

What are/will be the annual operating costs for the UAVs?

Assuming no mishaps requiring major repair occur, would need to replace batteries and props now and then, est. \$600/year (Per manufacturer)

PLUS Personnel time to maintain currency requirements (Still in state of flux but some time may be required each month on simulator and/or actual UAV). Estimated 4 hrs./month time/pilot.

What research was done which led us to this particular UAV?

The Deputy Director, LEI, and other staff were invited to attend a meeting in Maryland, hosted by the Navy, regarding UAVs in the summer of 2005. After this meeting, contacts were made with other law enforcement agencies that were considering using this equipment. LEI additionally contacted several manufacturers, U. S. Army NATICK, National Institute of Justice, former Special Forces personnel, read articles in the media and met with FS Fire and Aviation Management personnel, who were also researching the use of UAV's. LEI also met with the DARPA UAV project manager. LEI's Technical Investigative Branch recommended we purchase the Sky Seer UAV after conducting further inquiry into this matter.

What if any tests were done with this or any other UAV?

Chang Industry conducted extensive testing in restricted airspace and spent three years in development. The U.S. Army researched, selected and purchased a Sky Seer for a local contractor performing contract work on their behalf. We thought this would help us get support from the manufacturer and provide a local expert on their use to compare notes with. The Los Angeles Sheriff's Office Technology Exploration Unit was testing and considering purchase of the Sky Seer also and an article was published in *Popular Science* about it. Later in 2007 the FAA took some LE agencies to task for flying without authorization and re-interpreted their rules, making them very restrictive and daunting for most LE agencies. The military has been using and testing UAV's for at least 30 years.

What other agencies use UAVs? Did we utilize them for advice, etc.?

At the time of our purchase, several agencies were considering UAV use but none were using them to the best of our knowledge. The Interagency Airspace Coordinator told us the USFS could be the first to meet FAA rules and use the UAV's legally. Even at this date, 1 ½ years later, we are told only two domestic LE agencies (Miami/Dade and Houston PD) have applied for Certificates of Authorization with the FAA and those are for research purposes only. This is not a reflection on actual needs or capabilities of the UAV's but a response to the very restrictive FAA posture released August, 2007 on their use by Government Agencies. We cannot speak to the use of UAV's by other federal LE agencies.

Did LEI research the privacy issues re: UAVs?

We were not aware of any legal or privacy constraints that would preclude the use of a UAV in Class G Airspace. The Sky Seer is not a Predator. It is a four-pound plane with no zoom capability that was designed to *recognize* criminal activity and at best, *classify* criminal activity. It is not capable of *identifying* individuals like a security camera. It is functionally similar to a camera looking at a very large parking lot with stick figures moving around. At best, operated at the lowest AGL in good lighting it may distinguish between males and females and provide some gross detail of clothing and whether the person is visibly armed.

How did LEI get the idea to utilize UAVs

The idea has been floating around since Operation Linebacker, a Border Enforcement Initiative which took place 1996-99 in San Diego County. FS LE technical support personnel were detailed to work with the Border Patrol and assist LEI with the initiative and the idea developed in the context of the challenges observed in San Diego County on the Cleveland NF. We thought if we did not take a hard look at the technology, critics would take us to task and ask why were **not** examining safer, more cost-effective alternatives to placing officers in jeopardy; why we were not re-evaluating the use of easily detectable, expensive full-sized aircraft; and why we were not considering the use of new methods to identify drug operations and other criminal activities when conventional methods fall short and nothing else works.