

Hello,

My name is Michael Carlini, and I am the founder of Southern Oregon Drone, an aerial imaging company that uses UAS technology. I recently read through House Bill 3049 and I wanted to share with you some insight from someone who will be directly impacted by this bill.

Real quick, I want to establish some credibility for you. I received my BS in Business Administration from the University of Oregon in 2014 and my FAA Part 107 Remote Pilot License in September of 2016. I am also have a Commercial Airplane Pilot's License, and I am Multi-engine and Instrument Rated, so I've got a decent background in aviation knowledge, safety, and regulations. In 2015 I founded my business, Southern Oregon Drone, and quickly grew the business using my own skills and resources. My client portfolio includes Garmin, Lexus, HGTV, Knife River Corp, and Harry & David, to name a few. Though the UAS industry is still young, I've been around a relatively long time and have adapted as the FAA has sought to keep up with the explosive growth of the industry.

Getting right to it, I do not fly my UAS over private property to spy or violate privacy of others anymore than a small corporate jet or large airliner flies over private property to do so. I fly over private property because I need to position my UAS in such a way that I can film or photograph my subject according to my paying client's needs. For example, I get quite a bit of work filming aerial videos for real estate listings, like [this](#). If I couldn't fly over private property, I couldn't do much more than point the camera straight down to film the property directly below me. Ask any real estate agent, and they will tell you the surrounding area is extremely important, so it is critical that I fly over private property so I can film from an angle to capture the surrounding area. Without that ability, my client gets nothing more than a moving map, which is fairly useless. And don't even think about telling a production company about this limitation; they'd forget about investing in Oregon for all future aerial shots in a hot second.

To expand on how this bill won't be effective, the FAA allows me to fly up to 400 feet above ground. If this bill were to pass, its completely ineffective because I could place a 300mm zoom lens on my drone's camera and spy from hundreds of feet away and it would be completely legal. I could also rent an airplane or helicopter.

When I fly over private property, I am as courteous as possible. I do not fly any lower than I need to, and I get the shot as fast as possible, minimizing the time spent over private property. No one is more sensitive to this than I am, because I am a fairly shy, introverted people-pleaser. I truly do everything I can to avoid making people upset with me. Having said that, I know that occasionally flying over private property for a brief moment does no harm to anyone, and does not reveal any information or data that is not already accessible to the general public via google maps or something like an airplane or helicopter.

I have completed just over 120 jobs over the course of 2 years throughout the entire state of Oregon, and only twice have I had to deal with someone who accused me of spying or peeping on them. I do not believe this issue is in ANY way whatsoever an "emergency" as stated by the bill. What IS an emergency is the fact that people are not doing their own research and actually learning real facts - they simply take whatever money-making headlines the media spews out as facts, and then bills like this get created based off of fear and a lack of understanding.

Representative Huffman, the sponsor of this bill, told me that various law enforcement offices have received hundreds of complaints about drones. There are undoubtedly a few legitimate cases of malevolent invasion of privacy or spying, but I would be willing to wager the majority of those cases are from the types of people I mentioned above, who make these calls based off of a fear and a lack of understanding.

If this bill can't be stamped out, I would implore you to immediately make available a waiver that would provide exception to this proposed law for legitimate and responsible operators such as myself. The Federal Aviation Administration met with the best and brightest all over the country to craft the rules for 14 CFR Part 107 with a goal to protect citizens while doing their best to encourage economic and commercial growth in this industry. From someone who responsibly operates under these rules every day, I have to say, they did a terrific job. **If a rule like the one proposed in bill 3049 had been deemed wise, it would be a Federal Regulation today.** There is a reason you don't see this kind of rule in the FARs. It does more harm than good.

I just turned 24 years old and I have created a profitable, legal, and responsible business that is paying off my student loans and covering my bills. Bill 3049 will directly impact my business and ability to make my payments, and will more than likely force me to shut it down because I will not be able to provide clients with what they need. This bill will result in, at the very least, one less entrepreneur and job in the state of Oregon.

Please consider the effects of this bill on responsible, law-abiding citizens who are contributing to society and the economy.

All the best,

Michael Carlini
SouthernOregonDrone.net
[541.326.1745](tel:541.326.1745)