CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY,
JOINTLY WITH COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

----- X

November 23, 2015 Start: 10:16 a.m. Recess: 12:58 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E:

VANESSA L. GIBSON

Chairperson

YDANIS A. RODRIGUEZ

Co-Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Vincent J. Gentile

James Vacca

Julissa Ferreras-Copeland

Jumaane D. Williams Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.

Chaim M. Deutsch Rafael Espinal, Jr. Rory I. Lancman Ritchie J. Torres

Steven Matteo

Daniel R. Garodnick Margaret S. Chin Stephen T. Levin Deborah L. Rose James G. Van Bramer

World Wide Dictation 545 Saw Mill River Road – Suite 2C, Ardsley, NY 10502 Phone: 914-964-8500 * 800-442-5993 * Fax: 914-964-8470 www.WorldWideDictation.com

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

David G. Greenfield Costa G. Constantinides

Carlos Menchaca I. Daneek Miller Antonio Reynoso Donovan J. Richards

Andy L. King Paul A. Vallone Brad S. Lander

Public Advocate Letitia James

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Henry Jackson
Deputy Commissioner
NYC Office of Emergency Management

Timothy Herlocker Director Emergency Operations Center Fire Department of the City of New York

Laura Kavanagh
Assistant Commissioner
Emergency Operations Center
Fire Department of the City of New York

William Seelig
Chief of Special Operations
Emergency Operations Center
Fire Department of the City of New York

Thomas Bosco
Director
Aviation Department
Port Authority of New York & New Jersey

James Coan
Deputy Inspector/Commanding Officer
NYPD Aviation Unit

Jon Ollwerther CMO Aerobo

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

David Donovan
President
New York State Broadcasters Association

Angela Miele Motion Picture Association of America

Flo Brown
New York Production Alliance

Benjamin Esner
Director
Center for K12 STEM Education
NYU Tandon School of Engineering

Jaami Ali Targeted Individual Awareness Campaign

Rashida Richardson NY Civil Liberties Union

Lawrence Brinker NUAIR Alliance

Brendan Schulman Vice President Policy & Legal Affairs DJI Technology, Inc.

Julie Samuels Engine

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Anthony Pansini President Staten Island Radio Control Modelers

Richard Hanson Director Government Regulatory Affairs Academy of Model Aeronautics [gavel]

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, welcome to City Hall. I am Council Member Vanessa Gibson of the 16th District in the Bronx and I am proud to chair the City Council Committee on Public Safety. I welcome each and every one of you today to our joint hearing of the Committees on Public Safety and Transportation.

I wanna thank my Co-Chair, Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez; Chair of the Committee on Transportation, for joining us in chairing this very important hearing; he will be joining us very shortly. Today's hearing is on unmanned aerial vehicles or UAVs.

I would also like to thank the members of both the Public Safety Committee and Transportation Committee who are here.

Today, this morning we are hearing four pieces of legislation related to the regulation of UAVs. I wanna thank prime sponsors for proposing these bills in which we are hearing.

UAVs or drones are unpiloted aircraft that may be operated remotely; they can range in size from a simple model aircraft to the size of a full-

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 scale aircraft. The FAA has said that as many as one

3 million drones could be sold during this year's

4 holiday season. Companies such as Amazon and Wal-

5 Mart are currently researching and developing systems

6 that would allow merchants to deliver packages by

7 UAVs. In addition to delivery systems, CBS has

reported that the new UAV industry could create

9 almost 100,000 new jobs by 2025.

While there may be many benefits to this technology, their increased presence in the skies has created new risks. Just a couple of months ago, in September, an operator of a UAV flying over the U.S. Open lost control and crashed into the stands. In addition, there has been an alarming increase in sightings near both LaGuardia and JFK airports. The FAA reports that UAV sightings by pilots have more than doubled between 2014 and 2015.

Given their small size and freedom of movement, UAVs equipped with microphones or cameras could encroach on people's privacy rights. These concerns show the need for appropriate regulations that both encourage technological innovation while at the same time balancing public safety. The FAA has passed some regulations to safely integrate UAVs in

2.2

2.3

national airspace but is expected to issue final regulations in mid 2016. While the FAA is preparing its regulations, other states and local legislators across the country are engaging in the same conversation that we will have today; how to regulate the use of UAVs in our airspace.

The first bill which we will hear today,
Intro. 0589-A, sponsored by Council Member Garodnick,
would regulate the aviation of UAVs by city agencies
and for commercial purposes.

Council Member Vallone has sponsored Intro. 0601-A, which will regulate the use of UAVs in city airspace.

The third bill, sponsored by our Public Advocate James, Intro. 0614, would require UAVs to be insured and registered with the New York City Department of Transportation.

And Reso. No. 0057-A, sponsored by Council Member King, relates to the protection of unwarranted surveillance.

In today's hearing I am hoping to learn more from the administration on their current use or contemplated use of UAVs, their experience with policing the unlawful use of drones and in addition,

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 9 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 2 we will also hear from industry representatives, 3 advocates and manufacturers about their use of drones 4 as it relates to today's bills. I thank you all for being here and certainly want to recognize the staff that prepared 6 7 today's joint hearing. I wanna thank the Counsel, Committee on Public Safety, Deepa Ambekar; 8

Legislative Analyst Beth Golub; Policy Analyst Laurie
Wen, and our Financial Analyst, Ellen Eng.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The Committee on Transportation, our Counsel, Kelly Taylor, Policy Analyst Gafar Zaaloff, our Policy Analyst, Jonathan Masserano and our Policy Analyst Russell Murphy.

In addition, our Legislative Drafting Unit, who worked very hard to get these bills drafted, our Counsel, Wesley Jones.

I also want to acknowledge the presence of my colleagues who are here -- Council Member Paul Vallone, Council Member Dan Garodnick, Council Member Antonio Reynoso, Council Member Andy King, Council Member Donovan Richards, as well as our Public Advocate Letitia James.

And now, as we begin the hearing, I will ask Council… we've also been joined by Council Member

2.2

2.3

Dan Garodnick.

James Vacca, and now we will have opening remarks
from all our prime sponsors and I will begin with
Proposed Intro. 0589-A, sponsored by Council Member

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Madame Chair and also to Chair Rodriguez for holding this hearing on the use of unmanned aerial vehicles or UAVs or drones.

My bill, Intro. 0589-A, will create laws that govern the use of governmental and commercial UAVs.

UAVs are now a very real fixture in our skies, as they have become cheaper to purchase and easier to operate. The FAA and industry experts expect one million UAVs to be sold this holiday season; that is on top of the thousands or tens of thousands that exist today.

Wanna fly them for fun, government bodies have expressed interest in utilizing them to inspect construction sites, potholes and to use in emergency situations. Some have been created in order to provide life-sustaining resources to emergency responders. The commercial sector is banging on the

2.2

2.3

federal government's door to allow UAVs for all types
of uses, such as pizza delivery and movie-making.

While there are many fun, innovative and thoughtful purposes for UAV use, there also remain significant safety and privacy concerns. In the past year there have been more than three dozen drone sightings just in the airspace near JFK. This is an enormous danger to our safety both in the skies and on the ground; the damage can be far worse if these devices were equipped with any type of a weapon.

In addition to the safety concerns, we need to develop smart policies to protect ourselves. It goes without saying that we should develop specific data retention and deletion policies to avoid government abuse. Drones are no longer science fiction but very real tools of our society; it is therefore our responsibility to ensure that we create a safe and sensible method of using these tools. The FAA is working on new rules, but we don't know when they will issue their rules and therefore can't wait for them; we need to make sure that there is a process in place that differentiates between the cornfield of Iowa, for example, and the city blocks of New York. Intro. 0589-A picks up where the FAA

2 leaves off. We will grant agencies the limited 3 ability to use drones so long as they adhere to

4 uniform and specific rules, such as uniform markings,

5 speed, GPS tracking and licensing. Commercial

6 entities will need to obtain a permit and adhere to

7 very New York City-specific standards. This bill

8 originally was structured as a ban or essentially as

9 a ban and based on the feedback that we have heard,

10 some thoughtful feedback, we have changed the bill to

11 ensure that we do not unnecessarily impact hobbyists

12 or prohibit limited commercial uses. We also see

13 legitimate governmental uses for drones under a very

14 specific set of circumstances. We are balancing

15 | those opportunities with real protections to our

16 safety and privacy.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1

We look forward to discussing with the DOT and the NYPD their ability to implement and enforce the laws and as always we look forward to hearing from the public. So Chair Gibson, thank you so much, to the authors of the other two bills on today's agenda, the Public Advocate Tish James and to Council Member Vallone; it's always a pleasure working with you on these bills and everything else.

25 Thank you, Madame Chair.

U

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Council Member Garodnick. Next we will have prime sponsor of Intro. 0601-A, Council Member Paul Vallone.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Thank you,

Madame Chair. Good morning Madame Advocate. Thank you very much for holding this hearing on Intro.

0601, which would locally regulate the private use of unmanned aerial vehicles, UAVs or drones, in New York City.

The technology now for drones has rapidly advanced in the last few years, allowing UAVs to be widely available and increasingly affordable for the average person; this has resulted in the rampant proliferation of drones in the city's airspace. This unchecked growth has spurred significant security and privacy concerns, as well as resulting in many close call incidents with commercial and city air traffic.

I'd first like to start by thanking
Wesley Jones for drafting the bill, Jonathan Szott,
Lionel Morales, Ahmed Nazaar and once again, for my
staff. And thank you to Chairs Vanessa Gibson and
Ydanis Rodriguez for bringing the bill today.

 $\hbox{ Intro. 0601 will create violations and } \\ \\ \hbox{misdemeanors with fines for UAVs that are flown in } \\$

2 prohibited areas, as well as those flown with the

3 intent to cause harm or damage or destroy property.

4 This bill will strive to maintain a balance with the

5 recreational use of UAVs by requiring the

6 Commissioner of the Department of Parks and

Recreation to designate areas within city parks where

8 they can be legally flown.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Finally, there will also be restrictions of times, locations and altitudes which UAVs may be operated and prohibit the use of UAVs for conducting surveillance or that are equipped with weapons or dangerous instruments. This bill will not affect the operation of UAVs by city agencies.

Today's hearing on Intro. 0280 is the crucial next step for what we hope to be eventual passage of this legislation that will finally address the rampant unregulated use of unmanned aerial vehicles in the City of New York. We need to reclaim our safety and reign in the wild west of drones here in our city. My bill finally gives the City the teeth to effectively regulation drones in our skies without waiting for the FAA to update federal regulations or for the tragedy to happen next. Our public safety now more than ever is a prime focus

2.2

2.3

that this bill finally gives the NYPD the tools they need to protect our skies and that's what this day is all about; that's why we've been brought to this point; that's why there's been so much talk and talking about amendments and agreements, because if it wasn't for our council's bills today we wouldn't be talking about finally clearing up our skies and if we had to wait for the FAA, you'd still be waiting for my dad to be back as speaker again, 'cause that's pretty much as long as it's been. So I thank you both, chairs for bringing the bills and I look

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Council Member Vallone. Next we will have prime sponsor of Intro. 0614, Public Advocate Letitia James.

forward to discussion. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC ADVOCATE JAMES: Thank you. I wanna thank Chair Gibson and Rodriguez for holding today's important hearing. I'd also like to thank the lead sponsors of the other bills being heard today, Council Members Garodnick and Vallone.

Whether we are ready or not, drones are a part of our world. We've seen UAVs employed for a host of uses, some positive, others negative and many in ways that we've never imagined possible. Some

2.2

2.3

House property.

possible examples of UAV use include helping to save migrants fleeing from war-torn countries or assisting farmers with observation of crops. The Motion

Picture Association of America is a proponent of UAVs for filmmaking and many hobbyists, as I've seen in several local parks in this city, enjoy the use of drones as a recreational toy. At the same time, UAVs have been reported interfering with civilian aircraft and jeopardizing passenger safety or breaching the White House security and crash landing on the White

One does not need to strain their imagination to consider the incredible threat to personal privacy posed by drones that carry cameras which can so easily record the actions of unwitting subjects in public or even private locations.

Several recent incidents where drones were found attempting to enter prison property to smuggle contraband raises concerns about how easily drones can be used for worrisome ends [sic]. And of course, as New Yorkers and in the wake of the tragic events in Paris, Brussels, Mali, Kenya; Somalia, we recognize that drones could present a new and very frightening terrorism threat to major population

2 centers like our beloved New York City. And apart

3 from the extremes, UAVs present a new reality to

4 | which many Americans and New Yorkers are simply not

5 accustomed. The example of Amazon using UAVs to

6 deliver goods to our homes is both incredible and I

7 must admit, somewhat unsettling in how it will impact

8 our day to day lives.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Not surprisingly, public opinion is divided on UAVs, including on my block. The public opinion indicates that 42% of respondents to a recent Reuters poll stated that they opposed private ownership of drones while 30% supported it, and a strong majority of respondents, however, some 73% indicated that they believe that drones should be regulated. It is with this strong support for regulation in mind that today's hearing takes place. There is no doubt that the emergence of UAVs presents lawmakers and policymakers with a new and unique challenge, but there is a strong sense that government should do something to ensure that drones are used responsibly and that their threat to privacy and public safety is curtailed to the greatest extent possible. I'm so happy; as an attorney I know that a

2.2

2.3

2 significant number of legal associations are now
3 looking at the issue of privacy rights.

But the bill that I am sponsoring,

Intro. 0614, would require UAVs to be registered with

DOT and to be covered by liability insurance and to

have identifying information affixed to them and this

bill would create exceptions for toys aircraft and

UAVs that are considered air carriers under federal

law.

On that note, we would hope that the FAA, they've indicated that they will also require some sort of registration requirement for UAVs, although it has not acted up to this point.

Again, I look forward to this informative hearing and again I thank Council Member Gibson and Council Member Rodriguez in his absence. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, Public Advocate James. And next we will have the sponsor or Resolution 0057, Council Member King.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Good morning and thank you Council Member and Chair Gibson and Council Member Rodriguez, Chair Rodriguez for today's hearing, as well to my colleagues who are sponsoring the other pieces of legislation, thank you; I'm glad

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to be part of a team that's thinking in such a way to recognize that UAVs can and will propose some danger to society.

This morning I'm pleased to be here to discuss this very important issue; in today's day and age it is very common that we all are all plugged in, tuned in and zoned out. However, it is important to remember that as individual members of society there is still an expectation of privacy, there are still certain expectations of private and offline living that we should all continue to strive for. recent uptake in the use of drones has brought with it certain national security benefits; however, the recreational use of these drones by civilians is a Due to the constitutional threats growing concern. that it can pose, we at the Council strive to balance security interests and civil liberty protections and we will demonstrate this commitment today by hearing these bills on the use of drones. It is my sincere hope that after today's hearing we will have gained much deeper insight into the risks posed by recreational use of drones and that we will adopt Resolution 0057-A, urging our colleagues at the state level to pass legislation that will help us protect

2.2

2.3

purposes.

ourselves from improper use of this potentially
dangerous technology by persons who are untrained in
their use and are using them for potentially harmful

Again I wanna thank Madame Chair and Mr. Chair and all of us who have come today to figure out what next steps should be. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,
Council Member King. Thank you to all of our
sponsors of the bills on today's agenda. We've also
been joined by Majority Leader Jimmy Van Bramer and
now we will get to our first panel, of which they're
already here. Our Deputy Commissioner of New York
City Emergency Management, Henry Jackson; Port
Authority of New York and New Jersey, Thomas Bosco;
FDNY, William Seelig; Laura Kavanagh, also of the
FDNY, and Tim Herlocker from the FDNY as well.

And those of you who are submitting testimony, we're going to do the oath, so I just ask that you raise your right hand.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to council member questions?

2 HENRY JACKSON: I do.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, and you may begin.

HENRY JACKSON: Good morning, Chair

Gibson and members of the Committee on Public Safety

and Transportation.

I'm Henry Jackson, Deputy Commissioner for Technology and Strategic Resources at New York City Emergency Management. I'm joined here by Timothy Herlocker, the Director of the Fire Department Emergency Operations Center and my other colleagues in City Government. We're here to talk about the potential use of unmanned aerial vehicles, UAVs, to enhance City agency operations.

As you know, UAVs are often referred to as drones and while this usage is widely recognized by the public, the Federal Aviation Administration uses the term unmanned aerial vehicles or unmanned aerial systems, because the key characteristic of these types of aircraft is the ability to fly them without an onboard pilot. For the purposes of this hearing we'll be using the term UAV.

The FAA is empowered by Congress to regulate the airspace throughout all 50 states and

the safe and innovative use of UAVs.

2 localities. The FAA is currently finalizing

2.2

2.3

comprehensive regulations regarding the use of UAVs by private entities. We await the finalization of these rules and look forward to working with the FAA, other municipalities and the City Council regarding

On our local front, several city agencies have started to research and discuss how the use of UAVs may improve their operations. You will hear next from the Fire Department about their explorations into using this new potential tool to gain situational awareness at serious fires. Many other agencies have similar needs for situational awareness and the Fire Department's efforts will likely inform solutions at other city agencies.

I will now provide a synopsis of activity from several other agencies.

New York City Emergency Management has been investigating and researching the use of UAVs for disaster response and recovery. There are generally two types of UAVs that would suit our purpose, those that are manually radio controlled, therefore allowing flexibility in determining the best use and angles of say a collapsed building and

2 those that can be programmed to follow a specific

3 grid pattern in an automated fashion. New York City

4 Emergency Management is particularly interested in

5 | the second type.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

After a large-scale event, such as a coastal storm, UAVs programmed to fly over an area of damage, like the Rockaways, could be up in the air as soon as the skies clear. This can occur much earlier than fixed wing planes of any size can typically get up into the air, the timeliness of which can be hampered by logistically concerns related to moving the proper specialized air assets into a metropolitan area and also the need for FAA approval of specialized flight plans. UAVs could operate well before local airports are reopened and air traffic has been reinstated post event in a metropolitan area. These considerations and the low-flying nature of UAVs in general contribute to minimizing any potential air traffic conflicts.

FAA approval for the flight plans of programmed drones could potentially be arranged pre event, based on hurricane evacuation zone areas.

UAVs flying back and forth in a prescribed rectangular pattern would use aerial photography to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

record damage from a storm; these photographs are georeferenced and tagged to the actual location on the earth and georeferenced photos can be correlated with all preexisting parcel data, allowing analysts to determine which properties have been damaged, along with ancillary data about the property, including ownership, type of building, number of housing units, etc. The City already has these before pictures for all areas also georeferenced and associated with lots, so a rough damage estimation can be quickly made. This of course would only be the initial reconnaissance regarding damage assessment; subsequently, inspectors on the ground will be able to provide more detailed assessments, but that ground level assessment cannot be started until roads and streets are accessible and other safety considerations for the inspection teams are taken into account. The reconnaissance provide by UAVs will certainly help determine the priority of areas to be visited by inspection teams and some programmed drones flying in a prescribed grid pattern hold the promise of providing the earliest reliable assessments of damage that may result in a catastrophic weather event.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The City Parks Department has also spent time researching the use of UAVs for aerial tree risk assessments in line with their agency operations. The surveys would detect structural defects and health conditions in the tree canopies that are not visible from the ground. Typical trees are approximately 120' high at most. Presently, monitoring and inspection team is conducted by a team of climbers and pruners in an aerial lift truck. UAVs, as an added benefit, would release equipment and human capital to perform more standard operational tasks. The Parks Department is considering the use of UAVs for scientific data collection of natural resource areas, such as detailed elevation information and vegetation classification, health and condition. The Parks Department has explored procurement and vendor service options and is ready to advance the use of UAVs for multiple purposes.

The New York City Department of

Transportation is exploring the use of UAVs for use
in initial cursory bridge inspections after a bridge
sustains damage, real-time information on events
impeding traffic in areas where traffic cameras are

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 26 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 2 not readily located and aerial photography 3 assessments of their transportation planning and 4 management projects. The Department of Buildings is exploring the use of UAVs to assist DOB with façade inspections 6 7 and along with several other agencies will receive a demonstration from a private company in the near 8 9 future. To conclude, the potential use of UAVs by 10 11 city agencies is still being researched; this 12 emerging technology may present significant 13 opportunity in reducing costs, increasing efficiencies, reducing danger or injury and offering 14 15 enhanced response capabilities during disasters and 16 emergencies. 17 Thank you for the opportunity to testify 18 and I believe Timothy Herlocker has got [sic] ... 19 [crosstalk] 20 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much. 21 HENRY JACKSON: You're welcome. 2.2 TIMOTHY HERLOCKER: Good morning Chair Gibson and members of the Committees for Public 2.3

24

Safety and Transportation.

2.2

2.3

I'm Tim Herlocker; I'm the Director of the Emergency Operations Center for the Fire

Department. I'm joined by Assistant Commissioner

Laura Kavanagh and our Chief of Special Operations,

William Seelig.

So I wanna take the time to come here and talk about our potential use for UAVs or unmanned aerial vehicles. Over the past few decades the mission of the FDNY has become more complex, attributable to the rapid new construction of buildings which have increased in size and complexity, a more complex harbor operation and an ever-evolving risk environment.

After 9/11, the FDNY realized it needed to enhance its situational awareness for its incident commanders and senior executives who are making critical life safety decisions and complex operations. We followed the recommendations of the McKinsey & Company report prepared after 9/11, which suggested acquiring live video feeds from the NYPD and news media helicopters. Currently, when a helicopter operates at an incident the video is shared with senior executives in the Fire Department Operations Center so they can the area of impact,

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 deploy additional resources and monitor new

3 developments; that can then been relayed to incident

4 commanders on the scene. However, helicopter

5 operations are inconsistent; they're weather-

6 dependant, their time in the air is limited and they

7 | cannot hover directly over a fire incident; they're

8 also costly to purchase and to operate, and those

9 owned by the news agencies have limited coverage

10 times. For these reasons, the FDNY continued to

11 explore other options for gathering on-scene video.

We formed the Command Tactical Unit (CTU) in 2007 with the mission of providing live video to incident commanders and the FDOC on a 24-hour basis in all weather conditions and at a lower threshold of fire alarm that is used for helicopter coverage. Its mission is to provide the view of the sides of a building the incident commander would not otherwise see, with the priority given to the roof and the rear of the target building. When possible, CTU personnel get an aerial view of the incident by videoing from a roof of an adjacent building. The video CTU provides has been critical not only in large-scale emergencies, but also at structural fires, and in the

course of a structural fire numerous members of the

2.2

2.3

FDNY may be on the roof as they seek to vent the building. Prior to the CTU being established, the incident commander would often be unable to see these members as they were operating. The additional viewpoints and information provided are critical to the operational capacity and safety of the incident

commander and of the members on the scene.

However, as with helicopters, the footage gathered by the CTU is inconsistent. CTU is dependant on the layout of the local area for getting relevant data or video. Many incidents are located in areas where there is not a taller building nearby and not every adjacent building could be easily accessible or even safe to enter. As a result, the CTU has continued to explore technical solutions that will allow the FDNY to acquire more accurate and consistent information at the scene of fires, collapses and other emergencies.

The FDNY began looking at the use of small UAVs that can consistent provide aerial views of incidents, but FAA restrictions on the use of UAVs in Class B airspace, the airspace that covers most of New York City, made its use impractical. The FDNY went back and presented the FAA with a concept of

2.2

2.3

operations that would employ the use of complex tethered UAVs that could meet FDNY requirements and be safely implemented by the department. The FAA supported the plan and has provided assistance in moving forward with it. Complex tethering, where power and data goes through the tether is a new technology, with most vendors still developing prototypes. The FDNY is currently testing with a vendor that has a production platform and if we are able to move forward with this vendor, the FDNY will seek to deploy this technology 24/7 at second alarm and greater fires or other emergency incidents.

A tethered UAV is essentially a pole camera capable of going up and down, but without the ability for lateral movement. The UAV and its tether becomes the pole, elevating a camera up to 200' and allowing us to consistent obtain a view of the roof and the rear of a building.

The FDNY is excited about the operational possibilities these tools can provide and we believe that they will enhance safety of our members and the public and will allow us to more effectively tackle the dangers presented at fires, collapses and other incidents, and we look forward to taking your

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

questions. Thanks, thanks for your interest...

3 [crosstalk]

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you... Thank you very much. Do we have the Port Authority?

[background comment] Thank you. [background comment]

THOMAS BOSCO: Good morning. I'm Thomas Bosco; I am the Director of the Aviation Department for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.

In this role I'm responsible for the operation,

maintenance and development of the Port Authority's airport system, which includes JFK, LaGuardia,

Newark, Teterboro and Stewart Airports.

At the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, our core mission is to meet the critical transportation infrastructure needs of the New York/New Jersey bi-state region. A critical element of that mission is our airport system, which last year accommodated more than 117 million passengers, 2 million tons of cargo on 1.2 million flights; this activity is extremely important to the regional economy, supporting 570,000 jobs and generating nearly \$80 billion in annual economic activity.

I wanna thank the New York City Council,
Chairman Rodriguez and members of the Council's

4 Transportation Committee for the opportunity to

5 address a serious issue confronting our airports; the

6 burgeoning use of unmanned aerial vehicles, commonly

7 referred to as drones. We fully appreciate and

8 recognize that drones have a lot to offer, their

9 innovation has already proven a tremendous asset to a

10 host of business interests; the application of this

11 | technology is as limitless as the imagination, from

12 enhanced product delivery to filming, surveying,

13 | military reconnaissance, law enforcement surveillance

14 and much more.

1

2

3

The promise of UAV technology aside, as airport operator, our primary mission is to ensure the safety of our patrons, employees and that of the air traveling public. Recently the proliferation of UAVs in the national airspace has produced numerous incidents of drones operating near airports without Federal Aviation Administration air traffic control clearance and in dangerous proximity to aircraft. Clearly, preventive and countermeasures are needed to mitigate this threat.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2.2

Unfortunately, registration alone will not and cannot prevent an unauthorized entry into protected airspace by a drone. We have real concerns about drone operators unfamiliar with the rules and regulations that govern our airspace and more ominously, about those operators who could use UAVs with nefarious intent. Until government and industry can develop software or other measures to protect airspace around our airports from intrusion by drones, I believe that our facilities are vulnerable.

Now to counter the threat of unauthorized UAVs operating near Port Authority airports and after consulting with the Port Authority's chief security officer who oversees the Port Authority Police

Department, a month ago I issued the following policy directive to our field personnel. In the event that a field supervisor observes an unmanned aerial vehicle, commonly known as a drone, operating in proximity to the airport, the supervisor shall maintain visual contact with the drone and immediately contact the air traffic control tower to determine whether the UAV is operating under air traffic control clearance. Should the UAV have ATC clearance, no further action is necessary. If

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

however the UAV is not under air traffic control, then the supervisor must contact the Port Authority police immediately and continue to monitor the drone's flight path. Now at any time, even upon first observation, the supervisor judges the UAV to pose an imminent threat to the safety of aircraft operations and that of the air traveling public, the supervisor shall take immediate action to eliminate that threat, including the discharge of an authorized firearm. The drone may indeed constitute an imminent threat if it is observed operating within airspace actively in use by aircraft arriving and departing or on a flight path that would intercept or infringe upon such airspace or in proximity to taxiing aircraft. In any case, the supervisor shall exercise professional judgment and discretion, including due consideration to the presence of personnel and equipment nearby before taking action.

Recognizing that supervisors at Port

Authority airports already receive FAA-approved

training to identify, evaluate and remove hazards of

flight operations posed by wildlife, including birds,

supervisors have been directed to treat UAVs posing

an imminent threat to aircraft in a similar manner as

they would large birds, taking lethal action as warranted in order to safeguard human life. important to note that FAA alone controls the flow of aircraft in the national airspace and recognizing this important role we must rely on the federal government to do its part. Fortunately, FAA is taking steps to address the problem, having recently formed a government industry task force to provide FAA administrative workers [sic] with recommendations on regulating UAVs to help ensure safety without crippling the innovative applications of this emerging technology. What's more, the Port Authority is currently cooperating with both FAA and the FBI to establish a test system at JFK to detect, track and potentially employ countermeasures against unauthorized UAVs operating in protected airspace.

In the meantime, the Port Authority will continue to take all necessary action within our capability to protect the air-traveling public from the threat posed by unauthorized drone operation.

I appreciate the Council and the

Transportation Committee for bringing greater

attention and focus to this issue; we share your

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

concern and pledge to work with you and continuing to
promote aviation safety. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much; I appreciate it, Emergency Management, FDNY and Port Authority. Thank you for your testimony today and I'm gonna get right into questions because we only have the chamber until 1:00, so our time has started ticking.

I wanna recognize that we've been joined by Council Members Robert Cornegy, Margaret Chin, Carlos Menchaca, Jumaane Williams, Minority Leader Steve Matteo and Brad Lander. Thank you all for being here.

So my very first question and a lot of my... well, not a lot; I just have two or three questions... are going to focus really on public safety as it relates to the NYPD and I noticed in your testimony, Mr. Jackson, I believe, Commissioner Jackson, you talked about some of the agencies that are currently exploring the use of UAVs, you mentioned Parks, you mentioned Buildings, you mention Transportation, as well as Emergency Management. So I just wanted to expand a little bit because you said

2.2

2.3

2 us, it's something that we're gonna have to document 3 and work our way through.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So is there currently some working group or a task force that we have right now to kind of look at all of these issues or is it done on an agency basis?

HENRY JACKSON: Right now it's sort of done on an agency basis; the people who are doing it, we know each other and I've attended a demo at the Fire Department, so we're familiar with the work that each is doing and you know, as I say, we're treading softly and lightly into this area and taking our time.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So is there any possibility moving forward that there will be, and I assume there will be, some level of integration and coordination, because every agency you described in the testimony is obviously looking at the aerial view in the event of a natural disaster, fire, etc., so is there going to be any coordination between agencies having multiple conversations separately?

HENRY JACKSON: I certainly anticipate that we will be coordinating our activities, given

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 that, as you rightly point out, some of our needs are
3 similar.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, I think it was last summer; there was an NYPD helicopter that collided with a drone that was on a PD night mission; are you familiar with that incident that took place?

HENRY JACKSON: I am not.

Wanted to know, just in terms of the current usage of drones, what we are doing like in instances where, you know we're colliding with drones -- the U.S. Open there was an individual that used it and it fell onto the arena, like things of that nature; what are we doing to prevent this from happening right now as we're having all of these conversations? Could you introduce yourself and hold on for one second; we have to do the oath?

JIMMY COAN: Good afternoon Chair Gibson and other council members. I'm Deputy Inspector Jimmy Coan, the Commanding Officer of the NYPD Aviation Unit; I'd like to answer... first, thank you for having me here today to be involved in this. I'd like to answer you question with regards to a collision. There was a near miss where a helicopter

2 had to take evasive actions to avoid an aerial

collision with a drone over the skies of New York
City, but there was no collision.

5 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So it was a near 6 miss?

also, with regards to your question about privacy, insofar as the NYPD is concerned, we do not have a drone, we have not tested drones, but we are always open to any methods or equipment that may be out there to enhance our capabilities, and when we looked at this and did a little research, we would just be looking at extending our current capabilities and then following all laws -- state, local, federal -- that are currently on the books that we currently follow. So our methods would not change at all and we would just use that for rescue operations.

[background comments]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So in reference to the near miss you just described, did you identify the owner of the drone?

JIMMY COAN: I believe the incident that you're talking about occurred over northern

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 Manhattan, up by the George Washington Bridge. Yes, 3 the… [interpose]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Close to the Bronx.

exactly which one we're talking about; it's very difficult to identify the owners; we have on several occasions and by basically visually tracking the device back to the operator, and these people pay big money for these things, they don't wanna lose them; eventually they have to retrieve them. We keep them under surveillance, coordinate with the ground units to come in and then conduct an investigation on the ground and if arrested is warranted, there will be one made, of course.

earlier hearing that this Committee, Public Safety
held last May in which our Deputy Commissioner of
Intelligence, John Miller, had talked about a
potential use of drones tied into ShotSpotter, which
is our gun detection system, and saying that it could
potentially be useful in helping officers identify
shooters as they're leaving the scene. ShotSpotter
would identify, you know the actual gunshot, but a
potential usage of drone could identify the shooter

2.2

2.3

2 leaving the scene. Do you have any response or anything on that?

JIMMY COAN: Okay, I was not privy to that, but again I will say that we are always looking for new equipment, new tactics, techniques and procedures to enhance our current capabilities to improve public safety here in New York.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. [background comments] I wanted to ask, and my colleagues who are the prime sponsors of the bills will probably delve into it a little bit more, but could each of you just talk about whether you support or have general concerns about the legislation proposed; Emergency Management, FD, as well as Port Authority?

HENRY JACKSON: I think we wanna give the FAA a little more time to come out with their rules; as you point out, there are a lot of complex issues here, and they're considering all sorts of different options for registration and licensing and flying them, so we wanna wait for the FAA to issue their regulations so that we can comply with those.

TIMOTHY HERLOCKER: For the FDNY, I think it's important that you realize that this is a useful tool to us and as you prepare your legislation, to

2 that so that, you know the public safety is

3 maintained?

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

25

THOMAS BOSCO: Well fortunately we do have eyes in the sky constantly, air traffic control personnel in the towers, our police officers and our field personnel on the airports are the eyes and ears and the first line of protection for us. Again, as stated in my testimony, when we do visually make contact with a UAV, the first call is to air traffic control to ascertain whether it has air traffic control clearance, if it does not; the supervisor is to continue to maintain contact with that drone, immediately call the Port Authority police and if at any time that drone poses an immediate threat to aircraft operations and the lives of the airtraveling public, then my field personnel are authorized to take action which includes the discharge of authorized firearms to bring that drone down.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Has that happened to date?

THOMAS BOSCO: No, fortunately, no.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And in your identification of that drone, the actual individual;

2.2

2.3

what would happen to that person in terms of legal action, law enforcement involvement of that individual that's operating the drone?

THOMAS BOSCO: Present we would have no way of identifying the owner of that drone and we would leave that up to law enforcement to track that.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. And the same question for NYPD. Just in terms of some of the incidents we've had recently, what types of charges are we looking at, like what types of action have been taken against the individuals to date?

JIMMY COAN: Alright, the department has...
we have the Administrative Code, we have the criminal
law; now we have not tracked the Administrative Code
relative to drones; however, public safety incidents
range from improper use of drones in neighborhoods to
operators navigating devices in and around our city's
airports and major sporting events; we've had one at
the U.S. Tennis Open, which was spoken about earlier,
other drones have come close to our aircraft. So
what we use is the Administrative Code for
unauthorized avigation, the criminal law, reckless
endangerment and we have charge obstruction of
government administration if it causes the police

the mechanics of the bills; we don't have that here,

administration might stand.

2.2

2.3

so we're denying the public the ability to have this
conversation and to go through it at a hearing. So
I'm gonna do my best to try to ask a few questions
about the bills and get a sense as to where the

But on the FAA issue, it sounds like the official position here is; we wanna wait for the FAA. So I will ask, you know how confident are you -- and this is really for OEM or maybe even for the Police Department -- that New York City's specific needs will be addressed by the FAA in this context of rulemaking as it relates to drones?

that they will recognize the needs of other localities and the benefits that these devices could provide us, and certainly, you know, the Fire Department has had conversations with the FAA in terms of their use case and the FAA has come to see demos there, so they seem interested in trying to work with us regarding this.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, so it's a hope. I mean of course the Fire Department example is essentially, put a camera on a pole that doesn't go anywhere; I mean I don't even understand how the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

FAA could possibly object to the Fire Department, you know using a camera much like it using already on the top of a building next door; it seems to me that this is the easy stuff; the tough stuff is whether we should allow governmental agencies, as you're expressing governmental agencies want to do, to use drones for their purposes; whether there should be any commercial uses for drones in New York City; what limits should we place on such uses. These are all questions that we have here in New York City that, you know, we don't know if the FAA; we may hope, but we don't know if they're actually gonna deal with Do you have any belief that anything that we have proposed here is necessarily in conflict with anything that the FAA might possibly come out with in their rules?

HENRY JACKSON: Again, you know there's lots of talk about what they're gonna do in terms of, you know, requiring people to have a pilot's license to fly them or register them, so there's just a lot of noise that hasn't been written down, and I know that they've been doing exhaustive studies on this and as I say, working with some of the localities to get some of these use cases right. So you know, we

certainly think that they will allow us to do these
things and that's why we're speaking with them.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So let us take the hypothetical situation, which is the reality now; the FAA has not acted and the FAA does not act or that the FAA act but leaves a carve-out for a local municipality like ours to make its own rules because we're a city of an extraordinary number of people with a high level of density and particular needs; let's take that example for a second. In that scenario, what rules do you believe should be in place for governmental entities to use drones that you have expressed in your testimony those agencies want to use drones?

HENRY JACKSON: I mean I couldn't say what the FAA is going to come up with; we... [interpose]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: No, no, no, this is a scenario in which we're saying the FAA has not acted. I'm asking you a scenario in which the FAA has not acted or they allow us to be like New York, to make its own rules. My question for you is; what does OEM think is an appropriate set of rules

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

governing government agencies for the purpose of
drone use?

HENRY JACKSON: Again, absent a process, you know, the FAA controls the airways and we're, you know, as I say, waiting for them to come up with some rules; if they made no decisions, we've been waiting very, you know patiently and doing our research; we may continue to do that so that we're not in violation of something in the future, but if there's a vacuum and absolutely no action, we might start to talk about what kinds of things we could do.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. So it's very clear to me that the administration has no opinion on this subject at this moment and is going to, as its priority, wait for federal action which may or may not take place and if at some point it becomes so clear that the FAA is not gonna act in a way that is in the interests of New York City or act at all, then and only then will we have this conversation; is that a fair assessment?

HENRY JACKSON: It seems prudent to do that, given all the variability in this area.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. Well I actually very strongly disagree with that and I think

HENRY JACKSON: By a city agency that would need a drone to go faster than what you recommend... [interpose]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. Do you see any reason why we should not have GPS tracking in connection with governmental drones?

HENRY JACKSON: I think that's an option on some drones; some have them, some don't; depends on which ones you get.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Yes, but my question is; should we as New York City require GPS on our own drones, to the extent they're being used, for the various purposes that you described in your testimony?

HENRY JACKSON: I wouldn't wanna opine on that, just 'cause I don't know what does to the cost or any other sort of associated issues with that.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: How about licensing by the user of the drone on behalf of the government of the City of New York?

HENRY JACKSON: I think that's something the FAA's looking at as well.

2.2

2.3

you know that if there is a use case, 'cause I

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

54

2 thought your legislation pointed only to the Police
3 Department...

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: No.

HENRY JACKSON: Oh, sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, so again, I would encourage you to take a look at the bill; it's 0589-A, and it prescribes -- just so that those who are interested and watching can understand -- that it requires the Department of Transportation to develop rules and regulations for agency drone use, not just for the Police Department, but it would require there be a fair amount of specificity, operator information, data collection plans, make, model, serial number, a route duration; post all of this information online, particularly for the non Police Department activity, so that the public knows that there is a public drone in use at a particular date and a particular time. So take a look at it and we'd like to ask you to respond to it, because this is important and I don't know if the City Council shares the view of the administration that we should wait and watch and hope that the federal government acts here.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.2

2.3

The last question that I will ask and then I will defer back to the chair and my colleagues is the question about the safety issues of drones. The Port Authority said very, very clearly that they are concerned, very concerned about drone use and the affect that it has on the airports. OEM we also count on to think about these questions on a more routine basis; not everything is right next to the airport, although much of New York City is in Class B airspace. What are you concerned about, OEM, from your perspective about unregulated drone use in New York City, beyond just the obvious impact of it flying into an airplane or a helicopter?

HENRY JACKSON: Well listen, just as everybody else here, we have lots of concerns about these devices in the wrong hands; we certainly care about safety and protecting the public and you know, we want the FAA to come out with these so that we can move forward and start implementing some of these initiatives.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. I'll leave it there, except to say that from a legal perspective, and I will end with this, we do not need to wait for the FAA for us to act here in New York

2.2

2.3

City and in my view we should not wait for the FAA to act, so we hope that we will aid you in getting some more clarity on this and we can do it locally, and I think that we're left without great clarity on the details of what the administration views on make, model, serial -- number of questions -- GPS technology for even governmental drones; not even the fact that we haven't even talked about commercial drones; we're essentially... you know, we don't have great feedback today, but we'll continue this conversation and we'll move forward. Thank you,

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much, Council Member Garodnick. I'm very proud to have my fellow co-chair here, the Chair of the Committee on Transportation, thank you Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez.

CO-CHAIRPERSON RODRIGUEZ: Thank you,
Chairman Gibson. First of all, I'm sorry that I am
late, but we were doing a ribbon cutting of Plaza De
Las Americas in Washington Heights with the DOT
commissioner.

Look, I think that no doubt that drones are part of our life and our question and concern is;

2 how can we guarantee that drones are used safely, 3 appropriately and in a way that respects the rights 4 of our residents. Drones have been, you know and will continue being very important for many sectors, for the film industry, for construction, for media 6 7 and for many residents who choose to enjoy the use of The question is; how can we live, you know 8 drones. in a society that we quarantee or that we do the best we can to be sure that we have a level of control. 10 11 And for me, you know we trust the administration, we 12 trust that those agencies responsible to oversee the 13 proliferation of drones are working 24/7, because on one hand, they are part of a new life of many sectors 14 15 in our society; on the other hand, they also come 16 with risk, and for me, that... you know, one of my 17 concerns is that, like especially knowing that we 18 have individuals in different part of the world always thinking about how to use technology not 19 20 necessarily for the good use. Like one of my 21 concerns is how much do you look at the danger that 2.2 we face in a society with a proliferation of drones. 2.3 How do you keep track on how many drones we have today and everything is local. We've gotta be 24 25 thinking about what the nation, but at the end of the

2.2

2.3

drones are important, is part of our life; they are important for many New Yorkers, especially for those sectors -- film, construction, media -- and is it right also that people should have, you know if they are able to get the license and know that they are using it in a controlled way in area they should have it, but our concern is about the safety of a city and how do we keep track on how many drones we have and how do we minimize that any drones end in the hand of those criminal individuals that can use it for a terrorist attack? [sic] Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,
Chair Rodriguez. And next we'll have one of the
prime sponsors, Council Member Paul Vallone.

Madame Chair. Kind of trying to bring us back in on where we are today and how we got here and how we're not really accomplishing anything. I can't tell you the amount of phone calls and emails that I've gotten on this topic for, against or just at least curious. Since we really haven't had any dialogue on this, I think if we didn't bring these bills forward we wouldn't be today, but I really don't wanna walk away from here today saying I don't know much else from

2 the administration or anyone else's side, when we have some really good beginning pieces of legislation 3 4 here. Now if we were to take the testimony that 5 we're just gonna wait for the FAA, it's not an answer that we can give as the Council back to our 6 7 constituents, to our communities and our families; there's just too many incidents and there are some 8 clear exemptions and you'll never see a bill from Councilman Vallone ever hindering the NYPD or the 10 11 FDNY or OEM in keeping our city safe. So as the 12 technology grows and the agencies need to take those 13 steps, we're all for that and that's why we need to have these dialogues to make sure these bills don't 14 15 touch that, but I know in ours we're talking about 16 the unregulated personal use of recreational UAVs, 17 and that's pretty much where the concern has led 18 today because that's where the term "the wild wild west" has been coming from. So for those listening 19 out there, what this bill is saying, what 0601 is 20 21 bringing forth, and if we just do it real quickly 2.2 we'll be able to get to the point. Under this bill, 2.3 under 0601, no person can fly a UAV under these conditions: with the intent to cause bodily harm or 24 25 damage or destroy property, equipped with a weapon or

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 61 dangerous instrument, regardless of perceived intent. Those two basic concepts is something that I would have hoped that we would have been able to agree with today and say there are pieces of these bills that we need to take the steps as New York City, the leading city of the world of what's going on in today's countries in the world, that we can take at least those steps and agree that if someone is caught that we give the tools to the NYPD and to our district attorneys for fines, regulations and at least on misdemeanors on our side and I would hope Albany would follow up with felonies. So I think Tom, you were the only one to actually talk about what someone's doing about anything and I think what I took away from the Port Authority's testimony is they could basically shoot it out of the sky, but we can't do that; sometimes it would be nice in New York City to say hey listen, we're just gonna take out what's in the sky, but we can't do that. So is there anything that we can put forward on the intentional use of an unauthorized, non-agency drone that we could agree today on this bill that we could start to

24

regulate, from anyone?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 62 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 2 HENRY JACKSON: I mean, you know we 3 certainly agree with that, you know that ... 4 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: See that's a 5 good first step. HENRY JACKSON: Thank you. 6 7 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: that's the first time you've said that before. 8 9 HENRY JACKSON: But you know, to legislate before the FAA comes out, because I know 10 11 they're concerned about the exact same thing... [crosstalk] 12 13 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: But you can see our frustration on that; I mean ... 14 15 HENRY JACKSON: No, I understand that. COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: how can we wait; 16 I can't... [crosstalk] 17 18 HENRY JACKSON: I know, but... and we've been in the same position, we've wanted to move on 19 some of these things, but we've had to be patient 20 because it is a complicated area and there are lots of 21 2.2 players and actors and technologies that are involved 23 in it, so that's why we're taking this cautious stance, 'cause we wanna get it right. 24

2 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Well no one disagrees that if the FAA does get their act together, 3 they will supersede and trump us, but if there are areas that are left for localities to provision for themselves, then these bills certainly aren't a waste of time; we can get them in place now; we don't have to wait for whenever the day they do act and we can 8 finally give ... and listen, what we're talking about here is fines of \$250 up to \$5,000 and we're talking 10 11 about a misdemeanor and we're not looking for little 12 Johnny who's flying in their back yard, we're looking 13 for someone... you know, the next time the Mets are in the World Series, and hopefully next year playing the 14 15 Yankees, I wanna make sure that Citi Field and Yankee 16 Stadium are protected; I wanna make sure that my schools and my students don't have drones flying over; 17 18 I don't wanna prohibit the news agencies, but today, every day I see another selfie, another person; what's 19 gonna... every one of these drones that are being sold 20 for the holiday season has surveillance equipment on 21 2.2 it and that's gonna be the next step and that's gonna 2.3 be a constitutional issue beyond this City Council, but there's gonna be some serious issues when somebody 24 25 starts using drones, flying in people's houses and

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 64 businesses and taking things and selling them to the 5:00 news and saying, oh we used it for news. didn't, it was personal use sold for profit. So we don't wanna hinder our news agencies, but the bills that I have are not that, they're personal use. So is there anything on the FDNY or the NYPD... right now you were saying reckless endangerment; is that basically 8 your only criminal tool that you have right now? JIMMY COAN: Right now the penal law, 10 reckless endangerment, and as I stated earlier, if it 11 12 impedes the course of the helicopter and the pilots 13 have to take evasive maneuvers or change the operation that they were doing, we would additionally charge 14 15 obstruction of governmental administration. But right now those are the tools that we have. Now we 16 appreciate any additional tools or tactics, techniques 17 18 or procedures that the Council can give us and we look forward to working with the Council and developing 19 that in the future. 20 21 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: See but I think that's exactly the dialogue I was looking for today 2.2 2.3 and I think Council Member Garodnick pointed that very clearly, as did the chairs; that those are the types 24 25 of steps we wanted to flush out today, as to what

24

25

would be acceptable, what would the NYPD see as the next step for a fineable offense for someone to be arrested for a misdemeanor or a possible Albany action to create a felony. Those are the steps that we're looking to see. Do you see now something that you do not have in your arsenal when someone is flying in restricted airspace, whether it's the Statue of 8 Liberty, the Freedom Towers, Citi Field, hospital; someplace within five miles. And the other part of 10 11 this bill, which is important for... it's five miles of 12 an airport, which basically knocks out New York City, 13 'cause we've got LaGuardia and we've got good old JFK. So this bill will affect every area of New York City 14 15 and that's why we have to ... just can't punt and wait 16 for the FAA, we have to talk about it, otherwise if this bill passes and it has the council member 17 18 support, unmanned UAVs will be banned in New York City, and we just can't sit back and say, FAA, we're 19 waiting. No, we need to talk about it now and make 20 sure that the good folks that are here telling us the 21 2.2 exemptions that we need to have we put them in the 2.3 bills.

So tell me about the misdemeanor and how would someone, if I flew my drone and now it went over

```
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH
1
    COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
                                                       66
   an NYPD, the 109 in my precinct and it was taking
   unauthorized surveillance of police vehicles coming in
   and out of the pound, what would happen?
                JIMMY COAN: What we would try and do is
5
   track that UAV, that drone, that unmanned aerial
6
   system and what we have typically done is, we launch a
   helicopter out, the pilots will acquire it visually;
   it only has a finite batter life; it has to return to
   the operator; the operator spent whatever he spent,
10
   $1,000-2,000; he wants to get his device back at the
11
12
   end of his expedition; we're aware of that, so we
13
   visually acquire it, we maintain a visual track on it
   and we follow it back to when the operator retrieves
14
15
   it. In the meantime we're coordinating with ground
   units to move into that area so that when we identify
16
   the person retrieving the device we can stop them and
17
18
   then if an arrest is warranted, certainly we will
   arrest them.
19
20
                COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: But that takes
   helicopter surveillance? You said that you were gonna
21
2.2
   launch a helicopter to...
2.3
                JIMMY COAN:
                             That's what members of my
   unit have done in the past. If we're able to do that
24
25
   surveillance with personnel that are on the ground,
```

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 67 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION that they see here's a device, there's a guy with a controller in his hand and he's flying the device back over and picking it up; then of course we don't have to launch a helicopter, but oftentimes these people are several blocks away and it's just not feasible to get enough personnel quickly into that area; the helicopter from up above will have a visual 8 representation of the entire neighborhood and they can see it move several blocks over to where the operator 10 is, and that's a tactic that we have employed in the 11 12 past, so we've had some success with it. 13 COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: Alright, so if you're able to track that operator, what happens next; 14 15 what are they charged with; what are they given; what fines are they open to; what criminal prosecution; 16 what have you? 17 18 JIMMY COAN: We charge under the penal law, the reckless endangerment felony; if the 19 aircraft had to take evasive maneuver, now it's 20 21 obstruction of government administration and we 2.2 charge the Administrative Code the summons, 2.3 unauthorized avigation and we notify the FAA and then the FAA will take civil sanctions against the person; 24

they can impose fines for a litany of ...

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: See I think that's where we can piggyback; I think that's where we can expand the fine-giving possibilities and the criminal misdemeanor side on New York City at what we can to define the areas that the public knows that if they violate these areas you're subject to these fines and these possible crimes, and I think that's where the uncertainty is today and that's what this hearing is about, as to where are these safe places, if any, and what will happen to me if I purchase a Now a lot of these things that Council Member Garodnick and Chairs and the Public Advocate and I are all talking about is not going after the person that's enjoying a moment with their son or their daughter; it's those... we are in New York City and there are bad guys out there and we wanna be able to make sure that we can do everything we do, outside of the Port Authority being able to shoot them down, that we can in New York City and I think that's the dialogue. So if there's... and I thank you for agreeing that the NYPD could use some extra tools; that's what we wanna do, we wanna be able to give the NYPD, the FDNY, our first responders, OEM, anyone that has the ability to enforce, to make sure that

2 people know New York City skies are not open; that

3 there are regulations and if you break those

4 regulations there will be fines and they will be

5 criminal and that's what we're gonna do today. So

6 | thank you very much, Madame Chair.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,
Council Member Vallone. And next we will have
Council Member Andy King.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Thank you, Madame
Chair. Good morning again; I thank you all for your
communication and your testimony today; I heard some
things and I liked some things I heard from the Port
Authority about, you know if there were unmanned
drones that they need to act swiftly to protect a
community or two, well I like to hear that. [sic]

But I wanna ask all of you; anyone can just chime in and answer the question any time; out of the four pieces of legislation that have been presented today, you're all familiar with all four of them; correct? Is there any one of them that you can say I support or I don't support?

TIMOTHY HERLOCKER: From the FDNY perspective, our concern is that we have a use model that we're putting forward; we don't want legislation

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

that's going to restrict us from doing that; we have
a legitimate life safety purpose behind this. Our
concern and our reason to be here today is to alert

5 you to the fact that we see this as a useful

6 technology and we want you to factor us into your

7 legislation and not prohibit our use and I think

8 sometimes it's a matter of the FDNY getting forward

9 and just reminding you that hey, this is a tool that

10 | we're looking at aggressively and I think we have a

11 reasoned and valuable approach toward using it.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Okay. NYPD, anybody else wanna chime in? [sic]

JIMMY COAN: From the NYPD perspective, we are cognizant of the needs of the public, but for us, we would just be looking at this as if we did go in this direction, which currently we don't have a drone and we're not in the process of getting a drone, but if we did look at this as a tool in the future, it would just be another tool in our arsenal of tools that we use to provide public safety and rescue operations; we would not want any further restrictions, just another tool from the Council to do our job in public safety for the people of New York City.

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER KING: 'Kay. Anyone else 3 wanna chime in? So with that being said, what piece of legislation or regulation would you construct or 4 5 help us construct, because as we start in this new age of technology and, you know these drones, how do 6 7 we have some regulation that we protect the privacy of the every day New Yorker, because that's one of 8 9 the major concerns; the resolution that I've submitted and talked about, making sure that the 10 11 unsavory character doesn't get a hold of a drone and 12 all of a sudden is spying on you when you're trying 13 to take a shower or just have a private moment with 14 your family, you know, how do we prevent all of that, 15 because we know with every good piece of technology 16 there's that bad entity out there who's gonna figure 17 how to use it for evil; how do we prevent that? HENRY JACKSON: I mean there are privacy 18 19

laws that exist right now that prohibit people from, you know, unduly surveilling someone, so we would rely on those until, again, the FAA acts and is more determined about it.

TIMOTHY HERLOCKER: From the FDNY perspective, we realize that with the use of drones comes a responsibility to protect personally

2 identifiable information; it's an obligation that

3 | we're going to have, but it's something that we're

4 going to have to address collectively between the

5 various agencies; I mean, our use model may be

6 different from the other agencies. But sir, you're

7 correct; privacy is an issue that we're going to have

8 to address as we move forward with these things and I

9 think somebody else mentioned that it's best that we

10 address it collectively.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Okay. Before I wrap up, I read a book about 25 years ago called "The New World Order" where they talk about the plan for the future and how they were gonna change the world and I'm watching some of this stuff come to fruition right now; some of it's a little scary, but I would like to know, 'cause even though NYPD does not have a drone that you're sharing with us today and you're not using drones, we know that government is using drones for whatever surveillances that they think they need to use it for; law enforcement, whether it's the U.S. Navy; whatever it is, so I'm asking you, in this day as we're transforming and we're moving forward and you're waiting for rules from Washington to come down before you really wanna take

2.2

2.3

a position, if you ever get to that stage, 'cause I foresee you probably will get there and we at the Council are gonna figure out how do we make some sense of it; that we all are protected, because I don't wanna be violated and I don't want... you know, you don't want your privacy out there as well; how would you be able to prevent your own system, and I' go to FDNY as well as NYPD; as you look into have your drones that do vertical, just to take pictures of fires, how do we make sure that some unscrupulous person that's inside your system doesn't violate your system?

have to create privacy policy that protects the public and is transparent to them, but the use model that we envision, I mean to be frank, doesn't really... it doesn't pose a big risk to the public. Keep in mind that, you know we're in the business of streaming live video of a building on fire to protect our own members as they operate on the roof and inside the building; we're pretty focused on the emergency, so we're really not in the business of collecting PII along the side of it. Secondly, you know, the fire event is such a loud, violent, open,

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, JOINTLY WITH 1 74 COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION 2 you know, operation that, you know, the idea that we 3 might be collecting something, certainly something 4 covertly, it just... it doesn't apply to it. So I guess what I'm saying is; we think as far as violating someone's privacy we're fairly risk-free; 6 7 doesn't mean that we aren't absolved of creating policy to make sure that we're protecting it and 8 we're working towards that. COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Can I hear from 10 11 NYPD or Port Authority? 12 TIMOTHY HERLOCKER: I'm with the FDNY, 13 sir. 14 COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Yeah, I'm saying, 15 can I hear from... thank you; can I hear from either 16 one of you also on that? JIMMY COAN: 'Kay, I didn't read that 17 18 book and I wish I had time to read books, and 19 certainly nobody wants to be looking at me in the 20 shower. [laugh] But we don't have a drone; we're 21 not looking at a drone program, but from what I have read and what I know as the commander of the Aviation 2.2 2.3 Unit; that would be or could be a fruitful piece of equipment in air sea rescue and searching for a 24

missing person in a park and we could cover a lot

2.2

2.3

currently employ.

more ground rapidly and maybe find that missing person and reunite them with their family. It would just be an extension of the capabilities that we already have; it just would enhance it and give us increased capability, which we currently use today. So I don't see how that rescue application would create any privacy issues, and we'd be cognizant of that, certainly and we would have to put management layers in place and procedures to be followed and proper supervision to ensure that proper procedures are followed so that an individual would not misuse that in any way, just like we do with what we

wrap up, and I wanna thank you all again today and as we move forward in this, I'm looking forward to us all working together and make sure... because there has to be some regulation; you know, I'm pretty sure Home Depot and Target never thought about someone raiding their whole system and getting people's stuff out there, hackers are out there every day trying to figure out how to get into stuff and flip the world upside down, so we can't be naïve; if we put drones up there because it might be good on one end that

right?

2 JIMMY COAN: That's correct.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Thank you.

And we also have joined with us Council Member Rory

Lancman and next for a question we have Council

Member Jimmy Vacca.

COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Just briefly. I wanted to ask; do you maintain at this point that we are preempted by federal law from taking any action? We keep hearing wait for the FAA; is this something you'd like us to do or are we prohibited from... in your view; are we prohibited from acting?

HENRY JACKSON: I don't know; I'm not a lawyer, it just seems to make sense to let them sort of lay out what their vision is and then, you know, accommodate it.

COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: What is their timetable for action; is there a date by which they will act or must act; is there a timetable that they have that we should be aware of?

HENRY JACKSON: I understand that it's imminent that they're gonna release some information, but then there's a period where it gets reviewed by the public, so implementation may be off, but I think that we'll start to see rules hopefully soon.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Well my

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

understanding also is that there is a task force that will be releasing a report, but then there will be a review process by the FAA, there will be public input; there will be a process in place for some time, so that is what concerns me, is that we are here at a hearing on legislative bills and we don't have a position from the administration on these bills and I don't see, if we're not preempted, what would be the reason for New York City not taking action if it was in the best interest of the people that we represent. In fact, we've been in the vanguard of taking action legislatively over the course of many years and much of the legislation we've passed here has served as a model for other cities and states, so it concerns me because, you know basically this has turned out to be an informative hearing and I appreciate the information; much of the information I could've gotten from the internet. We are here as a legislative body; our function is to do oversight or legislation; we came, the agenda was clear, there is proposed legislation and I don't think that the proposed legislation has been addressed, except for the answer that we should

2 all wait for the federal government to take action

3 whenever they take action. Especially in this day

4 and age, with all that's going on and how New York

5 City sits here sometimes as a target for many, I

6 would think that certain use of drones would want to

7 be addressed by the City of New York, and I'm

disappointed in the lack of response today,

9 basically.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

MENRY JACKSON: Well, as we have said, I mean we're here to talk about agency use to enhance our operations and that's what we've done and we haven't been doing anything; I mean we've been doing the research that we can, working with the FAA, working with partners to be ready when those regulations are provided.

council Member Vacca: Well again, I express my... my concern... Let me use one last word; is this legislation, your opinion, premature? Do you consider this premature or do you think that the legislation is not warranted; is not appropriate? What terminology do you use? I know you don't have an official position, but why is there not an official position?

3

4

1

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

HENRY JACKSON: [background comments] road... what the rules of the road are before we start heading down that road and the FAA owns that airspace and what they do is gonna be impactful.

COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: But under the ... I

hate to be a little historic in this; under the rules of federalism, which founded this country, under the rules of federalism we as a city or a state can take action as long as we have the jurisdiction and power to do so; we cannot do that if we're precluded by the federal government. So if we take action and the federal government takes a different action, which perhaps imposes more stringent regulations; our actions are sustained, as long as we're not legally precluded. We are allowed to take action in this case, it appears to me and it seems like there's a reticence or there is just an inability to communicate with this body today and that preparation should have been done; we expected a position, and a position could've been that there are good parts of the bill and not so good parts of the bill and we are willing to work with you, or we feel this bill is totally unacceptable; that's a position I would've understood, whether I agreed or disagreed; I just

2 think today's position leaves it to whoever,

3 wherever, whenever and that's not acceptable to me.

Thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,

Council Member Vacca. And as we go to the next

panel, certainly this council is working with you and

looking forward to not only... [background comments]

Council Member Lancman.

Madame Chairwoman. Sorry I've come to this hearing late. I just wanna understand a couple of things maybe a little bit better. The gentleman from the... the Port Authority's representative in this panel.

Yeah. So I was just reviewing the testimony and it's Port Authority policy that if a Port Authority police officer or law enforcement official sees a drone or a UAV that is operating that could potentially be hazardous is authorized to shoot it down, to discharge a firearm to shoot that drone down?

THOMAS BOSCO: Yes. First of all, let me tell you that it's the field supervisors; not the police. Our field supervisors are already qualified and trained, FAA approved to detect, identify and fire on wildlife, such as large birds if they pose a

2 threat to aircraft arrivals and departures, and so

3 the guidance to the field supervisors is to treat a

4 drone as if it were a large bird.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: What's the protocol, 'cause you know, what goes up will come down and I wasn't aware that the Port Authority had a policy of firing weapons at birds up in the air.

What are the guidelines; I mean what if the trajectory of the round is... if the person firing misses, and I apologize if this was covered already, is over a populated area; this is raising concerns to me that... [interpose]

THOMAS BOSCO: Let me try to alleviate those concerns, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Thank you.

THOMAS BOSCO: First of all, the weapons that the wildlife supervisors use are shotguns that use ammunition that have an effective range of 40 yards. These individuals are trained, again under an FAA approved training course curriculum to identify the threat, if it indeed is a threat, and to fire on that target, be it a large bird or a drone, but they first have to consider what's in the range of their

2.2

2.3

weapon, whether that be people or equipment and they
make the necessary decision then and there.

just hope that those guidelines and those protocols are very tightly drafted and the people called upon to exercise that authority are appropriately trained and you know give consideration to the fact that again, what goes up will come down.

THOMAS BOSCO: We've been doing it for decades.

my last question, just to the representatives from the City, as I understand it, there are no drones that are currently being deployed by the City and if at some point though there... is it a determination that's gonna be made agency by agency or is there some agency within city government that has the final say so as to whether Parks or Buildings or FDNY can use drones and under what standards?

HENRY JACKSON: So yeah, currently no agencies are deploying drones other than what the Fire Department talked about with a test case, with their use case, and the Mayor's Office would likely

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

weigh in on deployment of drones by agencies in priority fashion.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much,

Council Member Lancman and I think what he was asking
is similar to what I was saying; one of the bills,

Council Member Garodnick's bill, that would allow for
city agency use would also incorporate a plan of
action, so if DOT, DOB, EM is going to use drones,
what is the actual plan, and you know, what we're
trying to understand is, if an individual agency
wants to use drones, would there be a coordinated
approach that would be uniform so who ultimately has
the final say if that drone is going to be used; is
it the commissioner of the agency or would this be
some other level?

HENRY JACKSON: We haven't set that process up yet, so I don't know, but likely the commissioner and the Mayor's Office.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So we are looking forward to working with; certainly we have to have a lot of conversations, but you know the bottom line is, there have been too many... anything greater than zero is more than enough for me of incidents

[pause]

24

25

Tandon School of Engineering.

Jon Ollwerther is here; right...?

3 [crosstalk]

2.2

2.3

JON OLLWERTHER: Yes.

Okay. Angela, okay. Flo? [background comment]
Okay and Benjamin. [background comment] Got it.
Okay. And we have, as I said, a limited time; our
hearing will commence at one, so if each of you could
just either summarize your remarks, but there will be
a three limit time. So thank you so much for being
here and we'll begin with Jon. Thank you so much.

JON OLLWERTHER: Chairpersons Gibson and Rodriguez and members of the Committee on Public Safety and Transportation, thank you for having me here today; it's my honor to speak before you.

My name is Jon Ollwerther; I'm a New York
City resident and CMO of Aerobo. Aerobo is a drone
services company based in the burgeoning tech hub of
Industry City in Brooklyn. Our staff designs, builds
and operates drones for business clients such as
movie studios, commercial producers and TV news
networks. Aerobo is an NYC company through and
through; co-founders Brian Streem and Jeff Brink
graduated from NYU Tisch School of the Arts and began

2 their career working in the film industry in NYC,

3 were funded by NYC investors in tech, finance and

4 entertainment and were staffed by NYC residents who

5 went to NYC schools and are making their careers in

6 NYC and their families in NYC.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Three years ago, when the word drone held little meaning for most of the American population, co-founders Brian Streem and Jeff Brink began their American dream. Recent film school grads, Streem and Brink honed in on the opportunity and promise that unmanned aerial technology held for the filmmaking They'd both seen a YouTube video of someone world. flying a tiny camera on a small quad copter; surely, they thought, if someone could fly a tiny camera on a small drone, then they could fly a cinema camera on a big drone. The co-founders recognized that drones could enable a cinematographer to move a camera through three-dimensional space in new and beautiful ways with precise control. Furthermore, they saw that the technology would empower filmmakers to achieve their artistic vision while preserving human life. Manned aerial vehicles, chiefly helicopters, represent the leading cause of death in film and TV production.

2.2

2.3

The budding entrepreneurs pulled their savings, formed our company and began searching for a drone to carry large Hollywood cameras. Their search took them worldwide, but after testing many systems they were left empty handed. Left with no off-the-shelf option, they did what any entrepreneur would do; they set out to create a drone to fly large cameras; they drew from academic and aerospace circles and assembled and hired a team of engineers. Today we employ sales professionals, we employ aeronautical engineers and we employ experienced drone pilots; we work all over the world, from the 50 states to Dubai, to Chernobyl, to the jungles of East Asia, but we're proud to New York City our home.

UAV operators in the United States are currently subject to a myriad of rules requirements and protocols pursuant to FAA regs; operators are required to secure certificates of authorization and plans of activity with local FAA offices and file notices to airmen. A commercial UAV operator must also employ an FAA-licensed manned aviation pilot to fly their vehicles.

Aerobo has regular requests from filmmakers, TV producers and commercial agencies

looking to operate drones for projects in New York

City, but due to FAA regulations we simply cannot

serve [bell] their requests.

In conclusion, all United States
navigable airspace, including New York City is
subject to FAA regulations; furthermore, most of New
York City is essentially a no-fly zone for commercial
operators because of FAA regulations already in
place.

Chairpersons Gibson and Rodriguez and members of the Committee, this concludes my statement; I look forward to answering any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much; almost perfect, right on time. Thank you. David Donovan. Okay. Thank you.

DAVID DONOVAN: Thank you, Chairperson

Gibson and Chairman Rodriguez; I'm honored to be here
today. My name is David Donovan; I'm President of
the New York State Broadcasters Association,
representing more than 400 television and radio
stations across the state and also including just
about every radio and television station in New York
City.

2.2

2.3

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I wanna have a conversation, because this a delicate balance; broadcasters every day fly news helicopters; we are concerned with the safety aspects that are raised in your bill, because we don't want our own folks to be placed in danger. At the same time I would ask you as we have this dialogue that we also consider two other aspects that I think are important here. First is the important first amendment implications about gathering news and the public's right to know. The second thing is, is that drones, or UAVs, in the context of commercial use, live broadcasters, have the ability to help public safety officials, particularly in the context of emergencies. And if I could, let me just go through some very quick examples and provide you with I think some suggestions for the legislation that you have before us.

UAVs are another tool and can have significant benefits to the public, whether it's providing a different perspective on the five boroughs or your communities, whether it's actually being able to provide information over fires or hazardous spills or areas which current on-the-street reporters cannot gain access to; whether it's a

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

concerns here.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION terrorist attack or an event covering multiple areas throughout the city. In many respects, UAVs may be safer than fixed-wing or helicopter aircraft in order to provide information about that area. But we're also first and foremost, and what I mean by first and foremost is that during emergencies local broadcasters help connect public safety officials to the community and give the community the ability to hear the public safety officials; it's been recognized by Craig Fugate of FEMA; it's been recognized in a number of other areas, and the ability to use a UAV for journalistic purposes during news emergencies I think would be very helpful and also used responsibly; again, I do understand the

If you go through the proposed legislation, there are just some things we need to consider. We can get into a discussion with the FAA; I know the FAA, in fact today, just released some of their registration procedures for further discussion, but if I look at the proposed legislation, there are a couple of things that concern me. One is that for commercial purposes it bans the ability to use [bell] for surveillance purposes, and if you look at the

definition of surveillance, it could become very

3 restrictive on the ability to cover news events, and

4 I'd like to have a further discussion with you on

5 | that. Bottom line; what I would like to suggest is

6 because we are licensed by the federal government to

7 serve our communities, that as we're crafting

8 | legislation we recognize that and perhaps create

9 exemptions for any entity or their network that is

10 | licensed by the federal government, by the Federal

11 | Communications Commission. Thank you very much and I

12 do enjoy and look forward to a discussion.

13 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much.

14 Thank you. Angela.

1

24

ANGELA MIELE: Thank you, Committee

16 Chairs. My name is Angela Miele; I'm with the Motion

17 Picture Association of America.

18 This is an exciting time for motion

19 picture and television industry; new technology is

20 | helping moviemakers and broadcasters push creative

21 | boundaries and create the kinds of scenes and shots

22 | we could've only imagined a few years ago. I'm here

23 | to urge amendments to all three pending intros to

provide for precise commercial use exceptions for

25 | those companies authorized by the FAA to legally

2.2

2.3

operate UAVs. Specific exceptions have been made in both the cities of Los Angeles and Chicago when they recently looked at this issue; we'd be happy to provide that to the members.

The FAA imposes very strict safety
guidelines for these UAV operators; it's especially
true with respect to motion picture and the
television industry, which you just heard about. The
FAA requirements include 20 pages of safety and
technical restrictions imposed by the FAA when UAVs
are filming. What I just wanna go through, because I
heard this was asked for before; we've identified
some of the concerns with the specific legislative
measures.

With respect to 0589-A, the operators are required to have a separate license from the City of New York; we just think that's duplicative because the FAA requires us and if we're required to do that for filming and the FAA, it could delay, depending on who's doing that approval process.

Also requires operators to get a permit from DOT and the FAA has already this approved plan; all these separate permit requirements could be problematic. I know the issue of speed was raised

2.2

2.3

flexibility.

before; the speed talks about 25 miles an hour; the

FAA speed is 50 knots, about 57 miles an hour; not

that we would use that all the time, but we want that

for creative purposes, so we'd like to have that

Intro 0601-A limits UAVs to those areas specifically designated by commissioner of Parks and Recreation; again, we want that creative opportunity to go elsewhere. Also, it sets forth additional limits on flights that may be inconsistent with FAA, like whether... well whether they'd want that opportunity, but nighttime; there could be some changes made coming in the new regulations.

Intro 0614 requires registration; we already have that registration requirement, and some of the tags that are required by that, if you start having different jurisdictions require tags, you have a camera; where are those tags gonna be, and those are all registered through the FAA and they're required by them as well; so they'll know where they are, they have to do the flight plans; it is very detailed that they're required to have. So I look forward to working with you on these amendments to ensure that all these FAA-authorized UAV operators

2 | are allowed to use for filming and news-gathering.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to be here and be happy to answer any questions.

[bell]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much.

7 | Thank you. Flo Brown.

2.2

2.3

FLO BROWN: Yes.

ANGELA MIELE: Oh, here.

I'm here on behalf of the New York Production
Alliance, and association with the producers, unions,
guilds, payroll companies, stages and vendors in the
New York State film, television and commercial
industries. Our 64 members, from multimillion
companies and union and labor and independent film,
commercial producers represent hundreds of thousands
of New Yorkers and NYPA's diverse membership shares a
common goal to secure the continued health of film,
television production in our state and specifically
to New York City.

Today I'm here to discuss this whole legislation to prohibit the use of unmanned aerial vehicles in the City of New York. NYPA supports the MPAA's contention that the current FAA guidelines

regarding the UAVs are sufficient in ensuring the
proper use of this technology on film production
sets. NYPA and the MPAA share the City Council's
concerns over the proposed use of this new
technology; however, we want to ensure its use under
the exemptions currently existing in the FAA

quidelines for filmmakers working in New York City.

The current FAA quidelines for UAVs already have strict limits on their use in New York City; nonetheless, the guidelines also allow for exemptions for the use of this technology on film sets under carefully controlled settings. exemptions have allowed a balance between security; something that we all desire, and the ability to use this technology on our projects. It is worth noting that although the UAV is a new technology that already vendors and technicians making use of it on our film sets do so under the strictest safety precautions. Flight paths are carefully choreographed to ensure the safety of production personnel and anyone in the surrounding area. operators have spotters who help track the UAVs while they are in use to be sure they are on a prearranged

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 fight path to alert the operators of any unforeseen 3 obstructions or person.

NYPA's members, for the most part, we live and work in New York City; we have a vested interest in the safety of our streets and we do not wanna see the misuse of this technology or for those who intend to harm people or simply be careless. Our members who produce film and television shows have a long history of utilizing all manner of technologies [bell] to creatively capture images. For decades we have utilized airplanes and helicopters in filming in New York; we mount cameras on giant cranes and fastmoving automobiles. Any of us working in the city have taken the greatest care to ensure the safety of crew and general public in all of these shooting styles; we employ the same level of care in the use of UAVs. Through the combination of our own oversight and the current FAA guidelines, we can assure the City Council that the safest use of UAVs will be on film sets in New York City. We would demand nothing less from ourselves and it is also worth noting that we are perhaps the only industry in the city which has an active police presence on our productions; this is something we benefit from, but

activities that have been acknowledged as important

2 and useful, applications of this technology would
3 exist.

At the School of Engineering our students, faculty and researchers use UAVs for research and educational purposes and importantly, we also incorporate this technology in our extensive K12 STEM learning programs for middle and high school students and teachers. Over more than a decade of this work we've trained hundreds of teachers in engineering and computer science and research methods and worked directly with thousands of New York City public school students, supported by the National Science Foundation, philanthropic foundations and corporations.

Our engineering students and researches often experiment with UAVs in innovative and exciting ways, enhancing their educational experiences, developing future technology and furthering scientific inquiry. The hands-on training students receive from fabricating, assembling and programming UAVs, including the research that can be conducted when flying one, is invaluable to their understanding of a constantly evolving engineering field.

2.2

2.3

This technology sits along with other interactive devices at a fascinating intersection of disciplines that encompass mechanical engineering, electrical engineering and computer science. The application of these technologies from smart cities' ideas for controlling traffic and inspecting civil infrastructure to monitoring and testing for pollutants and contaminants need to be explored and developed by responsible students and researchers.

In our education program it is precisely this intersection of disciplines and these kinds of applications that most deeply engage young people and their teachers in STEM learning. The ability to design, build, test and iterate is at the core of activity-based teaching and learning and at the core of engineering research. We urge you to consider these factors as they pertain to the pending legislation.

Some interesting ways our students have used UAVs is through environmental monitoring experiments; a mechanical engineering lab at our university is currently developing a high school curriculum based on UAV technology, using the real tools of scientists and engineers, micro controllers,

2.2

2.3

schools.

motors, actuators; sensors, while illuminating and applying fundamental concepts in physics,
aerodynamics and wireless communication, not only
[bell] the programming required to control a UAV,
whether it's for sensor and based data acquisition
and analysis or for its very control delve deeply
into computer and computational science, which we

know is a big emphasis now in the city's public

The rest of the written testimony is provided for you; we have some specific concerns regarding registration, make and issues surrounding that because of devices that may be built in classrooms or in our lab and similarly regarding height restrictions and time of day. So thank you very much for your attention; I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much to each of you who are here; thank you for your testimony and for providing your input; your concerns. I wanna acknowledge we've been joined by Council Member David Greenfield and Council Member Chaim Deutsch; thank you colleagues for being here.

So I just have three questions that I'm gonna throw out at the panel, because of all of you

talk about your frequent usage of drones. So I wanted to know how many do you use, do you own, the sizes of the drones and also, are you required or do you notify local law enforcement when you're using them; is there a system; do you have an agreement in

place; how does that work with your usage of drones?

JON OLLWERTHER: So why don't I field that one. We own upwards of a dozen drones; they range in size from the tiniest micro drone weighing less than 2 kilograms up to the FAA limit of 55 pounds. These are always flown in compliance with FAA Section 333 Exemption Requirements; we are required to file flight plans, plans of activity, certificates of authorization and NOTAMs, Notices to Airmen, for every flight we conduct and that's required to be filed 24 hours in advance.

To date, when we're flying somewhere that is outside of the norm or in a more populated area, we do touch base with local PD and often we have interactions on-set or on the scene of a story where local PD will come around, stop by in their car; we'll take the drone down, show it to them; let them touch it and they say hey, that's pretty cool; we

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

anyone who would be conducting this type of activity as well.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. So you said that when you notify the FAA you also notify the local police department as well...

JON OLLWERTHER: We try to do that informally, whether it's reaching out by telephone or stopping an officer on the street and saying hey, here's what's going on and here's what we're up to.

Of note and record though, we've conducted only two commercial flights in New York City; the first was in Brooklyn in August and that was the first legal commercial drone flight since FAA Section 333 came out, and the second was actually in the 2nd Avenue subway tunnel at 72nd Street, so that was 150' underground and not of concern to the FAA.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay. Anyone else?

Thank you. Okay, let me get to my colleagues,

Council Member Andy King, followed by Council Member

Paul Vallone.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Just wanna be real brief, but thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you for the work that you're doing in the music... uh music industry; in... excuse me, in the movie industry. My

2 question is; I'd like to know, on the proposed

3 regulations that were proposed today; do any of those

4 pieces of legislation hinder your bottom line

5 | financially; how does it have an impact on the monies

6 that you might receive if we regulate the usage of

7 drones?

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

[background comments]

DAVID DONOVAN: I'll kinda address at least part of that, sir and then I'll let the folks from the movie production industry, although our interests overlap in many respects. One of the concerns I have as drafted is that both bills prohibit commercial entities, which are New York broadcasters or city broadcasters, from monitoring or close observation of an individual, group of individuals without the knowledge and consent of such individual or group of individuals. In effect what that does; it significantly limits our ability to provide news on a daily basis, but certainly during emergencies; let me just sort of walk you through that.

A couple of examples come to mind.

Recently there were problems with laser pointers; it

hit helicopters, now a news helicopter also got hit

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and the news helicopter zeroed in on where that problem was, and as a result of that, that person, the police were able to work with that, you know, find that person; clearly a hazard to navigation and an issue. But as drafted, while I could do that with a helicopter, that would be considered illegal surveillance under the bill. An example in Boston, during the bombing, Tsarnaev brothers, you were able to use news helicopters to see where that person was, but under the terms of this bill this would be considered surveillance, we think, at least as interpreted. So I think to the bottom line of your question, is that unless changed or unless we work certain things out, there are a number of newsrelated activities that may be precluded from using a UAV for and we would ask ... and does that affect our bottom line? In the end, we're in the news business, and would that affect our bottom line? Yes. more importantly, it also affects the ability of the public's right to know what's going on around them and there are certain things that we can do with UAVs that you just can't get the same perspective from an on-the-street reporter. You can't get the same perspective from a helicopter, although ironically,

2 many of the activities that I think would be

3 precluded under these bills you could do with a

4 helicopter and a telephoto lens. So I think there

5 has to be a discussion here as to how we move forward

6 | with legitimate first amendment interests of

7 providing news and at the same time dealing with

8 issues of privacy. I think the bills, the language

9 of the bills may be a little bit overbroad and I

10 think we need to work on that.

1

11

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Okay.

BENJAMIN ESNER: And I would just note,

on the noncommercial side, for education and

14 research, requirements around liability insurance,

15 registration of a make and a model, when you might

16 have built that device in your lab, those do add time

17 | and cost; research is conducted with National Science

18 | Foundation funding; other funding [bell], so while we

19 | have no particular commercial interest in terms of

20 revenue and profit, it certainly does impact both

21 what we can do on the education side, at the

22 | undergraduate and graduate level, as well as the K12

23 | level, and in addition, what our researchers might be

24 able to do in terms of determining new applications

25 and new uses for the technology.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I would just... Angela Miele 2 ANGELA MIELE: 3 with the Motion Picture Association. I would just 4 add; you can't quantify it now, but as I read the intros as currently drafted, it could delay the filming process and we know how costly that can be on 6 a daily basis, so if you're required to get certain... 7 8 you've already gotten the FAA approval; if you're 9 then required to get a permit, a tag, certification from several different City agencies; if it's not 10 11 streamlined it could be problematic and cost in that 12 respect.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Okay. Well my time seems to be expiring on me, so thank you, Madame Chair; I'm just gonna take... I wanna say to you all, 'cause I wanna know; is the use of drones gonna eliminate jobs, 'cause I understand people in helicopters and cameras, but if we're gonna trade them out for drones one day, I don't know if you... [interpose]

ANGELA MIELE: Supplement... I think it'll supplement, [background comments] yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER KING: Okay. So I'm gonna ask you all, in the essence of my time is done, to be mindful of why we came up with these pieces of

2.2

2.3

legislation, because there is the flip side of people who are not doing right and I know your job is to come here to advocate for your position, but I'm asking you to be real respectful on both sides to the coin because, you know, we cannot keep continuing to go on and being oblivious that there is a world that we're living in where people are taking this technology and using it not for the greater good.

[background comment]

[background comment] Alright, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Council Member King, and next we'll have Council Member Vallone, followed by Council Member Garodnick.

even our brief conversations this morning, David and Angela; I think that's how we can come with good amendments and changes, but it doesn't take away from the public safety aspect, which is the real reason of why I put in our bill and why I feel that New York City has a higher obligation above any other place in the world, and even your panel didn't really get to that. We were talking about protecting the interests of who we represent and I think that's where the amendments come in, but we need... your first sentence

2 today was striking the balance and we didn't talk about the balance, we just talked about protecting. 3 4 So if news agencies are exempt and commercial exempt and educational purposes are exempt, there's also an 5 area for abuse of that or someone saying well I was 6 7 filming a private movie and I'm gonna use this ... there's going to be a conversation way beyond today's 8 9 hearing, especially on the constitutional side, but in the meantime, I'll be damned if we don't do what 10 11 we need to do in New York City to keep us safe, and 12 all I see is what's happening in the world and every 13 paper with a news helicopter getting targeted and unsafe situations by our airports; that's not me, 14 15 with a family and children that feels comfortable and 16 we don't wanna hinder the other areas of what you 17 represent, which is very important, so I think ... yes, 18 I just wanted to say I look forward to working with 19 each of you to make these the best they can be while 20 FAA just sits there and does whatever they're gonna 21 do, but in the meantime, they haven't done anything, 2.2 so not doing anything is not how I was brought up; 2.3 gotta do something, and I think with your input on this, and I think we can get to a good place, and 24 25 then we can always amend to tweak it, but we need to

considerations and I just wanted to acknowledge that; that we're open of course to discussion and finding the right way to create exemptions for research and education that make everyone in the city comfortable.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: And I think that's a perfect point, 'cause that might not have been something we were thinking about; to make sure that the exemption. [sic]

JON OLLWERTHER: And our standpoint on the issue is that we should be governing the behavior; not the technology. You know, if we are concerned about privacy, then maybe we should tell Canon and Nikon to stop making lenses; Apple to stop selling phones. So we're very much in favor of governing the behavior, which in many cases already has... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: It's the action; you have to be held accountable for the action, how you...

JON OLLWERTHER: Correct, that's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER VALLONE: I think that's...

that's where the NYPD is looking for additional

tools, to be able to make sure that if someone goes

2.2

2.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

above and beyond what they're supposed to be doing,
there's gonna be [bell] accountability. Thank you.

[background comment]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much;
Council Member Dan Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Madame Chair. And let me just follow up on a couple of points. First of all, it's worth noting that the bill that I introduced initially was a much stricter bill; in fact it would have eliminated, you know most commercial uses; we have recognized here the importance of some limited commercial uses and have added in a permissive ability to use drones for commercial purposes in New York City; I will note that the response from industry in the first instance was, you know a ban is too excessive and now we have a licensing or permitting requirement and the response is that that is duplicative, so it feels like we are perhaps damned if you do, damned if you don't here, but I do think that we need to come up with a set of rules that make sense. Once question that I have for you all who are engaged with the FAA on a permissive basis for various opportunities here is; what's the enforceability of those rules where

2 the FAA grants you permission to use a drone for

3 | limited commercial purposes; you get the... I forgot

4 exactly what the number was... you get the approval;

5 you go ahead and you fly your drone; let's say you

6 break all of the rules, you use it far too long or

7 differently than specified; what is the

8 enforceability of that rule; how does that get

9 enforced?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

JON OLLWERTHER: So there is great recent example in the case of SkyPan; SkyPan was fined \$1.9 million; it's pending, but the FAA has some teeth on this and they've shown willingness to enforce this in civil cases.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, I'm sorry; I didn't understand that, sir.

JON OLLWERTHER: Sure.

and we'll look at that case. How does the NYPD know whether or not you've had the approval; if they see a drone flying above overhead, whether it's a news gatherer or it's a motion picture or, you know, other purposes; how does NYPD look up there and say, gosh, you know, that is an authorized drone, pursuant to FAA section whatever or not?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

fly.

JON OLLWERTHER: All of our drones have 2 3 what's known as an N number or a tail number; it's 4 the same thing that you have on a plane; it's 5 actually registered by the same mechanism that an airplane or a helicopter is. So that tail number is 6 7 like a license plate for a drone; NYPD can look that 8 up; it's public information; you can Google it, you 9 can look it up on the FAA's website and see to which operator it is licensed; you can also ask us for our 10 11 333 exemption, our COA, you know, any of the 12 documentation that goes along with that permission to

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And that is what the FAA requires; that you put that tail number on the drone?

JON OLLWERTHER: That's correct, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So we are of course exploring something similar here in New York City for government agencies that wish to use drones and also for commercial entities that wish to use drones; we know that you [bell] all view this to be duplicative, in light of the fact that you have to do certain things for the FAA, but I would also just ask for some recognition that New York City and the

Our next panel is Jaami Ali, Targeted

Individual Awareness Campaign and Rashida Richardson

from New York Civil Liberties Union. [pause] Thank

you; you may begin. Yes. Press the button; make

sure your mic is on; you'll see the red light.

JAAMI ALI: Hello.

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 CHAIRPERSON GIR

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Oh, much better.

Thanks... [crosstalk]

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

JAAMI ALI: Okay. So my name is Jaami Ali and this is what I have to say for the record.

So during the April 23rd, 2013 U.S.

Senate Judiciary Hearing on drones, Rosa Brooks of the Georgetown University Law School and former Pentagon adviser to rule of law and human rights, stated that there were major implications as for claims that the executive branch can kill anyone any time, anywhere for secret reasons by undisclosed officials. Now we've had terrorists plots carried out, but the U.S. did not use drones which can be operated with finite precision and has not been used to deliver assaults to enemies of the state; still thinking about Rosa Brooks. Now if we look at the DOD directive 5541, we learn that the intelligence agencies, like the Pentagon, executes human experimentation and electronic surveillance on Americans without their consent for an ongoing period of time and drones are tools that facilitate those aims.

Now Lockheed Martin, a DOD contractor, developed nano; it's catchphrase is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

nanotechnology offers the promise of a new dimension in innovation that we have not seen; that's the phrase that most nano researchers agree with. If you don't know, nano is about 10,000th a size in measurement, less than the size of a strand of hair and nano had the ability to reengineer DNA, shapeshift material; be used as an operating system in its size. To see what I mean, I encourage you to look at YouTube video titled "Nanosculpting." What Lockheed Martin does is exploit nanotechnologies to its fullest extent; I should say, what Lockheed Martin does is exploit nanotechnology capabilities to its fullest extent and it develops a large percent of it for DOD. Now remember, DOD performs nonconsensual human experimentation on people and they survey people with drones.

But let's go back to Rosa Brooks, the

Pentagon adviser talking about executive overreach;

it hits home. I'm one of those human experimentee

victims that was subjected to drones, nanotechnology

and directed energy technology, and so is Alexandra

McDonald and many other U.S. citizens who say they

are being assaulted by direct and energy weapons for

behavior modification and racial cleansing. Now I

2 know the city cannot override executive order or 3 overreach; [bell] however, the language in the

proposed legislation needs to factor in that

executive overreach has a domestic impact. As such,

6 language needs to be included to accommodate for that

7 | overreach, especially if there is no justification

8 for that experimentation. As such, agencies need to

9 accommodate for this, and as the executive branch

10 uses drones for secret reasons, my complaints as a

11 | victim of electronic harassment, remote body

12 modification for trafficking and pain issued for what

13 I believe is for racial cleansing cannot be ignored.

14 Now let me tell you, I've worked for the City of New

15 York... [crosstalk]

1

4

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you.

JAAMI ALI: as a public servant [bell] for six years and I have a master's degree, and for some reason in 2013, the same time that Rosa Brooks spoke about government overreach with regards to drones, I was targeted. Look at this lady; she says that directed energy weapons and lasers from drones are deteriorating her skin; her name is Alexandra McDonald; this is her neck, this is her upper neck,

drones are being used to hit her 2-year-old child,

dispute that certain uses of UAVs pose a significant

risk to public safety and that the regulation of surveillance technology is needed. However, UAVs also facilitate investigative expressive activities that are protected under the Federal Constitution and the Constitution of New York State. It is the position of the NYCLU therefore that any regulation of emerging surveillance technology such as UAVs must balance government interest in protecting public safety with the obligation of government to protect civil liberties. While UAVs are not yet routinely used by law enforcement or other government agencies, it is not merely speculative to anticipate that unregulated of UAVs can lead to the invasion of personal privacy.

We support proposed Resolution No. 0057-A and Intro. No. 0589-A because the proposed legislation seeks to protect civil rights and civil liberties while recognizing government's interest in utilizing UAV technology to protect public safety. The proposed resolution and bill are also consistent with national legislation regarding UAVs and with guidance from the Department of Justice regarding government use of UAVs.

2.2

2.3

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

residents.

1

Intro. 0614 proposes a UAV identification tag registration process and insurance for all UAVs. Providing accountability for UAV operators through some kind of registration process may make sense, however, lawmakers must ensure that the process does not violate first amendment rights of New York City

Media coverage of UAV crashes demonstrate that unregulated use poses a variety of public safety concerns, but this media attention fails to acknowledge the constitutionally protected uses of UAVs that benefit the public; in fact, the registration process outlined in Intro. 0614 would likely have a chilling affect on constitutionally protected speech. Considered that most photograph and video recordings that document misconduct by government officials, from unreasonable use of force by police, to [inaudible] by educators, to government corruption by politicians are not created by the press, but rather members of the public; hence, this constitutionally protected conduct may necessitate a level of anonymity that would not be possible under the proposed regulatory scheme.

In light of the breadth of this legislation, we encourage the Council to consider tailoring regulations to the manner that protects first amendment and other constitutional rights.

Proposed Intro. 0607 seeks to criminalize the use of UAVs in a number of situations and we encourage the Council to reconsider these proposals [bell] and the fact that there are existing criminal penalties and tort laws that would protect against these prohibited uses. And I'll stop now, but I also have testimony or at least comments relating to preemption issues that the Council had been interested in.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Yes, we have it.

Thank you so much. Thank you ladies for being here and providing your testimony; we appreciate it and certainly thank you for your presence today. Thank you very much.

RASHIDA RICHARDSON: Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Our next and last panel for this hearing is Lawrence Brinker from NUAIR Alliance; Brendan Schulman from DJI Technology, Inc.; Julie Samuels from Engine; Anthony Pansini from AMA

2.2

2.3

2 and Staten Island Radio Control Modelers, and Richard 3 Hanson from the Academy of Model Aeronautics.

[pause] Are you ready? Mr. Brinker, you may begin.

LAWRENCE BRINKER: Thank you, Chairperson Rodriguez; Chairperson Gibson and members of the committee. On behalf of our over 70 public, private and academic partners in NUAIR Alliance, I thank you for the opportunity to be heard on this transformative technology issue.

As background, NUAIR Alliance is a New York not-for-profit corporation that manages the congressionally mandated, federal aviation authorized, Griffiss International Airport unmanned aerial systems test site. One of only six such test sites in the nation, New York happens to be one of them. Six such test sites in the nation; we provide the UAS Flight Safety data gathered at our UAS test ranges in New York, Massachusetts and Michigan to FAA and NASA; that data informs these agencies' regulatory research and development efforts toward fully integrating civil and commercial use of UAS into the national airspace system.

Further, NUAIR Alliance promotes and encourages the economic development of the UAS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

industry sector in New York through public education in many and very beneficial civil and commercial uses of UAS, as well as development of public-private partnerships to advance the civil and commercial growth of unmanned systems. Accordingly, we respectfully request the committees to consider the following information before deciding on any of these initiatives before the committee. One, operation of all aircraft in the national airspace system is the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. State or local governments do not have authority to regulate the airspace or the aircraft that fly in; UAS is an aircraft, it is not a bird, with this operation regulated exclusively by the Federal Aviation Administration. The UAS is only a tool; how a person uses that tool is already governed by all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations; there is no need to make a special law Singling out UAS for disparate legal for UAS. treatment makes the use of the technology more difficult for routinely using UAS for its many and varied beneficial uses. For example, law enforcement is already required to have a warrant for a particular action; it is the proposed action by law

2.2

2.3

enforcement that requires the warrant, not the tool
the law enforcement agency is using to conduct the
surveillance; let's not make it more difficult for
law enforcement or anyone to use the UAS to all of
its beneficial uses it can perform by establishing
arbitrary special rules. If a criminal uses a hammer
to commit burglary, we don't ban hammers or levy
special qualifications for the use of the hammer; we
punish the lawbreaker that used the hammer in a
criminal manner.

The President of the United States on
February the 15th set up a stakeholder group in
Washington, D.C. to establish best practices that has
to do with civil liberties protection, civil rights
protection and the democratic domestic use of
unmanned aircraft systems. In speaking with one of
the committee members, they will be publishing their
report in January; I suggest that before you take up
the issue of privacy and how you're going to protect
or deal with the privacy issues, you wait for that
report, and since I only have five seconds left to
go, the practical reason [bell] that aviation in
America and around the world is governed by federal
standards is simple; the freedom to fly across state

with the integration of UAS.

and local government boundaries, not having to worry about complying with a patchwork of law underneath the aircraft permits that tool to be efficient, effective and cost-effective and safe. The remotely piloted aircraft system is an aircraft; it must be treated like an aircraft and simply an addition to our national airspace system; national airspace governance by the FAA brought us the safest aviation system in the world; the FAA will do the same thing

It is a myth that operation of UAS are not currently regulated; FAA regulations require all UAS to comply with all existing federal aviation regulations or have a waiver or exemption to compliance with that regulation granted by FAA.

Currently the FAA... [interpose]

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Can you summarize the last part for me, roughly?

LAWRENCE BRINKER: Sure. Let me just say this; the test site has been operating since the end of 2013 on behalf of the FAA to assist with the integration under national airspace system; I would encourage you to use your New York test site to

2.2

2.3

comments] I spent my entire 15-year legal career practicing in New York City, first at Cravath, Swaine & Moore and then at Kramer Naftalis & Frankel, where I founded the country's very first UAV legal practice

group. I'm currently serving on the FAA Registration

17 Task Force, whose report was just released today.

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Questions about how to balance public safety and privacy concerns with the enormous benefits of UAVs have been the focus of my work for the past 3 years. Thank you very much for this opportunity.

The benefits of unmanned aircraft are by now well known, but New York City stands to gain in particular; with New York's rich history of

2 filmmaking and photography, UAV tools become new

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3 vantage points for the world's most photogenic city.

4 New York's density is also ideal for using small UAVs

5 for surveying infrastructure and building inspection,

6 including in connection with Local Law 11 that

7 requires building façade inspection every 5 years.

Our company has already been asked to provide UAV demonstrations to two of the city's largest agencies who already see tremendous benefits to their work. Also, in terms of recreational and hobbyist use, New York hosted this year the first New York City Drone Film Festival, sponsored by NBC, which brought filmmakers from 19 countries here and received over 300 million media impressions. September, at the New York Hall of Science in Queens, DJI sponsored the Drone Zone Exhibit at the World Maker Faire Show that was by far the most popular of the entire event, and that was an event that was attended by 95,000 people, including thousands of school children. It was amazing really to see those children's faces light up when they saw the flying drones and the races that we had going on there.

New York is also the city that I have been planning to make the location of DJI's east

2.2

2.3

coast headquarters and I've already toured dozens of potential Manhattan locations in so-called Silicon Alley. We plan to invest in New York City and we also care about people, who like me, live or work here. I am familiar with a handful of reported incidents in New York in the past few months and we're very concerned about public safety, but it would be a tremendous loss if a few uninformed, irresponsible people who have generated alarmist headlines, combined with what seems to be fundamental misunderstandings about the technology cause all those benefits we've heard about today to be lost to the city.

I have with me here today our Phantom 3; this is arguably the most popular consumer and commercial UAV in the world; this is what you're proposing to regulate. It weighs less than 3 pounds, about the same as the countless seagulls that fly around the city, and includes dozens of safety features, which are listed in my written testimony, including automatic return to home in the event of a signal loss or a low battery, it has a maximum altitude feature, it has GPS-based geofencing, which helps restrict operation of the drone near airports

2 and FAA flight restriction areas, including when

3 there's a Yankees or Mets game. We provide education

4 to our customers via online videos, in-person new

5 pilot experiences and a flight [bell] simulator, as

6 | well as an FAA-approved know before you fly product

7 insert across all brands; there are millions of these

8 | flying and I've yet to hear of a serious injury

9 anywhere in the world.

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I'm very concerned with what I see in the proposals; the dozens of restrictions, licenses, registration, permits, pre-flight and post-flight administrative requirements and criminal penalties; these basically say to the world that New York City is no place for UAV technology and if you remove the word UAV from those proposals and ask people what is this about, I think they might think it's about guns or toxic chemicals or something serious like that.

My more specific comments about the proposals are set out in my written submission and I respectfully propose the formation of a working group; I would be delighted to work with members of the Council and your staff on a balanced approach, one that accounts for the legal framework that the aviation field is preempted by the federal

2.2

2.3

government. Together we can work on making New York

City not only a leader in public safety, but also in

this exciting new technology. Thank you; I'm happy

to take your questions.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much. Thank you. Next; Miss Samuels.

JULIE SAMUELS: Thank you very much for having me today; I will be brief in my comments.

I run an organization called Engine; we work with the startup community here in New York and across the country, connecting high-tech, high-growth startups with policymakers and New York City is such an incredibly exciting place right now, for those in the startup community, for those in the tech industry. A 2014 study done by Abney found that the New York City tech industry has created 141,000 jobs and is responsible for more than 12% of the city's total tax revenue. From 2003 through 2013 the New York City tech ecosystem employment has grown by 18%, New York City's economy grew by 12%, while the economy for the full country grew by just 4%.

Also, the creation of one high-tech job is predicted to create 4.3 other jobs in the local economy and most importantly, new firms, startups,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

create all net new job growth in the United States; we want that job growth to be happening here in New York City, so we want to incentivize innovation here, we want to incentivize tech growth; we want to attract hobbyists, who know the most about these technologies, all of which is to say we should be careful as we think about regulating drones to ensure that we are attracting companies to get started here, because if we implement prohibitions, which should be the last resort, we are sending a much larger message basically saying, don't come here, don't innovate here; go somewhere else, and it is important for all the reasons we've heard today; drone technology can be so important, smart cities and I think that we want to not only incentivize those uses here, but incentivize those companies to come here. The impact of these rules may seem limited to a specific industry, but they in fact could set a precedent far beyond just that industry that would make New York City decidedly unappealing to both new startups and existing technology companies.

So with that I would encourage the Council to take the time to ensure that we are not going too far at the outset. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRPERSON GIBSON:

2.2

2.3

And Mr. Pansini.

ANTHONY PANSINI: Good afternoon,

Chairperson Gibson and Council. My name's Anthony

Pansini; I'm the President of the Staten Island Radio

Control Modelers. I've been safely flying radio
controlled airplanes in New York City for over 30

years; my club has held a Parks permit to fly in

Latourette Park for around 40 years and we have a

great relationship with NYPD and the Parks

Department.

I understand and agree with the Council's concerns that it should not be legal for UAVs to fly amongst city buildings, over people, in close proximity to airports or invade people's privacy.

Members of my club have never done any of those things because we abide by the safety and privacy codes of the Academy of Model Aeronautics. However, in the light of the upcoming federal requirement for the registration of UAVs, which is due out in December, I think it would be redundant and unnecessarily onerous on us to be required to also register at the local level. I was told that one of the main objects of these bills is for local law

at one level of government.

2.2

2.3

enforcement to have the ability to identify the pilot of a UAV flying in the city and NYPD will be able to do that through the federal database. Even full-scale manned aircraft are only required to register

If the Council still feels the necessity to require local registration, I think the AMA members who fly at designated fields on New York City parks land in a safe and responsible manner, as we have for decades, should be exempted from the registration process. As AMA members, we all have our AMA numbers on our aircraft and we would agree to a requirement to that effect, if the Council would allow that.

Regarding the insurance requirement in 0614, a prerequisite of joining my flying club is membership in the AMA; therefore, every member of my flying club carries \$2.5 million of liability insurance through the AMA and we have separate flying site insurance through the AMA that names New York City Parks Department as the insured. Because of this, I feel that AMA members flying in designated areas in New York City parks should be exempted from carrying a separate additional insurance policy. My

2 club has held the permit to fly in Latourette for

around 40 years and every year, as part of the

4 permitting process, we supply the Parks Department

5 with a copy of the insurance policy that names them

6 as the insured.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

And some comments I have -- In 0601-A, UAVs are not mentioned until Section 1, Paragraph H, on Page 4; it seems that Paragraphs B through G pertain only to full-scale manned aircraft; if this is correct, I am fine with them; if not, Section 2, Paragraph B directs the commissioner, and I assume that's the Parks commissioner, to designate certain parks where UAVs may be flown, but Paragraph C of Section 1 specifies places designated by DOT or Port Authority for taking off and landing and it seems to be a contradiction. [bell] And also, Paragraph G has wording regarding reporting to police an accident involving serious damage to the aircraft; does that mean if my model plan flips over on the ground during takeoff and breaks, I have to report that to the police? It seems a little much. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you very much.

25 And Mr. Hanson.

RICHARD HANSON: Thank you very much,

Madame Chairperson Gibson and members of the Council.

My name is Richard Hanson; I represent the Academy of Model Aeronautics that Mr. Pansini just mentioned; I am their Government Regulatory Affairs Director.

In the interest of time, and I know we're getting short to the end of the day here, I'll not read my written comments; I'll provide those to you for your future use, and they pretty much mirror Mr. Pansini's comments in terms of support of model aircraft activity within the City of New York.

I would like to mention, however, something that may not be well-known, as far as the prevalence of model aircraft in terms of their existence in the airspace for well over 100 years.

AMA was founded back in 1936; for nearly 8 decades now model aircraft enthusiasts have operated safely and responsibly within our airspaces; more importantly within our communities; they're not only a harmonious activity, but they're also an enrichment to the community and to the members of that community.

Interestingly enough, the City of New 2 York is actually a benchmark in model aircraft 3 4 history; the very first model aircraft club that we're aware of was founded in 1908 by Emma Lillian Todd, who is the first woman of flight; she founded 6 7 the Junior Aero Club for boys here in the City of New 8 York to recognize young men that had an aptitude or an interest in aeronautics and there has been a presence in model aircraft activity in the form of 10 11 AMA-chartered clubs since that time, especially since 12 1936, when the AMA was founded. So we would 13 certainly ask that you take into consideration this particular community, their safe history and their 14 15 contribution to the community.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: [background comments] Thank you so much and obviously, for the sake of time we will not be able to ask questions, but we do have all of your testimony and certainly the recommendations you have provided we will certainly take into consideration and I thank you for being here and thank you for brining a drone as well. Could we see how it works? No, never mind; just joking.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE	ON	PUBLIC	SAFETY,	JOINTLY	WITH
COMMITTEE	ON	TRANSPO	ORTATION		

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: No, no, no, no. But thank you all for being here; thank you to all of my colleagues; thank you to my co-chair, Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez for co-chairing this hearing; we will have another hearing at 1:00, which will be the Committee on Education here in the chambers. thank you so much to all the staff and certainly to the sergeant at arms; thank you for having us today and this hearing... [background comment] I also want to acknowledge that we have received testimony for the record from the New York Metropolitan Retail Association, as well as Consumer Technology Association for the record regarding this hearing. This joint hearing for the Committees on Public Safety and Transportation is hereby adjourned.

[gavel]

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date December 7, 2015