



**Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist**

*Northwest Arborvitae*  
8318 26th Ave NW  
Seattle WA 98117

phone 206-789-3283  
fax 206-789-0262  
email tinacohen@worldnet.att.net

February 19, 2008

To: David Miller and Maple Leaf Community Council Members  
From: Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist

**Arborist Services: Trees at the Waldo Hospital Site**

Site visit: February 18, 2008  
Site address: 8511 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Seattle WA 98115

Dear Mr. Miller and Maple Leaf Community Council Members:

On February 18, 2008 I observed the trees at the Waldo Hospital site currently owned by Camp Fire USA. The purpose of my visit was to determine if the stand of conifers on the east side of the property is high quality and worthy of preservation. The second part of my investigation was to explore the impacts to specific trees designated for retention as confirmed by Greg Kappers of Prescott Homes. This report includes my review of the documents associated with the Prescott project and a spreadsheet of the retained trees with their appraised values.

**Summary**

- The site has large, healthy trees throughout, however the stand (group) at the east portion is notable for its overall size, aesthetics and vigor, which is a rarity within an urban area. The entire stand is appropriate for protection under the DPD Directors Rule 6-2001.
- The Prescott plan retains a portion of the east stand and removes nearly all the rest of the trees on the site. They propose to retain 34 live trees out of 82 total = 41% retained.
- The Prescott plan will greatly impact the east stand of trees because the project will encroach on the roots and canopies of the trees at the west, north and south perimeters. As proposed, the project could create declining, high-risk trees.
- Recommendations include using a consistent scale to show the tree locations and their dripline measurements on all documents, retaining more trees, allowing more room for the roots and canopies, bonding the value of the retained trees, and requiring arborist participation and inspections.



## Findings

### 1. Records Review

David Miller provided the copies of Prescott Homes site plans dated 2/07 and 12/07. The plans were drawn to three different scales 1:10, 1:16, and 1:20 that made it challenging to determine the actual impacts from the new houses. Sheet L1.1, 'Tree Protection Plan & Table' was inaccurate according to Greg Kappers, and will be reprinted. He provided a different list of proposed retained trees. The tree protection fencing shown on sheets L1.1 and 1.2 was inadequate; hopefully these plans are also under revision.

I reviewed the report by Rob Williams, Certified Arborist and printed his spreadsheet for reference in the field. His task was to only identify the trees and locate any that would be considered Exceptional under Seattle code.

### 2. Site Overview

Approximately one-third of the site is comprised of a mixed stand of trees, mostly conifers, along the east side of the property. The Waldo Hospital site was originally built in 1924 and the larger trees were installed around that time. Some of the trees may be 'volunteers', meaning they were self-sown instead of planted. Smaller trees and shrubs at the southeast corner near the sign are much younger, probably planted within the past 10 or 20 years. They were not included in the Williams report, which only assessed trees with trunk diameters of 6 inches or greater, but they contribute to the aesthetics of the stand.

There are large, healthy trees through out the site, however the stand along the east side is notable for its overall size, a rarity within an urban area. Please see the attached photos.

### 3. Health

The trees were observed to determine their vigor, but were not excavated or drilled. The thin tops of the canopies and large amounts of cones are typical symptoms of drought stress.

In general, the trees at the north end of the stand appear the most stressed, probably due to shade from the surrounding trees. Within the stand the smaller diameter interior trees are 'suppressed', which means the larger trees not only shade them but they also lean on their tops distorting the smaller ones. The south, east, and west edge trees have more vigorous canopies because they're in full to mostly-full sun. I did not observe any fungus or other indications of disease. Storm damage from 12/06 was limited to broken branches but no whole tree failure was reported.

Overall I consider the east trees to form a high quality stand, although individual trees may be in decline. Future management should be included in the project arborist's recommendations to the owner.

The trees proposed for retention were reviewed and listed on the attached spreadsheet. The survey provided the tree numbers and trunk diameters.

Health Ratings: The guidelines established by the International Society of Arboriculture's Tree Hazard Evaluation Form and the Tree Condition Assessment Form were used to rate the trees:

Excellent=no apparent defects

Good=minor defects

Fair=significant defects but can be retained if not further stressed

Poor=declining or hazard tree.



#### 4. Additional Exceptional Trees

I identified three additional Exceptional trees (per DPD Directors Rule 6-2001):

- #3 Madrona. This is a vigorous sapling and may eventually fuse with #2. Status per Prescott: retain.
- #4-5 Douglas fir. The two are grafted at the base and are actually one tree. See photos. Status: retain
- #66 Western white pine. Although it was limbed up it's still very healthy. I measured the trunk diameter to be 25.8 inches, so it's over the size threshold. See photo. Status: remove.

#### 5. Legal Protection

The benefits of trees in urban settings has been well documented and quantified. Trees improve air quality, sequester carbon, provide provide passive cooling in the summer, and reduce storm water run off.

The DPD Director's Rule 6-2001 quotes the Seattle Municipal Code:

"SMC 25.05.675N.2a It is the City's policy to minimize or prevent the loss of wildlife habitat and other vegetation which have substantial aesthetic, education, ecological and/or economic value."

It is my opinion that the ENTIRE east stand of trees meets the criteria of aesthetic and ecological value within an urban area. Therefore it deserves protection through the mitigating measures listed in SMC 25.05.675N2d:

- Relocation of the project on the site;
- Reducing the size or scale of the project;
- Preservation of specific on-site habitats, such as trees or vegetated areas;
- Retention of existing vegetation.

#### 6. Retained Trees per the Prescott Plan

##### 6A. Tree Count

See the enclosed site plan that indicates which trees will be retained.

The original survey shows 104 trees, dead trees and shrubs. In addition there are 4 pines not shown that increase the total to 108 plants surveyed on site. Of this total, 36 will be retained as confirmed by Greg Kappers of Prescott. However this number actually breaks down to 34 live trees, 1 dead tree, and 1 shrub less than 6 inches in trunk diameter.

Rob Williams' report covers 79 trees and shrubs on site that are 6 inches or larger, minus 2 dead trees to equal 77 live trees and shrubs in his assessment. In addition to these, there is one madrona that's less than 6-inches that needs to be included because it's Exceptional, plus the 4 pines to bring the total to 82.

**34 live trees are proposed for retention out of 82 total = 41% retained.**

##### 6B. Impacts from the Proposed Project

**6B.1 Expect root stress due to the proximity of the excavation and the reduction of water availability.** Conifer roots extend far beyond the edge of the canopy. Mr. Miller said soil studies did not show any underground water source; therefore the trees are receiving their primary water as runoff from the adjacent lawn, uphill to the west. Further damage could occur if the utilities and drainage lines are routed through the trees.

**6B.2 Canopy decline may occur on the west side of the stand because of shade from the 35-foot tall houses.** The lower foliage will die because conifers need full sun.



6B.3 **The newly exposed south perimeter trees will be susceptible to failure in high winds.** The prevailing winds are from the south, and the existing south perimeter trees (called ‘edge trees’) have adapted to the pressure from storms. Note there were no failures in the 70 mph December 2006 storm. If the south trees are removed, then the former interior trees will be more exposed and could break or uproot. The north edge trees could also be effected.

## Recommendations

- **Improve/clarify site plans:** I suggest using a 1:20 scale for all the site plans so they're consistent with each other. Show the retained trees with a dot to indicate the trunk location, and the radius of the canopy shown TO SCALE as a dotted line. The different size tree symbols on the existing plans are not to scale.
- **Save additional trees:** Retain the entire south portion of the stand, trees and shrubs #50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62 (already saved), 63, 64, and 65. The protection fencing around this group would need to be placed at a minimum 24 feet west of fir #52. Ideally we want to include the north trees as well for their aesthetic and ecological value.
- **Allow more space for trees roots:** At a minimum there should be NO disturbance within the radius of the dripline plus an additional 5 feet (example, if the dripline radius is 20 feet, then construction disturbance can start at 25 feet from the trunk). The project arborist must first approve any exceptions.
- **Allow more light:** The project’s design should be reviewed so more light can reach the lower portion of the west side of the stand.
- **Bond the retained trees:** The developer must post a bond with the City for the appraised value of the retained trees to insure their viability for 10 years. The values are listed on the enclosed spreadsheet.
- **Require arborist participation:** The project arborist needs to meet with the contractor and approve the placement of protection fencing. He/she must review landscaping, pruning, and any other changes within the protected area so the trees aren’t compromised. The arborist shall monitor the site regularly for compliance and to answer questions. If pruning is needed, it should be done under the arborist’s supervision.

## Conclusion

The planned development of this site should be reviewed and modified to allow adequate space for the entire east stand of trees.

## 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. 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

Enclosures:     Spreadsheet of retained trees  
                  Annotated site map (separate from the report – not transmitted electronically)  
                  Photos (not transmitted electronically)  
                  Tina Cohen's resume



Waldo Site  
 Retained Trees per Prescott Plans

Tree #	Species	Diameter inches at 4.5 ft per survey	Health	Status	Dripline radius in feet (TC measurement)	Survivability assuming adequate protection	Appraised Value using ISA Trunk Formula Method	COMMENT
1	Douglas fir	22	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$9,747.00	Firs along 15th Ave NE will not be disturbed. Be sure utilities are NOT routed through the trees.
2	Madrona	6	excellent	Exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$480.00	Saplings are good candidates for retention.
3	Madrona	4	excellent	Exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$480.00	
4	Douglas fir	24	good	Exceptional	20	good candidate for retention	\$11,593.80	4 and 5 are one tree, grafted at the base.
5	Douglas fir	32	good	part of 5	20	good candidate for retention	\$20,212.20	
11	Douglas fir	30	fair	non-exceptional	15	FAIR	\$15,867.73	As shown, this will be a newly exposed edge tree at the north perimeter of the stand.
12	Douglas fir	18	fair to poor	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR to poor survivability	\$4,071.94	As shown, this will be a newly exposed edge tree at the north perimeter of the stand.
13	Hemlock	12	DEAD	DEAD	NA	NA	\$0.00	retain for HABITAT
14	Douglas fir	10	fair to poor	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR	\$1,266.47	Short, suppressed by other fir: Protect this tree within the group formed by 14, 15, 16
15	Douglas fir	20	fair	non-exceptional	27	FAIR	\$7,047.34	Retain as part of the group because of esthetics viewed from the west.
16	Douglas fir	16	fair to poor	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR	\$3,222.28	Shaded by other trees.
17	Douglas fir	26	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$13,620.15	The tree is near 15th Ave NE, will not be disturbed.

Tree #	Species	Diameter inches at 4.5 ft per survey	Health	Status	Dripline radius in feet (TC measurement)	Survivability assuming adequate protection	Appraised Value using ISA Trunk Formula Method	COMMENT
18	Douglas fir	32	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$20,212.20	Is adjacent to 15th Ave.
19	Douglas fir	14	fair to poor	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR to poor survivability	\$2,468.81	The tree is suppressed (shade and has a trunk wound). As shown, this will be a newly exposed edge tree at the south perimeter of the stand.
20	Douglas fir	24	fair	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR	\$10,144.58	Will be more exposed to prevailing wind if trees to the southwest are removed.
21	Douglas fir	28	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$15,774.75	Is adjacent to 15th Ave.
22	Douglas fir	22	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$9,747.00	Is adjacent to 15th Ave.
23	Douglas fir	22	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$9,747.00	Firs 23-26 form a group adjacent to 15th Ave.
24	Douglas fir	16	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$5,155.65	
25	Douglas fir	12	fair	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$2,536.14	
26	Douglas fir	20	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$8,054.10	
40	Douglas fir	24	good	non-exceptional	35 to west	good candidate for retention	\$11,593.80	Protect firs 40, 41, and 42 as a group using the largest canopy radius plus 5 ft as the limit for disturbance. Plans do not allow adequate protection.
41	Douglas fir	36	good	Exceptional	30 to west	good candidate for retention	\$24,983.10	
42	Douglas fir	32	good to fair	non-exceptional	35 to west	good candidate for retention	\$18,948.94	

Waldo Site  
 Retained Trees per Prescott Plans

Tree #	Species	Diameter inches at 4.5 ft per survey	Health	Status	Dripline radius in feet (TC measurement)	Survivability assuming adequate protection	Appraised Value using ISA Trunk Formula Method	COMMENT
43	Red cedar	16	good	non-exceptional	NA	good candidate for retention	\$6,186.78	This cedar is well within the ar to be protected.
44	Douglas fir	28	good	non-exceptional	22 to south	FAIR	\$15,774.75	As shown this will become an edge tree at the south perimet
45	Douglas fir	12	poor to fair	non-exceptional	22 to west	FAIR to poor survivability	\$1,811.53	Firs 45 and 46 should be protected together at the west They are shaded by trees to th north and south. They will become new edge trees at the south perimeter.
46	Douglas fir	14	fair	non-exceptional	NA	FAIR	\$3,456.34	
47	Douglas fir	20	fair	non-exceptional	18 to west	FAIR	\$7,047.34	47 and 49 are drought stresse and have thin tops. Can be retained as a group.
48	SHRUB	NA	NA	shrub	NA	good candidate for retention	not included	All the understory shrubs and herbaceous plants should be retained except holly seedling; and Himalaya blackberry.
49	Douglas fir	18	fair	non-exceptional	19 to west	FAIR	\$5,700.71	see 47.
62	Pacific dogwood	6	excellent	Exceptional	8	good candidate for retention	\$952.56	Will be more successfully retained if surrounding trees a also retained.
105	Pine, Austrian	12	good	non-exceptional	at W fence	good candidate for retention	\$3,091.68	Dripline radii were measured from the fence to the west since the 4 pines were not shown on the survey that was used on 2/18.
106	Pine, Austrian	12	good	non-exceptional	4' W of fence	good candidate for retention	\$3,091.68	

Further information about the appraisal process is available upon request.

Site visit 2/18/08  
 By Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist

Waldo Site  
 Retained Trees per Prescott Plans

Tree #	Species	Diameter inches at 4.5 ft per survey	Health	Status	Dripline radius in feet (TC measurement)	Survivability assuming adequate protection	Appraised Value using ISA Trunk Formula Method	COMMENT
107	Pine, Austrian	16	good	non-exceptional	12' W of fence	good candidate for retention	\$5,499.36	
108	Pine, Austrian	18	good	non-exceptional	1' W of fence	good candidate for retention	\$6,949.44	
totals	34 live trees, 1 dead tree, and 1 shrub under 6 inches will be saved						\$286,537.15	

Further information about the appraisal process is available upon request.



**Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist**

**I. Statement of Qualifications: Consulting Arborist Services**

**Firm information:**

Northwest Arborvitae LLC  
8318 26th Ave NW  
Seattle WA 98117  
phone 206-789-3283  
fax 206-789-0262

Years in business: 25; years under current ownership by Tina Cohen: 7.

**Key Personnel:**

Tina Cohen, ISA Certified Arborist #PN0245  
Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists  
206-789-3283  
web tinacohen.com  
email [tinacohen@att.net](mailto:tinacohen@att.net)

*There are no other employees or sub-consultants.*

**Northwest Arborvitae** was established as an urban forestry consulting firm in 1982 and is a woman-owned business. In January 2000, after long association with the founder, Tina Cohen became the new owner. Clients include municipalities, schools, contractors, landscape architects, non-profits, and homeowners.

Sole proprietor Tina Cohen has been offering arboricultural services in the Seattle area since 1992, including urban horticulture planning since 1999.

The objective of the company is to provide professional consultation services and assistance in the assessment and management of trees growing in urban areas and in the urban-forest interface, especially in the unique environment of the Pacific Northwest. The region's complex ecology, its population pressures, and its developing interest in the uses of street trees, greenbelts, and urban forests now require expert resource identification and creative management strategies. Northwest Arborvitae seeks to provide site-specific analysis based on extensive experience and the most current urban forestry research. Northwest Arborvitae provides expertise and consultation including:

- Street Tree Inventory and Evaluation
- Site Development and Tree Preservation
- Tree and Plant Health Diagnosis and Management
- Hazard Tree/Risk Assessment

- Tree Appraisal
- Tree Selection and Vegetation Management Plans
- Integrated Pest Management and Non-toxic Controls

## **II. Selected Projects**

### **1. Pike Pine Neighborhood Tree Inventory, Seattle**

Expertise: Tree inventory, Hazard assessment, Vegetation management.  
 Client: City of Seattle, and the Pike Pine Urban Neighborhood Council  
 Contact: Liz Ellis, City of Seattle Department of Transportation  
 Date: 09/04  
 Scope: Location, identification, and management recommendations for the street trees within the designated neighborhood.

### **2. Beaver Lake Preserve, Sammamish, WA**

Expertise: Site development, Master Plan technical memo, tree inventory & preservation  
 Client: City of Sammamish  
 Contact: Tanja Wilcox, J.A. Brennan Associates  
 Date: 7/05 and 3/06, ongoing  
 Scope: Provided a technical memo regarding the quality of the trees in the areas of proposed development. The following year I provided specific information about trees impacted by the first area under construction.

### **3. Medina Tree Risk Evaluations, Medina**

Expertise: Hazard assessment.  
 Client: City of Medina  
 Contact: Kristin Hoffman  
 Date: 2004 -2006  
 Scope: Evaluate the hazard potential of selected trees and provide an independent second opinion regarding their viability.

### **4. Lynnwood Neighborhood Parks, Lynnwood, WA**

Expertise: Site development, hazard assessment, diagnosis  
 Client: City of Lynnwood  
 Contact: Greg Brower, The Berger Partnership  
 Date: 11/03  
 Scope: In anticipation of creating two new parks, I inventoried the trees on each parcel. In the report I delineated areas of high quality versus lower quality or damaged trees. The designers will use this information in the planning process.

### **5. Diagnostic Services for Parks & Recreation, Mercer Island, WA**

Expertise: Tree health & diagnosis.  
 Client: City of Mercer Island  
 Contact: Paul West, Parks & Recreation, Mercer Island

Date: 2005  
Scope: Evaluation and management of bigleaf maples.

**6. SE 46th Street Trail Development, Mercer Island, WA**

Expertise: Hazard assessment, diagnosis, integrated pest management.  
Client: City of Mercer Island  
Contact: Jimmi Maulding, Public Works, Mercer Island  
Date: 11/03  
Scope: Evaluation of conifers for health and safety.

**7. Taylor Parks, Duvall WA**

Expertise: Hazard assessment, tree health & diagnosis.  
Client: City of Duvall  
Contact: Alana McCoy  
Date: 12/03  
Scope: Evaluation of maples near picnic and play areas prior to park renovation.

**8. Lincoln Reservoir Replacement Project (Cal Anderson Park), Seattle, WA**

Expertise: Site development and tree preservation, tree appraisal  
Client: City of Seattle, Seattle Public Utilities  
Contact: Stephanie Murphy  
Date: 9/99 – 2/05  
Scope: Initial tree health assessment & value appraisal, review of tree protection specifications, and ongoing construction site monitoring.

**9. Volunteer Park Tree Evaluations, Seattle**

Expertise: Hazard Assessments, Diagnosis.  
Client: City of Seattle, Seattle Parks & Recreation  
Contact: Eliza Davidson  
Date: 11/03  
Scope: Locate hazardous and declining trees.

**10. Port of Edmonds Tree Inventory & Inspection, Edmonds**

Expertise: Tree inventory, Hazard assessment, Street tree management.  
Client: Port of Edmonds  
Contact: Debbie Eckholt  
Date: 03/04  
Scope: Determine the health and potential hazard of trees growing in the marina parking lots.

**11. B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation Tree Protection, Seattle**

Expertise: Tree protection during construction, Street tree management.  
Client: Piha Rogel  
Contact: Stanley V. Piha  
Date: 05/03-05/04

Scope: Inspect the root pruning and provide recommendations for protecting the adjacent Seattle street trees during construction.

### **12. West Mercer Way Restoration Plan, Mercer Island**

Expertise: Vegetation management, Hazard assessment.

Client: City of Mercer Island

Contact: Jimmi Maulding

Date: 08/03 - ongoing

Scope: Design and monitor a revegetation plan where trees had been illegally removed from a steep slope. Evaluate the remaining trees.

### **13. Street Widening Project, Newcastle**

Expertise: Vegetation management.

Client: City of Newcastle

Contact: Fritz Timm

Date: 08/03

Scope: Determine the prognosis for street trees impacted by an improvement project; provide input on species selection.

### **14. Northwest College Creek Stabilization, Kirkland, WA**

Expertise: Tree preservation during site development.

Client: City of Kirkland

Contact: Jenny Gaus

Date: 12/02

Scope: Prior to construction to relocate the stream, I assessed the impacted trees and determined their prognosis. I made recommendations regarding removals, and tree protection.

### **15. Lake Washington School District Projects, Redmond**

Expertise: Tree inventory, Hazard assessment, Tree protection during construction.

Client: Lake Washington School District

Locations: Redmond Jr. High; Mann, Redmond, and Juanita Elementary Schools

Contact: Mike Currie

Date: 07/00-10/02

Scope: Inventory and assessments of existing trees prior to rebuilding the schools. Also provided diagnostic and pest management information.

## **III. Resume**

**Tina Cohen**, Certified Arborist, has been actively involved in horticulture since 1985. She received her arborist certification in **1992** and offers a full range of arboricultural consulting services.

### **Owner and Operator, Northwest Arborvitae.**

Assumed ownership in January 2000 after a long-term association with founder Molly Beck.

## **Certifications & Affiliations**

Certified Arborist #PN0245, International Society of Arboriculture  
Certified Tree Risk Assessor #194, International Society of Arboriculture  
Commercial Pest Control Consultant #42988, WA State Dept of Agriculture  
Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists  
Member, Pacific Northwest Chapter International Society of Arboriculture  
Member, Western Chapter International Society of Arboriculture  
Member, PlantAmnesty Heritage Tree Committee

## **Education**

American Society of Consulting Arborists - Arboricultural Consulting Academy  
Edmonds Community College - Horticulture  
University of Washington - Continuing education: Urban Forestry  
Ohio State University - Bachelors Degree

Professional seminars and continuing education workshops have included Hazard Tree Assessment, Appraisal, Pests and Pest Control, Site Development and Tree Preservation

## **Awards**

2003 Building With Trees Award of Excellence, National Arbor Day Foundation  
1998 PlantAmnesty Plant Activist Award  
Academic Achievement Awards: Edmonds Community College and Ohio State University  
New York State Regents Scholarship Award

## **Lectures & Presentations**

University of Washington School of Architecture: Guest lecturer on Tree Preservation.  
Edmonds Community College: "Landscape Practicum: Site Analysis". Course instructor.  
American Society of Landscape Architects, Washington Chapter: Presentation "What an Arborist Can Do For You".  
Washington State Nursery & Landscape Association: "Introduction to Plant Diseases".  
University of Washington: Field trip leader for Urban Plant Protection class with Dr. Robert Gara, Department of Forestry.  
PlantAmnesty: "Rhododendron Problems".  
King County Master Gardeners Arboretum Clinic: "Tree Tragedies and Diagnosis".  
Seattle Tree Steward Training: "Tree Identification"  
Association for Women in Landscaping: "Plant Selection: Don't Plant Problems".

## **Publications**

"Case Capsule: Herbicide Damage". *The Arboricultural Consultant*, Issue 2, 2006.  
"Time Your Pruning". *PlantAmnesty Newsletter*, Spring 2003  
"A Tough Place for Plants: Planting a Wet Site". *PlantAmnesty Newsletter*, Fall 1999  
"Plant Health Care: Japanese Maples, Pruning & Disease." *PlantAmnesty Newsletter*, Fall 1998  
"Dutch Elm Disease Alert." *PlantAmnesty Newsletter*, Summer 1998  
"Plant Health Care: Yet Another Cherry Problem." *PlantAmnesty Newsletter*, Spring 1997  
Edited and quoted in "Arborists Key in Preserving Trees." *Plant Source Journal*, Nov/Dec 2000

Cited without attribution for discoveries of Dutch Elm Disease in 1994 in the *Pacific Northwest Disease Control Handbook*, and in 2001 in the *Seattle Times* and on Channel 5 News.

**Related Volunteer Work**

PlantAmnesty: Technical writing and editing services.

PlantAmnesty Heritage Tree Committee: Evaluate nominees for the City of Seattle's Heritage Tree Roster.

King County Master Gardeners: assistance to the public in diagnosing plant problems.