

## City of Racine, Wisconsin Common Council

1

2

27

28 29

30

liable for failing to prune or remove before its fall.

AGENDA BRIEFING MEMORADUM  COMMITTEE: Finance and Personnel LEGISLATION ITEM #: 0139-18		
DEPARTMENT:	City Attorney's Office	
Prepared By:	Nhu Tran	
Reviewed By:	<b>Scott Letteney</b>	
SUBJECT: Commur	nication from the City Attorne	ey submitting the claim of Luis Cabrera for consideration
EXECUTIVE SUM	MARY:	
a tree branch falling on the defect ir have a ministerial dut	onto the vehicle during the night the tree, which turned out to	\$639.54 worth of damages to his vehicle as a result of ght of December 5, 2017. Here, there was no prior be internal decay and hollow. As such, the city did not om liability. For this reason, it is the recommendation of d.
BACKGROUND &	ANALYSIS:	
•	<u> </u>	s alleged damages pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 893.80. In
	•	on municipalities for acts that are considered
•	•	e that requires an exercise of judgment when applying the task of deciding which trees need pruning,
		ould be taken are all discretionary acts requiring
		cretionary nature of these acts, the city cannot be held

In some cases, the city could be held liable if it was given notice of a defect and its failure to remedy such

defect was unreasonable. Here, there is no evidence that the city knew of the defect in the tree. Inspection of this particular tree was conducted as part of the annual summer inspection in August of 2017 and it was

31 32 33 34 35 36 37	not marked for removal at that time. Subsequent to the fall, it was determined that the branch fell due to a combination of high winds and internal decay and a hollow. According to the City Forester, many trees can exists for decades with hollow portions and can be nearly as strong as a solid. The problem in this case was really the internal decay, which is much harder to identify. Such decay is nearly impossible to identify without some sort of external sign (there was none here) or through the use of advanced inspection techniques and tools (the city does not use any of these). Since the annual inspection revealed no such defects and the city did not have prior notice/complaints of any defect, it did not have a ministerial duty to repair.
39	For these reasons, the city is immune from liability and the claim should be denied.
40	
41	BUDGETARY IMPACT:
42 43	None
44	OPTIONS/ALTERNATIVES:
45 46	Pay the claim.
47	RECOMMENDED ACTION:
48 49	Deny the claim.
<del>4</del> 9 50	ATTACHMENT(S):