



TreeStuff Aerial Rescue Rally by Kask Scenario 1 - Dudek



Treestuff.com/Rescue-Rally | Watch The Rescue Here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=80SnlwyKa6w>

Category	Score (X / 5)	Notes & Commentary from Officials
Site assessment and creation of plan	3.5	Don't ask Dispatch questions! You are not going to do a pulse. Great site inspection and excellent execution of rescue plan Caller had 911 repeat the information back to him and stated "High angle rescue" Did not assess for electrical hazards or other site hazards. Did not secure worksite. Rescue plan not thoroughly communicated. Walking under unsecured limb (ground worker did mention it being unsecured). Did not communicate casualty's injuries/state of wellbeing. More detail needed. Good communication but not a very thorough inspection or communication of the plan.
Contacted emergency services; quality of explanation and info provided	3.7	
Efficiency, speed, and safety	3.8	Did talk through patient's status Communicated the whole time with the casualty and team Ascent and access to the victim were very fast and controlled 1m 17s to assemble ascent system and leave ground. Smooth, efficient ascent. Vague casualty assessment. Good conversation with injured person and ground personnel. missed some communication of ongoing assessment
Continued inspection and assessment	4.0	
Identification of hazards	3.3	Minimal discussion of other possible hazards Handled the hazard very well. Nice to see a break on the lowering line and actually lowering the piece out of the tree The whole team looked for additional hazards, not just the climber Ground workers standing directly under limb while lifting and lowering. Not much attention to the detail of the hazards aloft. Appears workers were under victim and suspended log, thus creating a potential struck by.
Method and execution of mitigation	3.3	
Assessment of casualty situation	3.5	Not taking into account the head (and possible spine) injury Didn't do a whole lot to stabilize the victim. Also released lanyard and lowered casualty a bit before establishing a hard connect Head to toe assessment is ongoing throughout rescue. Rescuer mentions "no blood" so no additional first aid was needed. Vague assessment not relevant to potential injuries. No aid administered. No packaging. Leg hung up on decent. More attention seemed to be paid to the lowering of the log instead of caring for the injured climber. Would have been better to lock off the log and then deal with the injured climber. Moved patient prior to EMTs arrival and didnt allow for them to assess how to move patient.
Administration of first aid & assessing of urgency	2.8	
Adequate and appropriate stabilization of casualty for transport	2.3	
Choice of system and technical execution of casualty support/tye in	3.3	Did try to support head and neck It was a pretty smooth decent but a bit of bashing around and his leg got stuck Rescuer got in something of a hurry and left the victims leg behind for a second but handling was adequate. Ground crew and Jason not entirely coordinated upon lowering of casualty. No packaging or comfort considerations given to casualty. Jason engaged the casualty's climbing device prior to creating a connection between himself and casualty. Casualty's base anchor appears to be a port-a-wrap with no backup. Good attention to supporting the injured climber. Very careful and efficient descent
Quality of transport for the casualty	3.5	
Quality of transition from suspension to injury appropriate position on ground	2.3	Did support head, minimal communication with EMS They did not address suspension trauma and just layer the casualty down and Unclipped him Casualty is lowered straight to the ground with no request for instructions from EMS. The site is tidy with little clutter. Casualty laid flat on their back. No neck stabilization, etc. No EMS on site to communicate with. Better communication with EMS would have been helpful. The climber mentioned that the injured was breathing but yet they did CPR on the ground. the video stopped as soon as the patient got to the ground
Care of site, scene, and equipment	3.3	
Transition of care to EMS	2.0	
Communicating the plan	3.7	Did good job of identifying hazards Excellent communication with the casualty and with the team about the casualty. More could have been said about staying out from under the hanging limb Communication with the casualty was verbal and was constantly relayed to ground support. Relatively smooth operation amongst the crew, but communication was sparse fairly vague throughout the rescue. More detail on the hazards should have been communicated to all. Not alot of communication and was very scripted by one person and didn't hear any confirmation from workers about hazards.
Communicating the hazards	3.5	
Communicating with, for, and about the casualty	3.5	
Reaction	3.2	For non-actors - a good job! This rescue was well done. Seemed a bit rehearsed but everyone did exactly what they were told and needed to do It felt rehearsed...but it SHOULD be rehearsed Focus seemed to be on speed rather than a measured, appropriate response to the situation. Felt pretty canned (like a typical TCC rescue). This is always difficult, they did ok but it is hard to simulate a real emergency. Rescue seemed like a typical competition style rescue and didnt have a sense of realism.
Planning	3.3	
Overall Realism	3.0	



TreeStuff Aerial Rescue Rally by Kask Scenario 1 - Dudek

