

Exhibit 6 Credit Pricing Analysis Table

Project Name	HGM	Type	Acres of Treatment	Acres Preserved	Base Acre-Points *			Risk Factor *	Proposed Acre-Points*			Additional Acre-Points *	Total Universal Acre-Points	Acre-Points / Acre	Appraised Land Value	Appraisal Date	Site Selection, Planning, Permitting & Design	Administration and Staff Time	Construction & Materials	Irrigation	Performance Period Maintenance	Monitoring for Performance Standards	Long-term M & M	10% of Site Implementation Costs	Total Project Implementation Budget (Minus Land Value)	Year Construction Complete	CPI Scaling Factor*	2014 Adjusted (Using CPI)	Cost per credit--Credit Fee*	Cost per Credit-Land Fee*	Cost per Credit--Mitigation Fee (Credit Fee plus Land Fee)*
					Wq	Hy	Ha		Wq	Hy	Ha																				
Larchmont Wetland Reserve	riverine/depressional	rehab/enhancement	16.1	0	22.44	9.28	20.12	1	22.44	9.28	20.12	15.0	66.8	4.2	\$1,175,000	2005 and 2011	\$270,000	\$163,000	\$821,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$40,000	\$253,000	\$82,100	\$1,644,100	2013	1.023	\$1,681,914	\$25,163.29	\$17,579.00	\$42,742.29
South Midland Wetland Reserve	riverine/depressional	estab/ rehab/ enhance	15.3	0	36.34	32.63	25.36	1	36.34	32.63	25.36	5.0	99.3	6.5	\$582,636	2005	\$200,000	\$317,550	\$1,829,125	\$160,000	\$15,000	\$40,000	\$253,000	\$198,912	\$3,013,587	2008	1.100	\$3,314,946	\$33,374.74	\$5,865.00	\$39,239.74
TOTALS			31.4						58.8	41.9	45.5		166.2		\$1,757,636		\$470,000	\$480,550	\$2,650,125	\$160,000	\$30,000	\$80,000	\$506,000	\$281,012	\$4,657,687			\$4,996,860	\$29,269.01	\$11,722.00	\$40,991.01

* Notes:

The **Base Acre-Points** and **Proposed Acre-Points** are anticipated credits expected from the two pre-capitalized receiving sites. At the time of publishing this Instrument these expected acre-points have not been reviewed or approved by the IRT. These numbers are, therefore, subject to change. However, they represent the Sponsor's best guess of anticipated credits and are therefore the best values to use to calculate the proposed Mitigation Fees.

The **"Risk Factor"** is the risk of failure of the mitigation site. If there is a chance of failure, the risk factor will be less than 1. According to the Credit/Debit tool, the risk factor is anywhere from 0.4 to 1.0. Since these sites have been implemented before any sale of credits and most likely (certainly in the case of SMWR), at least one year will pass between the time "as-built" plans are submitted to regulatory agencies and any credits are sold, a risk factor of 1.0 applies to these sites (in other words, no deduction of credit).

Additional Acre-Points represent extra credit beyond what was determined through application of the Credit/Debit tool. These extra acre-points may be granted by the IRT, on a case by case basis, when the Sponsor demonstrates that there has been additional ecological lift that the rapid credit/debit assessment tool simply didn't capture. Examples may be improvement of groundwater quality by the removal of contaminated fill, or significant and measurable retention of stormwater flows (but not enough to register with the robust metrics of the Credit/Debit Tool).

The **CPI Scaling Factor** is generated by dividing the latest Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, Washington Region by the annual CPI of the year construction of the project was complete. The CPI Scaling Factor will be adjusted annually as part of the program review and review of credit pricing.

Fees are subject to change after IRT review, and annually thereafter. Based on the values in this table, the credit fees and land fees at the inception of the PCILF program are \$29,000 plus \$11,000, respectively, for the Chambers/Clover Creek Watershed (WRIA 12) and \$22,000 and \$8,000 for the Nisqually Watershed (WRIA 11). These prices are subject to change based on actual numbers once additional sites have been added to the program.

Irrigation cost 66% of initial planting cost for SMWR. If no other model, use this for budgeting purposes. Larchmont will not be irrigated.

2005 and 2006 acquisitions totalled \$759,000. This price includes the additional \$416,000 we spent to acquire Schmidt and Lindley.

Per Grant, as of 4/30/13. Tasks 3 and 4.

\$317,550 was actual cost for SMWR Admin (staff salaries) with estimate of \$6,000 for future 8

This includes all other staff time not accounted for in previous column. This includes TASK 8. \$60,000 spent as of 4/30/13. As with SMWR, anticipate 6,000 additional administrative/staff costs over next 10 years for admin tasks beyond and above

This is based on a cost of \$500.00 per day for WCC crew and average of 10 days per year for 10 years.

ACI contract is \$705,000. Cost for fence along west side of property was an additional \$16,000. WCC is hand removing invasive plants and replanting/underplanting. Budget \$100,000 for this effort, which is ongoing as of 02/2014. Future

This is related to the contingency fund. The 10% allocation to the contingency fund is based on this calculation of 10% of the costs of site implementation (land acquisition, site assessment, design, permitting, construction, and any irrigation). This is what we budget for cost overruns, in the event of disagreement with contractor, change orders, etc. This is for cost overruns during the construction phase. Not related to performance period maintenance, monitoring, or long term M&M. By including it here, this becomes part of the credit fee. The overall credit fee is then allocated according to the allotments in the instrument. The Contingency fund ends up being 10% of everything (once administrative time, short and long term maintenance and monitoring, etc.) is figured in.