

TreeStuff Aerial Rescue Rally by Kask Scenario 1 - Davey Seatle



| Treestuff.com/Rescue-Rally Watch The Rescue Here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9B_3n34R32l | | |
|---|----------------|--|
| Category | Score (X/5) | Notes & Commentary from Officials |
| Site assessment and creation of plan | 3.2 | Little information regarding patient or EMS call Action plan was a little vague No plan communicated. Cursory hazard assessment. 911 called but did not hear comms. Good communication. Ok assessment but didn't feel the communication of the plan was very concise or effective to the team |
| Contacted emergency services; quality of explanation and info provided | 2.6 | |
| Efficiency, speed, and safety | 2.6 | Minimal assessment and communication with ground Climbed under the victim and the hazard the whole way up! Not good Quick off the ground. Not efficient (body thrust). Ascending directly under unsecured log. Little comms with team. Team under log. Good communication. Slow ascent and too much slack in the system at times didn't hear an on going inspection. |
| Continued inspection and assessment | 2.8 | |
| Identification of hazards | 3.4 | |
| | 5.4 | Focus on removal of limb but good work at it It was safe after he wasn't directly under it anymore No plan communicated. Jostling log. Quick and efficient lift/lower. No progress capture No need to lower the log, could have cut the rope. Good use of tools to secure and mitigate the hazard |
| Method and execution of mitigation | 3.2 | |
| Assessment of casualty situation | 2.6 | Not much though on patient's needs Poor patient care. More attention was paid to the log than the patient Cursory assessment. No aid. No neck support. Casualty held upright with chest harness, but carabiner is clipped above Rope Wrench! Good overall assessment. Assessment was ok nothing too special or bad just not very thorough or efficient. Never heard you declare skill or training in AR or first aid to show abilities were within abilities |
| Administration of first aid & assessing of urgency | 2.4 | |
| Adequate and appropriate stabilization of casualty for transport | 2.4 | |
| | | |
| Choice of system and technical execution of casualty support/tie in | 2.8 | Did not support head 5-1 was excessive and unnecessary for the size of the piece. Having the ground crew Lower the casualty was bumpy and hazardous Carabiner above RW! Jerky descent. Good job to keep the injured upright. Transport out of the tree seemed ok |
| Quality of transport for the casualty | 2.8 | |
| Quality of transition from | | |
| suspension to injury appropriate position on ground | 3.8 | Nice that they could land on the board Site was tidy but they didn't do anything to address suspension trauma Good EMS role play. Clean site. Casualty lowered directly onto gurney/EMS care. Nice job of transferring the injured to the EMS. Good job working with ems and taking their lead |
| Care of site, scene, and equipment | 4.0 | |
| Transition of care to EMS | 3.4 | |
| Communicating the plan | 3.4 | Again, little patient discussion Decent communication. Could have talked to the casualty more Sparse delegation of tasks. Did not hear hazard comms. Good EMS comms. Good overall communication. Good communication but felt their could have been better communication about the hazard and the full plan |
| Communicating the | 3.2 | |
| hazards Communicating with, for, | 3.6 | |
| and about the casualty | | |
| Reaction | 3.4 | As with most a good job at roleplaying Seemed pretty staged. Rescuer didn't walk around the whole tree, seemed like he was already clipped in Pretty much canned. Hard to create a real emergency. Great training but just didn't feel real. It felt like a typical competition style rescue but nice work none the less. |
| Planning | 3.6 | |
| Overall Realism | 3.0 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |



