

TreeStuff Aerial Rescue Rally by Kask Scenario 1 - Petree



Category	Score (X / 5)	Notes & Commentary from Officials	
Site assessment and creation of plan	3.5	Good assessment of tree but little regarding patient or details to EMS call Excellent site assessment and plan I did not hear the call so I don't know what info was shared with 911. I noticed they walked under the hazard several times during walk around. Cursory walk around. Some delegation of responsibilities. No plan communicated. Never actual stated to call 911. Dude holding the tail of GRCS rope is creating a trip hazard. No worksite demarkation. Not clear that EMS was called, it was mentioned at 04:25, but not before. no call to EMS and lots of talking but not a very clear plan of action	
Contacted emergency services; quality of explanation and info provided	2.3		
Efficiency, speed, and safety	3.5	Good job of accessing but limited communication First rescuer was quick and thorough, second climber didn't really of much and was slow Communication was constant and clear. Access to the casualty was quite fast. Rescuers did a full body check of the casualty. One minute from ascending system setup to leaving the ground. Little to no comms to crew while in tree. Quick, but hectic ascent. Good attempt to communicate with injured, but not much detail with the rest of the crew. decent ascent but lack of inspection on the way up and of climbers situation	
Continued inspection and assessment	3.0		
Identification of hazards	2.8	Still focused on the limb, not other possible hazards but dealt with this one well Great hazard mitigation. Hazard was locked off and left alone. It was quick and efficient Again, the crew walked around under the hanging log. The log was then secured very well. Crew walking under log. No mention of the log until he began to secure it. Secured, but left hanging would be better to lower it. Lots of fiddling around with ropes and gear. It seemed to take a fair amoun of time to identify the hazard and mitigate it. workers under the load and potential for struck by	
Method and execution of mitigation	3.5		
Assessment of casualty situation	3.3	Assessment but no first aid Patient wasn't bumped around too much but they didn't really check him enough No administration of first aid since this was to access, assess and lower the casualty. Lowering the casualty to the board	
Administration of first aid & assessing of urgency	2.7	was an excellent choice Relatively sparse assessment. Neck support provided. Couldn't see what was being done with the packaging. Casualty's position remained upright. Second climber a nice touch, but comms between climbers minimal. Didn't look like they did a complete assessment, but once they started to move the injured they did a good joi of controlling the injured. good assessment but never stated training or credentials of rescuer being properly trained to do so. No EMS on site to assist in assessment or how to properly secure.	
dequate and appropriate abilization of casualty for transport	3.0		
Choice of system and technical execution of casualty support/tie in	3.5	Good approach and well executed, use of two climbers was good touch Decent was weird. Not sure why they needed an extra climber. Seemed to just slow things down and the decent was sloppy Every precaution was taken to lower the casualty with care. Couple bumps along the way. Casualty remained upright. Centered on patient comfort. Fiddling with ropes. Jerky descent at times. Binding hitch in casualty's system. Nice use of two rescuers to control the descent, but could have done a better job supporting on the way down. Really liked the two rescuer descent! But focus on patient comfort and care	
uality of transport for the casualty	3.3		
Quality of transition from suspension to injury appropriate position on ground	3.8	The lower and placement on ground was good but no EMS interaction Nice transition but nothing was said about suspension trauma. But the back board was a good call Who was acting as EMS was a little foggy but I think it was the litter bearers. If so, nice touch No EMS on site. Casualty laid flat. Backboard a nice touch, but not utilized effectively. Strain on casualty's neck due to rope wrench position? A little bit of an uncontrolled swing as they got ready for the backboard. EMS wasn't onsite until after they had the injured on the ground. Good landing patient on back board but again without EMS on site who is qualified to make this call? Also who carries a backboard to jobsites?	
Care of site, scene, and equipment	3.8		
Transition of care to EMS	2.7		
Communicating the plan	3.7	As with many good job assignments and tree assessment but limited patient interaction. Great communication but a	
Communicating the hazards	2.8	lot of the team members walked right under the hazard before it was secured Tasks delegated verbally and clearly. Hazards were communicated but still a lot of foot traffic below the hazard. This was all about Randy. Little delegation. Poor communication throughout. No EMS on site. More immediate contact with EMS and having them onsite would have been better. No EMS on site so no communication with first responders. Lots of talking but very little effective communication of plan and response.	
Communicating with, for, and about the casualty	2.7		
Reaction	3.7	I thought they did a good job They did a great job recreating a rescue scenario right from the beginning, great communication from the team leader High marks here for the simple reason that not everything went as planned and	
Planning	3.7	the team overcame stress and a touch of exhaustion without sacrificing victim care. Folks standing around doing nothing. Needed better delegation of responsibilities. Main climber was taking on too much and not spreading the workload. Unrealistic start with folks leaning on the fence. No urgency in the beginning. Always hard to create a rec "emergency" Good training demonstration but lacked a sense of a real jobsite and response	
Overall Realism	3.7		