



Arborist Report: Tukwila Village

Prepared for

Mel Easter, ASLA
The LA Studio
15200 52nd Ave S, Suite 210
Seattle, WA 98188

Site visit : September 13, 2011

Prepared by

Tina Cohen, I.S.A. Certified Arborist #PN0245A
Northwest Arborvitae

Report date: September 16, 2011





Table of Contents

Introduction and Scope of Work	page 3
Summary of Tree Health	page 3
Explanation of Spreadsheet terms	page 4
Spreadsheet	separate attachment
Recommendations by Area	page 5
Conclusion	page 5
Limits to the Report	page 5
Photos	page 6-7
Site plan	via postal mail





Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist

Northwest Arborvitae
8318 26th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

phone 206-789-3283
fax 206-789-0262
email tina@tinacohen.com

September 16, 2011

Mel Easter, ASLA
The LA Studio
15200 52nd Ave S, Suite 210
Seattle, WA 98188

Arborist Services

Re: Tukwila Village, International Blvd & S. 144th Street, Tukwila, WA
Site visit: 9/13/11

Dear Mr. Easter:

On September 13, 2011 we met on site along with Jessica Marquardt from your office. I received the site survey, and evaluated the on-site trees. The purpose was to determine which trees are the healthiest and best candidates for retention.

Scope of Work

I determined the health, structure, life span, overall quality, positive or negative impacts on long – term survival, and positive or negative impacts to the development. The information is intended to guide the design as decisions are made about preserving or removing trees. I understand that the City of Tukwila does not have any tree preservation requirements, only guidelines.

Summary of Tree Health

The majority of the site trees are drought stressed, excessively pruned, and/or unaesthetic. I noted only 5 superior trees worth special retention consideration out of 59 trees evaluated. This project is an excellent opportunity to replace declining trees with vigorous, appropriate species.

- North trees, north of the matchline, #1-18, 45-47: These are all unaesthetic and in marginal health. The exception is fir #18, which somehow escaped damage during the construction of the adjacent apartment building to the east.
- East trees, #19-24: These are benefiting from the irrigation from the adjacent library's lawn and are the most vigorous on the site. See the photo on page 5.



- North of S. 144th St.: The trees are dying or very stressed from wounds, excess pruning, and drought. See the photo on page 6. The exception is Coast redwood #32; even with graffiti on the trunk it stands out as a superior tree. It can grow to 200 feet and live 300 years. This species is tolerant of disturbance.
- Trees along S. 144th St.: Most were excessively pruned. The Lombardy poplars, although mostly healthy, are short lived (about 75-100 years) and are not the best candidates for retention for this reason. The London planes vary in condition, but they are long-lived (200+ years) and very tolerant of root and canopy damage.
- South of S. 144th St.: The cedars adjacent to the barbershop have been excessively limbed up. The trunks are growing into the concrete bulkhead. They will tolerate these conditions, although the cut stumps of four adjacent cedars indicate the owner does not. Coast redwood #35 at the far southwest corner of the site is healthy.
- West ROW along International Blvd: The hybrid Norway maples in the sidewalk vaults are healthy although drought stressed. Eventually they'll fill out to help soften the visual impact from the busy arterial. Two Red oaks are dying from drought, as noted on the site plan.
- West on site: The Incense cedars are healthy with only two appearing stressed. They're a good choice for this location because they rarely damage sidewalks. They are small enough to transplant assuming they'll get water while being held for replanting.

Details of Findings – Explanation of spreadsheet terms.

Please see the following fields on the enclosed Excel spreadsheet.

<i>Tree #:</i>	Each tree is numbered corresponding to the site plan.
<i>Species:</i>	Common names are listed.
<i>Trunk diameter:</i>	I measured the trunk diameter inches at 4.5 feet from the ground if the survey didn't provide it.
<i>Health rating:</i>	Healthy = normal vigor and appearance for the species (these will be the best candidates for retention); Healthy fair = viable but not necessarily the best tree for retention; Poor = not healthy, in decline; Dying = will not survive another year.
<i>Structure:</i>	Characterizes the general shape of the tree. 'Codominant' refers to having two or more trunks or tops that are parallel, versus a single trunk. Many species do this naturally.
<i>Comment:</i>	The comment provides an opinion regarding esthetics and in the case of the incense cedars, transplant information.
<i>Canopy radius:</i>	I measured the extent of the canopy (its radius) from the trunk to the outer edge. This is a rule of thumb for distance to place protection fencing and stay away from a tree during construction.
<i>Current status:</i>	Viable refers to being alive <u>now</u> and remaining so into the future, assuming it would be protected during the project. Non-viable means the tree will not survive long term, whether or not it's protected.



Retention info: This will help you decide/justify if a particular tree should be saved or not. If a tree is noted as Superior, it should be saved if possible. Tolerant species will accept root loss; sensitive species are likely to decline.

Recommendations by Area

East: The best trees on the site are near the east property line, adjacent to the irrigated King County Library lawn. I recommend saving maple #20 and cedar #21, and protect them as a group at their dripline radii. Fir #18 is also worth saving if the design will allow it.

West: The incense cedars are small enough and worthy to transplant except for multi-trunked specimens, or trees that are stressed. The ROW hybrid Norway maples should be retained and protected during the project. Replace the two ROW Red oaks with maples because of their condition.

Central/southwest: The two Coast redwoods #32 and #35 are worth saving if they will have enough space to grow. These are very young trees.

Along 144th Street: The poplars are short-lived and not worth special design changes to accommodate them. If you decide to retain the most east poplars #23 and #24, they should be further inspected when the ivy is cleared.

The London planes #36-39 will tolerate nearly any amount of disturbance and can be retained except for #38, which leans towards the street. They're young but already provide shade along the street. Consider if they have enough root space during the design process because they're well known for buckling sidewalks.

Conclusion

There really aren't very many trees worth saving on this site. They've suffered from excessive pruning, trunk wounds, and drought. The superior trees clustered near the east property line should be considered for retention. The small incense cedars near the west property line are tolerating the dry conditions and should be used elsewhere on the project. If there will be space for the Coast redwoods, they would create quite a statement in the new landscape.

Limits

Unless expressed otherwise (1) information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection, and (2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without further dissection, excavation, probing, or coring.

Loss or alteration of any part of a report invalidates the entire report.

Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be realized that trees are living organisms and their health and vigor constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site conditions or seasonal variations in the weather.



There is no warranty or guarantee expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the trees in question may not arise in the future. The report and conclusions expressed herein represent the opinion of Tina Cohen d/b/a Northwest Arborvitae. Our fee is no way contingent upon any specified value, a result or occurrence of a subsequent event, or upon any finding to be reported.

Respectfully submitted,



Tina Cohen, ISA Certified Arborist #PN0245A
American Society of Consulting Arborists, Registered Consulting Arborist #473
PNW ISA Certified Tree Risk Assessor #194
tina@tinacohen.com



Enclosures
Excel spreadsheet 'Tukwila Village Tree Data'
Site plan via postal mail



PHOTOS



Trees near the east property line fence, north of S. 144th, are the healthiest because they receive irrigation from the adjacent library property.
From the left the on site trees are #19 Lawson cypress, #20 Bigleaf maple, and #21 Western red cedar.





The left tree is Doug fir #41. It's dying because of damage from the asphalt poured over the roots. The right tree is Western red cedar #42 which has been excessively pruned. Many of the on site trees suffered extreme limbing and are unaesthetic. The tree in the distance, to the left of the salmon-colored building, is Coast redwood #35. It's in good health and should be retained assuming there's enough space for its roots and canopy.



Tree #	Species	Trunk diam inches	Health rating	Structure	Comment	Canopy RADIUS feet	Current status	Retention info
1	Pear	5	healthy	Excess limbing		9	Viable	tolerant species
2	Pear	4	healthy fair	codominant trunks		9	Viable	tolerant species
3	Pear	10	healthy	Excess limbing		9	Viable	tolerant species
4	Apple	5	healthy fair	Excess limbing	not esthetic	9	Viable	tolerant species
5	cedar, w red	4	dying	Knocked over		5	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
6	Hornbeam	5	healthy fair	codominant trunks	poor esthetics, ugly	9	Viable	tolerant species
7	cedar, w red	12	dying	Excess limbing	dead top, drought	12	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
8	cedar, w red	14	dying	Excess limbing	ALL	13	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
9	cedar, w red	23	healthy fair	Excess limbing		14	Viable	sensitive species
10	cedar, w red	12	healthy fair	Excess limbing		12	Viable	sensitive species
11	cedar, w red	12	healthy fair	Excess limbing	trunk wounded	15	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
12	cedar, w red	14	healthy	Excess limbing	must save group or none	14	Viable	sensitive species
13	cedar, w red	12	poor	Excess limbing	dead top	13	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
14	cedar, w red	14,8	poor	codominant trunks	drought	12	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
15	cedar, w red	8	poor	Excess limbing	wounded	6	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
16	Doug fir	12	healthy fair	Excess limbing	impacted by building; poor color	14	Viable	tolerant species
17	Doug fir	14	poor	broken top	16,17 stressed	14	Viable	remove unhealthy
18	Doug fir	15	healthy	OK	best of group	16	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
19	Lawson cypress	21	healthy fair	codominant trunks	basal wound	9	Non-viable	sensitive species
20	maple bigleaf	29	healthy	codominant trunks		19	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
21	cedar, w red	43	healthy	codominant trunks		18	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
22	Portuguese laurel	12	healthy	codominant trunks	ugly	10	Viable	tolerant species
23	Lombardy poplar	45	healthy	OK	ivy prevented full inspection	18	Viable	Short lived species
24	Lombardy poplar	48	healthy	OK		15	Viable	Short lived species
25	Lombardy poplar	36	healthy fair	Excess limbing	if saving recheck after cleaning ivy	10	Viable	Short lived species
26	Lombardy poplar	36	healthy fair	Excess limbing		15	Viable	Short lived species
27	Lombardy poplar	36	healthy fair	Excess limbing		10	Viable	Short lived species
28	Lombardy poplar	36,24	healthy fair	codominant trunks		15	Viable	Short lived species

See report for further explanation and summary of findings.

Tree #	Species	Trunk diam inches	Health rating	Structure	Comment	Canopy RADIUS feet	Current status	Retention info
29	Lawson cypress	8	dying	OK	suppressed	6	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
30	Lombardy poplar	32	healthy fair	Excess limbing	basal wounds	15	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
31	Copper beech	8	healthy	Excess limbing	trunk wounds	10	Viable	tolerant species
32	Coast redwood	40	healthy	OK	trunk wound	21	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
33	cedar, w red	18	healthy fair	codominant trunks	33,34 limbed, impacted by wall, ugly	16	Viable	sensitive species
34	cedar, w red	36	healthy fair	codominant trunks	ugly	18	Viable	sensitive species
35	Coast redwood	32	healthy	Excess limbing	adja bldg, carp ants	16	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
36	London plane	16	healthy	OK		15	Viable	tolerant species
37	London plane	17	healthy	Excess limbing		15	Viable	tolerant species
38	London plane	16	healthy fair	Excess limbing	leans south	15	Non-viable	tolerant species
39	London plane	31	healthy fair	Trunk tore away		18	Viable	tolerant species
40	maple bigleaf	32	poor	codominant trunks	canopy dieback	18	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
41	Doug fir	32	dying	topped	in paving	18	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
42	cedar, w red	18.18.18	healthy fair	codominant trunks	ugly, trunk wounded	15	Viable	sensitive species
43	Colo spruce	32	healthy fair	Excess limbing	trunk wounded	15	Viable	sensitive species
44	Sweetgum	30	poor	Trunk tore away		18	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
45	Mt ash	6	poor	codominant trunks	stump sprout	12	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
46	Mt ash	22	poor	codominant trunks	extensive wounds, poor canopy	18	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
47	E dogwood	6	dying	OK	drought, anthracnose	5	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
48	incense cedar	8	healthy	OK	transplant	4	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
49	incense cedar	5	healthy	codominant top	looks broken, NOT suitable to transplant	6	Viable	tolerant species
50	incense cedar	3	healthy	multiple trunks	NOT suitable to transplant	3	Viable	tolerant species
51	incense cedar	3	healthy	OK	transplant	3	Viable	tolerant species
52	incense cedar	6	healthy	multiple trunks	NOT suitable to transplant	6	Viable	tolerant species
53	incense cedar	4	healthy	OK	transplant	3	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
54	incense cedar	6	healthy	OK	transplant	4	Viable	SUPERIOR tree
55	incense cedar	6	healthy	OK	transplant	5.5	Viable	tolerant species

See report for further explanation and summary of findings.

Tree #	Species	Trunk diam inches	Health rating	Structure	Comment	Canopy RADIUS feet	Current status	Retention info
56	incense cedar	3	poor	OK	stunted, NOT suitable to transplant	2	Non-viable	remove unhealthy
57	incense cedar	5	healthy	OK	transplant	4	Viable	tolerant species
58	incense cedar	4	healthy fair	codominant tops	NOT suitable to transplant	2	Viable	tolerant species
59	incense cedar	4	healthy fair	OK	thin canopy, NOT suitable to transplant	3	Viable	tolerant species