to resolving these issues, which will result in the project moving forward, hopefully on an expeditious basis. Consequently, we expect to be submitting shortly to the Corps some updated information and documentation.

In the interim, we're interested in addressing some wetland-related questions raised by Mercer Island and requesting the Corps to confirm certain of our mitigation assumptions. Specifically, although both

our wetland consultant (Sewall Wetland Consulting) and the "peer reviewer" engaged by the city (ESA Associates) recommended for mitigation to be accomplished through the fee-in-lieu program administered by King County, Mercer Island's ordinances contemplate mitigation to preferably occur on Mercer Island in the same drainage sub-basin. Accordingly, as we discussed, we request the Corps to simply confirm that:

1. Based on the Corps' hierarchy of mitigation alternatives, the fee-in-lieu program such as offered by King County is the clearly preferred approach; and

2. If any alternative mitigation method is proposed, the applicant has the burden of proving to the Corps' satisfaction that the alternative produces results ecologically superior to the fee-in-lieu program preferred by the Corps.

Thank you for considering this request. Please advise me if you have any questions or concerns.