



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JAMES HARRIS		PHONE NUMBER: 573-761-7875	
REPRESENTING: STATE ARMOR ACTION		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 122 EAST HIGH STREET, SUITE 200			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: SCOTT SHTOFMAN		PHONE NUMBER: 469-964-7887	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ASSOCIATION FOR UNCREWED VEHICLE SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL (AUVSI)		TITLE: DIRECTOR GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS	
ADDRESS: 3100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 1200			
CITY: ARLINGTON		STATE: VA	ZIP: 22201
EMAIL: sshtofman@auvsi.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 5:30 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

April 2, 2024 Representative Schnelting Representative Allen Representative Barnes 201 W Capitol Ave
Special Committee on Homeland Security Joint Hearing Room 117 Jefferson City, MO 65101 RE:
SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL 1415, WITH MODIFICATIONS Special Committee on Homeland Security, We
are reaching out today on HB 1415, Establishes the “Unmanned Aerial Systems Security Act of
2024” The Association for Uncrewed Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI) is the world's largest
nonprofit organization dedicated to the advancement of uncrewed systems and robotics, representing
corporations and professionals from more than sixty countries involved in industry, government, and
academia. AUVSI houses the Partnership for Drone Competitiveness, a coalition of U.S. drone and
drone component manufacturers and enterprise users who are committed to strengthening the U.S.
drone industry. Uncrewed aircraft systems (UAS) are relied upon by public safety agencies for
numerous critical operations. These operations are inherently security sensitive, and this measure can
help ensure the high levels of cyber-security these operations necessitate. While we support the
measure's intent, we urge the Committee to consider: 1. Limit the definition of “drone” to an
“unmanned aircraft” As a multi-domain association, we work with members developing and using
robotics across ground, water, and air. Drones a reasonably defined in statute currently at the federal
level, so creating a new broad definition here would be confusing. Currently, “The term “unmanned
aircraft” means an aircraft that is operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from
within or on the aircraft” For these reasons, we urge the committee to strike “, watercraft, or ground
vehicle or a robotic device” from lines 11 and 12. 2. Clearly split a restriction on procurement from a
restriction on usage Currently, the bill is confusing on the dividing line between use and procurement
as outlined in 524.558 Sections 1 and 2. The inclusion of the phrase “or otherwise use” seems to
implicate current usage of covered systems, as opposed to not barring usage until July 1, 2027, as
stipulated in 524.558 Section 2. We support the operational transition period of approximately 39-
months, depending on when the bill is passed. This accurately accounts for the life cycle of a sUAS
and provides public safety agencies with the time needed to properly transition their fleet with as little
difficulty as possible. Based on feedback we have received from the public safety community; we
encourage the Committee to clearly consider bifurcating procurement restriction and usage
restrictions. We further encourage the Committee to tie this bill to a potential grant program to provide
UAS to law enforcement and fire departments. This recognizes the investment many public safety
agencies have already made in their drone programs and allows them to transition to cyber-secure
UAS without additional monetary investment. We also support the requirement for transparency for
schools and government agencies that want to use the exceptions. This measure prohibits the
purchase of UAS from countries of concern, specifically China, and Russia, among others. This

measure is a necessary step to protect the security of Missouri and its critical infrastructure. The use of non-secure drones, specifically those from China, raises serious concerns of national security and safety. This security threat has already been affirmed at the federal level, with the American Security Drone Act (ASDA) prohibiting federal agencies from using non-secure drones for these cybersecurity reasons. Additionally, earlier this year the FBI and the Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) released a memo noting that, in the interest of national security, organizations collecting sensitive information, including critical infrastructure owners and operators, must shift away from unsecure PRC drones and reliance on foreign supply chains. Due to the inherent sensitive nature of public safety use, it is imperative that these agencies make this shift as well. With a clear transition period, and the consideration of an associated grant program bill, Chapter 542 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri becomes a rational, tailored measure that protects national security and recognizes the needs of the public safety community. The combination of the phase-out period and grant program will prevent the overnight end to programs and give public safety agencies the flexibility needed to do their jobs, transition their fleets, and ensure the security and safety of Connecticut's infrastructure. The security threat that PRC and other non-secure drones pose is very real. With these modifications to HB 1415, Missouri is taking the necessary steps to protect its infrastructure, while providing first responders with the tools they need to do their jobs. We appreciate your consideration of our views and welcome the opportunity to address any questions you may have about implementation, policy, or development regarding this bill in Connecticut. Respectfully, Scott Shtofman AUVS Director
Government Affairs



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: arniedienoff@mail.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person		SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 11:49 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I am Opposed to this Bill. United States Drone Manufactures do not have the Security and Encryption necessary to safely protect transmission of the flight. Law Enforcement Agencies and Witnesses heard through Committee Testimony have proper protocols and acceptable practices to ensure confidentiality and protections of parties affected. Defeat this Bill!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: AUSTIN KING		PHONE NUMBER: 314-301-9201	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SAINT LOUIS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: POLICE OFFICER	
ADDRESS: 1915 OLIVE			
CITY: SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63103
EMAIL: asking@slmpd.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/30/2024 6:52 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Thank you for the opportunity to give my testimony in opposition to MO HB 1415. My name is Austin King. I am a Police Officer with the Saint Louis Metropolitan Police Department. I am also a member our full time SWAT team and am the lead drone operator within the unit. Our unit frequently uses drones in a tactical capacity during high risk SWAT operations. I am deeply concerned with HB 1415 and the consequences of it becoming law. We have used aerial drones during tactical operations for over 2 years now and have utilized them in a wide variety of circumstances. From barricaded criminal suspects, to hostage rescue operations, or simply a high risk search warrant raid, drones have been an invaluable resource. We have experience flying drones made by Brinc (a new upstart American drone company, based in Las Vegas) and DJI (a long standing, international commercial drone company based out of China.) We have been very underwhelmed with the drone which was purchased from Brinc. We have, on the contrary, been very satisfied with our two Avata drones purchased from DJI. These drones are used to clear structures and suspicious objects to prevent risk to a Police Officer who would traditionally have needed to have been placed in harm's way. The safety and real time intelligence benefit they provide cannot be overstated. We have explored many companies and their drones, and found that DJI is by far the best drone provider for our mission. In my experience; the performance, reliability, quality of hardware and software and overall craftsmanship is far superior in DJI drones than in any other commercial drone provider in the world. Lately, there has been considerable anxiety regarding government entities purchasing and utilizing drones made in China. The concern is that because of the CCP's habit of siphoning information from technologies they sell, American interests will be compromised due to law enforcement's utilization of these drones. I can confidently say to you that this fear, in regard to DJI drones, is completely unsubstantiated and baseless. There has been absolutely zero evidence to suggest that DJI drones pose an intelligence risk. DJI drones had been commonly used for years by Green Beret special forces, in top secret clandestine missions overseas. If there was a legitimate security concern, that would have never been approved by the DOD or CIA. DJI drones are frequently used by IDF (Israeli Defense Forces) in Gaza. DJI drones are also commonly used by Ukrainian special forces in their conflict with Russia. If they posed an intelligence risk, doesn't it stand to reason that China (Russia's ally) would be giving the Russians that information? No such outcome has occurred. As a law enforcement Officer and as a patriotic American, I fully acknowledge and share the concern of the CCP's influence. However, in this particular field, there has been not a shred of evidence that DJI drones have been compromised. The real purpose of this bill is not to secure American interests and safeguard against China's influence. The real reason for this bill is to stifle free market competition, to allow American drone manufacturers to dominate the domestic market. American drone companies have lobbied their legislators to outlaw DJI drones so they don't have to compete with them. DJI is consistently the number 1 best seller of

commercial drones. Domestic drones like Brinc don't sell as well as DJI. Instead of creating a better product to compete with them in a free market, they are trying to outlaw the competition. This is a concerning motive and is frankly, un-American. These domestic companies are preying on the fear of Chinese influence, taking advantage of the public's naivete on the subject, in order to corner the domestic market. It would be like Ford lobbying for Toyota to be banned simply because it's a Japanese company. St. Louis is frequently listed as one of the top 15 most dangerous cities in the world. The job of law enforcement today is harder than ever. We need every tool and bit of modern technology to help level the playing field. To take away one of our most valuable assets, (DJI drones) would have serious consequences in the SLMPD's ability to safely and effectively mitigate high risk situations and stand offs. I cannot express enough how necessary these drones are in the rapidly evolving world of law enforcement. I would once again point out the underhanded, un-American lobbying efforts of these American drone companies such as Brinc, as they are in opposition to the principles of a free market. DJI drones are the best quality product in the commercial drone market and are an essential asset to SLMPD SWAT's operations. Thank you.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: BOB MUENZ CHIEF OF POLICE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: bmuenz@bluespringsgov.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2024 10:10 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

The proposed bill would have a devastating effect on emergency services providers that use drones to help protect the public. Both Law Enforcement and Fire services have used this technology to save citizen's lives and protect first responders. This bill would create huge financial issues as well as cripple if not eliminate this valuable tool for first responders. At a time when our agency (the Blue Springs Police Department) is using every bit of valuable technology to cover personnel shortages and protect hardworking officers, the removal of good equipment from our arsenal of tools is not a good idea.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: BRET HILL		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: bret.w.hill@gmail.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2024 10:26 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Sir/Ma'am, Let me start by saying I have no financial ties to DJI or the drone industry. I am employed by a law enforcement agency and lead a drone team that frequently utilizes DJI drones during search and rescue missions, SWAT operations, and other law enforcement related activities. DJI is currently the primary manufacturer of drones used in most drone teams around Missouri. These drones are used by law enforcement agencies, search and rescue teams, fire departments, and many other groups charged with protecting the safety of our citizens. These teams, and the DJI drones they use, have saved many lives. Just a couple weeks ago I used one of our drones to locate a person suffering a mental health crisis. The person was suicidal and had swam across a creek while trying to make his way to the Missouri River in an attempt to drown himself. Without the DJI drone equipped with a thermal camera, we would not been able to locate him and he likely would've died from Hypothermia. His body temperature was measured by emergency medical personnel as 87 degrees. This is just one example of what these drones are used for on a daily basis all across our state. Grounding these drones would prevent life-saving operations like these from taking place. Banning DJI drones is not the answer. I've heard people suggest replacing DJI drones with American-made drones. While good in theory, American-made drones usually come at a severe price increase while, at the same time, lacking many of the features of DJI drones. DJI's Mavic 3 Pro costs in the neighborhood of \$3,000-\$4,000. A comparable drone made by the American company Brinc costs \$25,000 (Lemur 2). That's a 525% price increase! Skydio, another American drone manufacturer, has a comparable offering, but it's still \$18,000. These prices are not sustainable for any law enforcement agencies I know of, including mine. This bill will effectively end our drone programs immediately. While the concerns about the data collected by DJI may be valid, they do not warrant the knee-jerk reaction of banning DJI drones. Do these drones really collect any data that wouldn't be readily available through online mapping services or a foreign government's own satellites? That's doubtful, but if that concern is genuine then force them to house that data within servers housed in the United States similar to what they're doing with TikTok. DJI drones also have a "local data mode". This is like "airplane mode" on your phone and blocks all data from being transmitted via the internet. This is another option if security is a genuine concern. In closing, please don't let the lobbyists end these life-saving drone programs. There are better answers out there than an outright ban on DJI drones.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: BRIAN TAYLOR		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: btaylor@jeffcomo.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 11:18 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHAD LAYTON		PHONE NUMBER: 636-262-0171	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: LAKE ST. LOUIS POLICE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: ASSISTANT CHIEF OF POLICE	
ADDRESS: 200 CIVIC CENTER DR			
CITY: LAKE SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63367
EMAIL: clayton@lakesaintlouis.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/29/2024 8:38 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Our agency created out UAS program years ago. In doing so, we researched all available aircraft and what there capabilities are. Again, last year we made extensive purchases for an agency our size for updated UAS. Again, researching all available aircraft, observing demos on various manufacturers. In both cases, we selected DJI products as they far exceed the capabilities of other products. Additionally, these aircraft and their capabilities (indoor flight, flight time, camera functions in low light) make them essential to the law enforcement mission. Other lesser UAS did not have the ability to do what the DJI ones do, to the same level, making them a poor choice for deployment in a critical event. By restricting UAS manufacturers to government agencies, this bill would cripple the UAS program in the state. Public safety, again, would take a back seat to public policy and the mission of mitigating critical incidents in law enforcement / fire service would be greatly hampered. Officer safety if of great concern as these DJI's perform functions, that other UAS cant with precision or reliability, therefore placing LE in the position of having to risk direct human contact, when the use of this DJI UAS would allow for remote contact and better assess a critical situation without having to put a live human in harms way.I ask that all of the testimony being heard by this committee be evaluated and that an understanding of the impact such a decision would have on public safety and safety of those in that service are realized.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHARLES BOOKER		PHONE NUMBER: 573-226-4813	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: AGRI SPRAY DRONES		TITLE: COMPLIANCE MANAGER	
ADDRESS: 13620 OLD HWY 40			
CITY: BOONVILLE		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65233
EMAIL: cbooker@agrispraydrones.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 2:18 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

March 2024 Dear Friend, You may have heard allegations about DJI and the use of its products to carry out human rights abuses. As a valued partner, retailer or operator of DJI products, we understand you may have questions about these claims and DJI’s alleged involvement in such activities. We write today to set the record straight, dispel falsehoods and underscore why these allegations do not represent the activities of DJI as a company. We want to start by making it completely clear: DJI absolutely deplores and condemns the use of our products to cause harm. This is a core belief of our company, which was founded to develop drones that would make the world a better place and benefit society. Thanks to this commitment, our first-mover advantage and continued innovation, research and development, DJI products are overwhelmingly chosen by global consumers for commercial and recreational purposes. Yet like any global company, DJI cannot control how our products are used once they are purchased. DJI products are available on the market in more than 100 countries, including from major chain and big-box retailers. This is similar to any other company distributing products to a global customer base – an iPhone, Ford truck, or Motorola two-way radio may just as easily end up in the wrong hands or be used in ways the company would not condone. However, what we can do is proactively take steps to mitigate the use of our products for harm – and we do so. For example, DJI does not manufacture military-grade products, nor do we market or sell our products for use in combat. We also take compliance with all laws and regulations, including U.S. sanctions lists, very seriously. Our internal procedures dictate that we do not do business with parties on U.S. sanctions lists, including those in China, even when there is not a U.S. nexus to such transactions. We have implemented procedures and controls to ensure that this is achieved in our direct sales, and we have a regular internal education program to ensure all sales team staff are aware of these restrictions. We also require DJI distributors to sign export control agreements and commitment letters to avoid any diversion of products to restricted parties. When a violation by a reseller is discovered, DJI ends its business relationship with the offending party. Despite these efforts, some have further attempted to tie DJI to human rights abuses by pointing to its placement on U.S. government lists to restrict the use of our products. DJI never had an opportunity to present our case or provide any evidence to refute these listings prior to their publication. As they are now being used to support claims that DJI is complicit in human rights abuses, we will do so now:• First, we address DJI’s position on the Department of Defense’s list of Chinese Military Companies. Again, DJI does not manufacture military-grade equipment and does not market or sell products for use in combat. We also oppose any outside attempts to modify our products for combat, such as attaching weapons, and absolutely deplore the use of any of our products to cause harm. This is a core belief of our company and as such we contractually prevent our resellers from knowingly distributing our products to anyone that intends to use them in combat. While we were not given the opportunity to engage with the Department of

Defense prior to our listing, DJI has since written to Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin to request a reconsideration of our position on the list accordingly. • As with the Department of Defense listing, DJI was not given an opportunity to review any of the information related to our placement on the Department of Commerce's Entity List, which is designed to prevent the export of intellectual property from the United States rather than the import or use of goods in the country. We reject any systemic wrongdoing by our company as a basis for inclusion on this list as well. While some have attempted to cite a specific 2017 memorandum of understanding as justification for this listing, the contracting entity was not on U.S. sanctions lists at the time and this contract was never fulfilled. Others point to proposed and enacted legislation in Congress, such as the "American Security Drone Act" and the "Countering CCP Drones Act," to claim DJI's involvement in human rights abuses. Not only are these bills unrelated to any such allegations, they also purport to address security concerns which themselves are unfounded. DJI gives users of its products control over the data they generate, and they must opt-in to share photos, videos and flight logs with DJI. Otherwise, the company cannot access it or provide it to anyone else. DJI drones also do not need to connect to the internet to operate, can be used in "Local Data Mode" to prevent any data from being transmitted to or from DJI's flight apps and the internet, and can be used with third-party software if users wish to avoid using DJI software at all. We hope this information is helpful to shed light on our actions as a company, as those are what are in our control. Should you desire any additional information, or should you have any further questions about our company or its operations, please let us know. Adam WelshHead of Global PolicyDJ



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: CHIEF CHRIS DIGIUSEPPI		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: THE LAW ENFORCEMENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION		TITLE: FOUNDING MEMBER, POLICE CHIEF, MO POLICE CHIEFS AS
ADDRESS:		
CITY: DES PERES		STATE: MO
		ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: CHIEF FRED J. FARRIS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: fredfarris@sbcglobal.net	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 3/29/2024 2:58 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

While I fully understand and fully support the national security intent of this bill, Law Enforcement and Public Safety executives have not had input on the implementation of such a ban nor have we been asked to provide input into the impact such a hurried passage would have on our agencies. A great deal of money has been invested in purchasing UAS systems and in training not to mention the incredible success we have had in locating missing individuals and apprehending dangerous and hiding suspects. Other states throughout the country are also pursuing such legislation but there has been at least input from arguably the most critical users; public safety professionals. One such state is our neighbor to the west, Kansas, who has similar legislation making its way through their state house. However, the unintended consequences of across the board and immediate bans were weighed out and they currently have a bill heading to their senate that has a measured approach, including funding to replace equipment, to get them to the same desired goal. I would ask that law enforcement is asked to help in coming to a compromise that achieves the same goal without doing harm to our agencies or more importantly, leaving a public safety gap that has become an almost daily part of the service to our communities. I would be happy to share the KS proposed bill if someone could provide an email address. Sincerely, Fred J. Farris Gladstone Police Department



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHIEF KURT FRISZ		PHONE NUMBER: 636-357-4277	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: LAW ENFORCEMENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION, MO POLICE CHIEFS		TITLE: CHIEF OF POLICE	
ADDRESS: 101 SHERIFF DIERKER CT.			
CITY: O'FALLON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63366
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: CHRIS SCHOEMAN		PHONE NUMBER: 636-541-1928
REPRESENTING: STRATEGIC CAPITOL CONSULTING		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY: CHESTERFIELD		STATE: MO
		ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: DEWAYNE MCALISTER, JR.		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: dmcalkerrealtor@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 7:10 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

Good Afternoon, My name is Dewayne McAlister, Jr. I serve as a Captain with the Cape Girardeau Fire Department, Cape Girardeau Missouri. The Cape Girardeau Fire Department began using drones in 2016 for Search and Rescue efforts. The first documented Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) use, involved a duck hunter who had not returned home while hunting in Scott County. The Missouri Region E Homeland Security Response Team was activated to lead and coordinate the Search and Rescue efforts with the Scott County Sheriff’s Department operating as Incident Command. Since that day the use of drones in our fire department has continued and has developed into a front-line response apparatus. Today the Cape Girardeau Fire Department can assist the Cape Girardeau Police Department with crime scene reconstruction, active-shooter incidents, hostage incidents, and the development of incident pre-planning for large-scale events. Our drones are also ready to deploy to any of the 13 counties in Missouri Region E that request assistance during an incident without charge for services provided. I could describe countless incidents when our DJI drones have provided Incident Action Plan re-evaluation for personnel safety reasons. I can speak about incidents when our drones provided information unavailable via any other resource at the scene. I can also cite examples of when our drones prevented citizen volunteers from being placed in compromising circumstances and potentially in harm’s way. It is safe to say Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) began during World War I. Britain and the United States developed the “first” pilotless vehicles. Neither the US nor Britain used these vehicles but understood the potential for future development and research. During the 1940’s the US began to realize the threat UAVs brought to the battlefield. During the Vietnam War, UAVs played the role of stealth surveillance with the development of the AQM-34 Ryan Firebee (USA). We did not suddenly wake up to this concern for UAVs and our privacy and security. The US began to express this concern roughly 80 years ago. In 2024 we find ourselves with the technology and the affordability for any person to use this technology. The “Internet of Things (IoT) is something we enjoy the benefits of yet justify with the comforts brought to our lives by them. Now we find ourselves here today discussing the removal of a vital asset to many understaffed and underfunded public safety groups. I fully recognize and understand the security concerns with manufacturers such as DJI. Yes, our department utilizes the affordability and unmatched power of DJI UAVs. However, the Cape Girardeau Fire Department flight information, data, and metadata are encrypted through a Texas-based UAV management and collaboration software platform (DroneSense). It is safe to say that minimal research, education, and proper planning have been completed. This dates back to World War I, including the Legislative Branch. UAVs, let’s just call it “drones” have existed for a long time. A bill is a great thing, it provides discussion, different viewpoints, and ultimately what multiple people believe to be the best direction forward. However, this bill appears reactive, rather than proactive. I have two questions for my Representatives. Have we identified, collected, and evaluated all of the information? Do we completely understand the unintended consequences of this bill becoming law? Thank you for your

time.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: DON VAN JR.		PHONE NUMBER: 636-757-3916
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: FOP LODGE 15		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 2110 COLLIER CORPORATE PKWY		
CITY: ST. CHARLES		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 63303
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: EDWARD BERNE		PHONE NUMBER: 314-938-1340	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: BRENTWOOD FIRE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF	
ADDRESS: 8756 EULALIE AVENUE			
CITY: BRENTWOOD		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63144
EMAIL: ebeirne@brentwoodmo.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 10:32 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

As a public safety agency with a limited budget, we are opposed to the restrictions set forth in HB 1415 due to the added burden placed on our agency to meet the financial needs. In addition, our current fleet meets all of our needs within our budgetary accounts with all of the field applicable functions. Our belief is that this bill will potentially ground our current fleet and restrict us from replacing the lost aircraft with those that do not meet our needs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: ERIC SCHMITT		PHONE NUMBER: 417-337-8537	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: BRANSON POLICE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CHIEF OF POLICE	
ADDRESS: 110 WEST MADDUX STREET, SUITE 100			
CITY: BRANSON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65616
EMAIL: eschmitt@bransonmo.gov	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2024 4:57 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Branson Police Department would like to express opposition to House Bill 1415 that will severely impact Law Enforcement drone operations and programs within the State of Missouri. This bill would require the elimination of most drones currently utilized today by police and sheriff's departments across the state. This includes the commercial sized drone that the City of Branson utilizes for law enforcement, fire operations, emergency management and special events (annual Veteran's, Adoration Parades and 4th of July festivities). Branson's drones were purchased with a match from the State Department of Public Safety's funds. Adherence would require tens of thousands of dollars in funding to substitute the current drone with less capable alternatives. Additionally, extensive training would be required to adapt to the more complex and less effective drone solutions proposed by this bill. Many times, drones are used to locate fleeing suspects at night where officers have no visibility or direction of where to search. Additionally, law enforcement drones are utilized to find lost or missing subjects when the lapse in time could mean the difference between life and death. Our law enforcement drone program also allows a tactical advantage for our specialty response teams and search capabilities that further promote safety for our officers and the public. Due to the ongoing staffing shortages that police agencies are experiencing statewide, drones are useful force multiplier acting as a first response tool and an additional level of safety for responding officers and community members. Additionally, Branson utilizes its drone program to ensure the safety of the two major parades every year. This includes one of the largest Veterans Day parades in the nation. Branson is well known as a tourist destination for the state, with approx. 10 million visitors per year. Therefore, it is vital for Branson to have access to its drone program to ensure the safety and economic interests involved. Branson utilizes best practices to ensure that critical information is not accessible to foreign countries.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: JASON E. POOLE		PHONE NUMBER: 573-986-8734
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CITY OF CAPE GIRARDEAU FIRE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CAPTAIN
ADDRESS: 1. S. SPRIGG ST.		
CITY: CAPE GIRARDEAU	STATE: MO	ZIP: 63701
EMAIL: jpoole@cityofcapegirardeau.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 8:54 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

As a Captain and a drone pilot for the City of Cape Girardeau House Bill No.1415 is more dangerous to the safety of the community more than the security of the state.It has been stated in 542.552 subdivision (3) line 25 it list Emergency Serviccers are to be affected by this bill. Witch in turn will affect any Department, Protection District and Team that is in current use of a UAV that is not approved by the state. The reason that most of the Emergency Services throughout the state use a UAV that has ties to a county of concerns is due to, one ease of access, two price of the unit and three ease of use of the UAV. By requiring to use from a select list of acceptable UAV's it could and would make it unobtainable by smaller and underfunded Law and Fire Departments. The state is willing to reimburse up to the amount to acquire a UAV that meets the minimum. Will this also replace all of the other equipment/attachments that are specific to the unit that is being replaced as well? Will the replacement meet and excide the capabilities what is being replaced? How and do the state have the funding secured to make this happen? This is a few of many concerns that myself and many others in my position have.CaptainJason E. Poole



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JASON WARZINIK		PHONE NUMBER: 573-447-5017	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: BOONE COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT; MO-TF1		TITLE: IT DIVISION MANAGER AND MO-TF1 UAS PROGRAM MANAGER	
ADDRESS: 2201 I-70 DRIVE NORTHWEST			
CITY: COLUMBIA		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65202
EMAIL: jwarzinik@bcfdmo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 4:53 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Good evening. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee my name is Jason Warzinik and I serve as the IT Division Manager of the Boone County Fire Protection District and the UAS Program Manager for Missouri Task Force 1. As a local, state and national emergency and disaster response agency, the Boone County Fire District and Missouri Task Force 1 oppose HB 1415 for the following reasons:1.

HB 1415 would not allow my agency to use the most capable drone for the mission. We have flown a variety of drones on local, state and national search and rescue missions. The drones this legislation would ban are currently the most capable and most affordable drones for our types of missions. Additionally, the eleven drones in our current fleet that would be banned come in a variety of different models with unique capabilities that match the various mission types we fly and replacement of these banned drones, that originally cost \$68,500, would cost our agency between \$165,000 and \$715,000.2. HB 1415 only bans the use of drones that public safety agencies like mine use, while allowing any ordinary citizen, who can fly right next to me by the way, use this type of banned drone. 3.

HB 1415 bans our use of drones based on where they are manufactured rather than verifiable security risks. If there are truly security risks with these drones, are there not security risks with any device (or parts of devices) made in the "countries of concern", such as, cell phones, tablets and computers and their peripherals? For these reasons, I urge you to oppose this potentially damaging piece of legislation.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: JOHN YEAST		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: jyeast@sccad.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 9:08 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I will provide my statement in full at the hearing.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: KATIE GAMBLE		PHONE NUMBER: 573-634-4876	
REPRESENTING: FIRE SERVICE ALLIANCE		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 1865			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: LESLIE CREWS		PHONE NUMBER: 314-581-2201
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MONARCH FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT		TITLE: ASSISTANT CHIEF
ADDRESS: 13725 OLIVE BLVD.		
CITY: CHESTERFIELD		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 63017
EMAIL: crews.l@monarchfpd.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2024 1:58 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I would like to testify in person before the Homeland Security Committee on House Bill 1415.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: LYNNE MARIE SCHLOSSER		PHONE NUMBER: 913-461-8724	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 1521 PEPPERWOOD DRIVE			
CITY: SAINT LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63146
EMAIL: lyneschlosser@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 11:56 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Society of Professional Land Surveyors is in opposition to this bill. Unfortunately, the technology available with US manufactured drones does not meet the standards necessary for the state or county land surveyors. Additionally, US manufactured drone WILL have parts from China, most technology does. For a US manufactured drones, I do not know how you can ban parts made in China you have no idea are components in your drone.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: MARK HABBAS		PHONE NUMBER: 314-393-9757	
REPRESENTING: CITY OF BRANSON		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 205 E. CAPITOL AVE			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: NICK KARPEL		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: nkarpel@sccad.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2024 9:56 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: RICHARD WIGINTON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: rwiginton@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 10:07 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Please do not move forward with HB 1415 which would negatively impact many Missourians like me who use drones for business, research, recreation, and/or public safety. HR 1415 is a wide-reaching ban that would prevent new products from the world's largest drone manufacturer, DJI, from coming to market and could even take away FCC authorizations for certain existing drones. This wouldn't just prevent Americans from choosing the newest drone technology on the market but could ground entire drone fleets currently in use by public safety agencies, small businesses, and many more across the country. HR 1415 would cripple the growing U.S. drone industry and force thousands of small businesses to close, hurting the American economy. One study even found that removing DJI and its products from the market would result in the closure of most American small drone businesses and the loss of hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs. Replacing the drones isn't an option for me because there is nothing else on the market at a reasonable price and with similar functionality and privacy protections. DJI drones are proven to be safe and contain a number of security features to protect my data. For example, in order to share photos and videos I have to opt in, they aren't shared by default. I can also download American software so I don't have to use DJI's app, and I can even use the drone without connecting it to the internet through the Local Data Mode feature. Rather than hurt the drone industry by passing bills like HR 1415, please set a security baseline without killing American jobs, small business, and a growing hobby. Again, please do not pass HR 1415. Thank you.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: RONALD MACKNIGHT		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: WRIGHT CITY FIRE DISTRICT		TITLE: FIRE CHIEF
ADDRESS:		
CITY: WRIGHT CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: SCOTT OLSEN		PHONE NUMBER: 573-447-5000
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: BOONE COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT; MISSOURI TASK FORCE 1		TITLE: FIRE CHIEF
ADDRESS: 2201 I-70 DRIVE NORTHWEST		
CITY: COLUMBIA	STATE: MO	ZIP: 65202
EMAIL: solsen@bcfdmo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 4:55 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee my name is Scott Olsen and I serve as the Fire Chief of the Boone County Fire Protection District and the Sponsoring Agency Chief for Missouri Task Force 1. As a local, state and national emergency and disaster response agency, the Boone County Fire District and Missouri Task Force 1 oppose HB 1415 as it is currently written for the following reasons:1.

HB 1415 would not allow my agency to use the most capable drone for the mission. We have flown a variety of drones on local, state and national search and rescue missions. Some work well , some don't. The drones this legislation would ban are currently the most capable and most affordable drones for our types of missions. Additionally, the 11 drones in our current fleet that would be banned come in a variety of different models with unique capabilities that match the various mission types we fly and replacement of these banned drones, that originally cost \$68,500, would cost our agency between \$165,000 and \$715,000.2. HB 1415 only bans the use of drones that public safety agencies like mine use, while allowing any ordinary citizen, who can fly right next to me by the way, use this same type of banned drone. If you are going to ban these drones, then ban them completely, for all citizens.3.

HB 1415 bans our use of drones based on where they are manufactured rather than verifiable security risks. If there are truly security risks with these drones, are there not security risks with any device (or parts of devices) made in the "countries of concern", such as, cell phones, tablets, laptops, desktop computers, computer peripherals and other devices? For these reasons, I urge you to oppose this potentially damaging piece of legislation as it is currently written.Scott Olsen, Fire ChiefBoone County Fire Protection District/Missouri Task Force 1



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: TAYLOR MORELAND		PHONE NUMBER: 816-258-3296
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: AGRI SPRAY DRONES, LLC		TITLE: CEO
ADDRESS: 13620 OLD HWY 40		
CITY: BOONVILLE	STATE: MO	ZIP: 65233
EMAIL: taylor@agrispraydrones.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 10:09 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am the CEO of Agri spray drones. We are at Missouri based company located in Boonville. Our primary focus is distribution sales service and support of spray drone and agriculture drone technology. We have hundreds of clients, many of whom are farmers and agriculture service providers right here in the state of Missouri. Our mission is to empower Rural America with new opportunities. The technology that we provide has created hundreds of small businesses and jobs across Missouri. All of these jobs are in rural areas, and would have not been possible to create without the use spray drone technology. The vast majority of the drones that we provide are manufactured in China. This is for one simple reason, there is no alternative. We would like to have a source for spray drones that are manufactured in the US. But as of right now that is not an option. Even companies that are trying to do this source 95% of the drones and drone components from China. Banning Chinese drones in Missouri agriculture would kill hundreds of small businesses started by young Missourians. It would also stifle the creation of future small businesses. I understand the concern for data privacy when using Chinese drones. And I can tell you that this concern is largely unwarranted. Few understand how data is secured within these systems. Drones in agriculture collect a very small amount of data that is only useful for that farmer. This data can be stored locally so that only the farmer has access to it. Therefore there is no legitimate concern about using Chinese drones in agriculture. Furthermore, the systems that we provide are unable to be operated sensitive areas such as airports and military bases. The control system will not let the operator fly into one of these areas. When you make the decision on this bill I urge you to think about the rural Missouri small businesses that will be greatly impacted. Thank you, Taylor Moreland CEO Agri spray drones



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: THOMAS MAXIE DAVIS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: tomptonite@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 12:11 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: TOM RACKERS		PHONE NUMBER: 573-230-3991	
REPRESENTING: RACKERS CONSULTING LLC, BOONE COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT AND MO. TASK FORCE 1		TITLE: CONSULTANT	
ADDRESS: 2201 INTERSTATE 70 DR NW			
CITY: COLUMBIA		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65202
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: TRAVIS M. ROZEBOOM		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: travis@rts-group.us	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 8:28 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Missouri House of Representatives, I am writing in my personal capacity to express my opposition to HB 1415. Background: I am a sworn police officer, a position I've proudly held for the past 16+ years. I am the lead sUAS (drone) instructor at my police department. We have 11 sUAS pilots who are highly skilled and experienced in drone operations and technology. I am a certified National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) proctor for UAS standards, a US Department of Commerce division focused on establishing standards related to technology. I have over 5,000 documented sUAS flights as a law enforcement officer and hundreds more in a non-law enforcement professional capacity. I have been heavily involved in the sUAS community since 2016. I have assisted and/or trained law enforcement agencies, emergency management divisions, fire departments, national utility service providers, public utilities, GIS departments and private citizens in sUAS techniques and FAA compliance. I serve as a steering committee member for the Law Enforcement Drone Association, a nationwide organization structured as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization consisting of thousands of law enforcement officers from across the United States. I have traveled to several states in the US and have assisted with training of law enforcement sUAS pilots. I have personally researched and tested numerous drone platforms; both foreign and domestic in order to compare specifications, capabilities, financial impact and effectiveness. The law enforcement agency I work for utilizes drones in a law enforcement capacity on a frequent basis to document crash and crime scenes efficiently, provide exterior situational awareness to SWAT officers, to locate unknown hazards inside structures prior to human or canine entry and to provide real time assessment of large-scale events. Our success in these endeavors is a direct result of the cost effectiveness and capabilities of the platforms we have chosen to utilize. They include both DJI and Autel branded drones. Among others, my opposition of HB1415 is rooted in the following points.

- The claim of lobbyists that non-American drones pose a cybersecurity risk are un-substantiated and/or unproven in academia to date. Many lobbyists or so called 'experts' in their field will reference excerpts of studies and/or make vague statements of what possibilities exist in a cybersecurity threat scenario; but none of these 'experts' will actually produce a study which backs their claims.
- The few formal analyses of Unmanned Aircraft System vulnerabilities conducted to date have either been inconclusive or have determined the drones analyzed to not be leaking data. On November 4th, 2019 when responding via email to an update request related to a CISA sponsored analysis of drone cybersecurity Nancy Lim – Senior Cybersecurity Advisor from DHS / CISA / Cybersecurity Division (CSD) herself stated – “Conclusion – the four platforms analyzed within the interference-free environment do not appear to be leaking any data.”
- The intention of laws written SHOULD BE to protect the good of the people. HB 1415 is specifically written based on un-substantiated claims of cyber-security threats with the intention to eliminate business competition and enable American drone manufacturers to sell their inferior products at a higher price.
- Removing tools from law enforcement, fire fighters and public safety personnel will

endanger lives. If HB 1415 were to pass and become law, all public safety personnel in Missouri will be immediately stripped of the tools they've invested in, trained on and utilized daily. 5. Finding, sourcing and obtaining new "American" equipment is not feasible in the current state of UAS technology when factors like availability, financial burdens and American capabilities are taken into consideration. 6. "US Made" requires additional research. The platforms I've personally analyzed, flown and tested that claim to be "US Made" are comprised of parts manufactured in other countries. Often times batteries, computer chips, flight controllers and various components are sourced from China, Taiwan, South Korea and Vietnam; but then assembled in the US and labeled as "Made/Assembled in the USA". 7. "US Made" products are difficult to obtain and take months, if not years, to acquire. A recent quote for 4 interior drones and 4 exterior drones by an American manufacturer indicated that the interior platform would take 6-8 months from time of order to receive. The exterior platform is not yet in production and is estimated to possibly be ready by Q1 in 2025 if pre-ordered now. A recent purchase of non-American platforms took only 2 days to receive while an exterior platform took 3 days to receive. Both arrived in an airworthy state and able to be deployed immediately.8. "US Made" products are without a doubt significantly more expensive. Typically an American drone with similar specifications will cost 3-8Xs the cost of non-American variants. A recent quote for 4 interior platforms and 4 exterior platforms from an American company quoted a 3yr cost of their platforms at \$570,000 under their contract pricing. This includes platforms that are not readily available and have 6-12 month lead times on delivery with platforms that have yet to be proven in a real world environment. Only specifications and claimed capabilities are available. A non-American alternative for 4 interior and 4 exterior platforms with better technology and proven functionality would cost approximately \$90,000 as a 1-time purchase and all platforms are immediately available. Additionally, any repairs or warranty claims can be completed within a week should an issue arise. My Recommendations1. Address the concerns. If the concern is cybersecurity as claimed by the lobbyists, then create a committee tasked with funding a cybersecurity study of all platforms, foreign and domestic. At a federal level, this is being proposed under the DETECT Act proposed by Sen. Warner, Mark R. [D-VA]. It was introduced in February of 2024 in the 118th Congress. 2. Incentivize American manufacturers to create better products with comparable features and reasonable price points. My ideas include tax incentives, grants, research funding, etc... There have been attempts at a federal level to do this, but I am not personally aware of the status, name or title of those legislative proposals.3. Do your own research. Look into and read the published studies on cybersecurity of drones. Start with OVERVIEW OF SECURITY OF UNCREWED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS (UAS) A SURVEY OF EXISTING WORK – MITRE. 4. Reach out to agencies or public safety officials who have experience on both American and non-American platforms; ask them about the differences in features and capabilities that they've personally experienced. 5. Reach out to Federal law enforcement representatives who are already forced to fly "American" or "NDAA" approved platforms and ask them for their honest opinion and their confidence in their equipment. Ask them how they feel their required platforms stack up to non-American platforms they've seen local law enforcement utilize. 6. Ask the American manufacturers and their representatives where their controllers, batteries, computer chips and parts are coming from. Accept only a direct answer. Finally, ASK YOURSELF THESE QUESTIONS If documented cyber-security threats exist currently, why not immediately ban and 'ground' ALL non-American drones? If documented cyber-security threats exist currently, why do most national and state level legislative restrictions allow for EXEMPTIONS? Wouldn't allowing exemptions if there were verifiable threats knowingly be putting our cybersecurity at risk? In summary, there are significant implications and detrimental impacts to law enforcement, fire fighters and emergency responders if HB 1415 is passed. At a minimum, further research and consideration needs to be done. The best course of action would be to create a committee in Missouri to address the concerns and seek input from the experts in the field who are utilizing these tools everyday. Your state has countless experienced public safety leaders who would be willing to provide honest and first hand feedback. Lobbyists serve one purpose: to get their clients legislation that benefits them financially. First responders of every form have one purpose: to protect the citizens they serve. Give some credibility to those who have dedicated their careers to building the trust of their community and listen to their concerns over those of lobbyists seeking to pad the pockets of businesses. Respectfully, Travis M. Rozeboom



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: TYLER GROSSER		PHONE NUMBER: 816-672-9843
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: KANSAS CITY MO, FIRE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CAPTAIN & UAS COORDINATOR, KANSAS CITY MISSOURI FI
ADDRESS: 13204 HOLMES ROAD		
CITY: KANSAS CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 64145
EMAIL: tyler.grosser@kcmo.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 3:35 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

As a captain tasked with the coordination of a UAS program for Kansas City, Missouri Fire department the passing of this bill would have serious adverse affect to the program built to protect the citizens of Kansas City. For the past year KCFD has built a UAS program that has proven pivitol in the protection of life. The use of this technology played a roll many of the news-worthy incidents recently. Sucessful outcomes likely pivot on the use of this technology, which is not currently being produced in the united states that can meet the same standards of UAS manufactured abroad.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: TYLER GROSSER		PHONE NUMBER: 816-672-9843	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: KANSAS CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CAPTAIN, UAS COORDINATOR	
ADDRESS: 635 WOODLAND			
CITY: KANSAS CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64106
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: ZICO OROZCO		PHONE NUMBER: 314-791-2623
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: WRIGHT CITY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT		TITLE: FIREFIGHTER, DRONE PILOT
ADDRESS:		
CITY: WRIGHT CITY		STATE: MO
EMAIL:		ZIP:
ATTENDANCE:		SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: JOHN BARTON		PHONE NUMBER: 636-677-3371
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: HIGH RIDGE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT		TITLE: FIRE CHIEF
ADDRESS:		
CITY: HIGH RIDGE	STATE: MO	ZIP: 63049
EMAIL: chief@highridgefire.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 5:25 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

Members of the Special Committee on Homeland Security, Missouri House of Representatives, My name is John Barton, and I respectfully submit testimony regarding HB 1415, the Unmanned Aerial Systems Security Act. I am writing to provide feedback for informational purposes, hoping to offer some helpful insight for your consideration on this topic. I approach the issues raised in this bill from two separate and distinct points of view. First, I am a Fire Chief at High Ridge Fire Protection District, an agency that has successfully operated a drone program for the past five years. I am an FAA Part 107 certified drone pilot, and our agency maintains a Public Aircraft Operator certificate from the FAA as well. Secondly, but also very relevant to this legislation, I have spent more than two decades in the field of information technology, with a focus on security. I maintain several industry certifications in computer security, including CNDA - Certified Network Defense Architect - a certification specific to government and military employees. In short, I understand both sides of the drone/security discussion. I have reviewed the proposed legislation, and while I understand the overarching theme of ensuring that government agencies do not put sensitive data or infrastructure at risk, I feel it is important to point out that simply operating a drone made by companies identified in this bill does not automatically compromise the agency using the equipment. In most, if not all, cases, the information from one of our drones, connected to the internet by a dedicated wireless access point, only provides information already available on commonly used platforms like Google Earth. We do not survey or collect sensitive information on critical infrastructure or connect our drone controllers to networks containing this information. However, we are concerned that imposing restrictions on connectivity without the context of a risk assessment can significantly degrade the ability to maintain safe flight operations and impair communication between teams operating at the emergency scene. It is also important to note that companies based in the United States offer alternatives to vendor-supplied flight management software, providing secure solutions with data that does not leave the United States. We have utilized one of these US-based management platforms since the inception of our program with great success, which largely addresses the concerns in this bill. At the federal level, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, in conjunction with the FBI, released a guidance document regarding cybersecurity concerns with drones from countries of concern. Our district has worked hard to implement the safeguards outlined in that document, but we were able to do so while still maintaining the ability to use them in emergency response. Additionally, the federal American Security Drone Act of 2023 recognized the critical capabilities in emergency response, so an exemption was included for wildfire management operations and search and rescue operations. HB 1415 could completely halt any agency operating hardware from the largest manufacturer of this equipment without any relief for the financial investment made to create and maintain our programs. For my district, we have utilized private donations from local businesses and budget allocations to invest approximately \$60,000 in a

capability that enhances our ability to serve our community. If this legislation declared that hardware unusable, we would not have the funding to replace it with all-new hardware. More importantly, our drone program, which has been credited with saving the life of an elderly victim lost in the woods in near-freezing temperatures, and which is requested over and over again by agencies across our region to assist because of its capabilities, could be forced to cease operation. It is a vital asset that we do not want to lose. Additionally, the legislation provides exemptions in 542.568 to law enforcement agencies but does not extend those exemptions to fire protection districts, search and rescue teams, and other agencies that could be the primary responders to emergency incidents at or near locations that may be deemed sensitive, even if they otherwise meet the security requirements outlined in this proposed. In summary, using unmanned aerial systems has brought incredible advances to how we search for lost people, survey a hazardous material incident to identify risks, and identify wildland fire areas and the locations of homes that need protection. The devices help save lives, save property, and protect first responders. We support the fact that the security of critical network systems is of utmost importance. Still, we also believe there are ways to accomplish this that do not eliminate the use of our current drone platforms and take away some of our emergency response capabilities. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to give feedback on this legislation. Best Regards, John Barton
Fire Chief High Ridge Fire Protection District



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JON		PHONE NUMBER: 818-512-0952	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: LAW ENFORCEMENT DRONE ASSOCIATION		TITLE: MR.	
ADDRESS: 1574 COBURG ROAD			
CITY: EUGENE		STATE: OR	ZIP: 97401
EMAIL: jonb@ledauas.org		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/2/2024 11:27 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Members of the Missouri House of Representatives, I write to you as the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Law Enforcement Drone Association (LEDA), a national 501(c)3 Non-Profit organization built by law enforcement officers FOR law enforcement officers for the creation and implementation of best practices and standards of training for the use of drones in law enforcement. We have over 2000 public safety, majority law enforcement, members nationally and internationally on our rolls and I wanted to shed some light on unintended consequences of House Bill 1415 related to a country of origin ban on drones for government agencies. For reference, we have at least 24 agencies in Missouri that we have trained and worked with in the past and will be working with more Missouri agencies this year as we have a training event scheduled in November in St. Louis. I invite any of you to come out and meet with us at that event and talk about how drones are being utilized to save the lives of officers and community members all over the country with these effective tools. First, LEDA is drone agnostic and does not endorse any manufacturer over another. We simply want to cast light on a growing issue we are seeing legislatively here in the United States with legislation that is based on zero data in studies and pure speculation at this point. To further that point, LEDA will be undertaking a push to create a new, independent study of drone platforms with the help of a major university laboratory to determine if data security concerns are warranted and will publicly release the fully transparent results upon conclusion hopefully later this year. As a background on myself, I am a former police sergeant of 13 years, starting my career with the Los Angeles Police Department in 2008, then laterally transferred to the city of Gresham, Oregon, police department, where I worked as a Field Training Officer, Narcotics Detective and Patrol Sergeant and ultimately created the agency's first Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Team. In 2021, I made a move to Nashville, Tennessee, for medical care for my son and transitioned out of law enforcement, but now run LEDA and train officers from all over the country on how to best serve their communities with drones. I speak with a lot of experience with drones, having 8 years of experience with them in the law enforcement field. They are truly a life-saving tool and have saved over 1000 lives over the last decade, as documented by DJI themselves from real life stories from around the globe. I can say with certainty that at least 80% of public safety agencies use Chinese drones, either DJI or Autel. That said, even US made drones will have some Chinese parts built into them. It is just a fact of supply chain at this point. We hope that the US will soon become independent for those types of parts, but at this point, even our vehicles, TVs, Laptops and various other electronics have some type of Chinese tech inside. If we are truly worried about data security and want to take the true nuclear approach that these types of bills are taking, steps should be taken to outlaw the aforementioned technology along with Chinese drones, as those items of technology are constantly on and active in the Internet of Things (IoT), whereas drones are not. If this bill were passed, I can say with confidence that the majority of public safety agencies in Missouri would cease to operate once in

effect. Lives would be at risk. I say this due to the following reasons: 1) Drones are an incredible tool for current and updated information and intelligence in volatile situations in public safety. We use them to make life and death decisions at the officer and command level with the information and vantage point they provide. They are a massive de-escalation tool in that regard. Agencies often are able to slow down, re-deploy tactically, and gain verbal control and effect arrests without the use of force that would have ensued without a drone overhead. This reduces force and the incidents of deadly use of force by not putting officers in a position where they walk into an ambush or the line of fire of a suspect. 2) Implementation of drones also saves the lives of suspects during tactical incidents. I know of at least two incidents in the state of Washington where a SWAT team was involved in an Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) with the suspect in a barricaded situation. The team deployed a small DJI Mavic Mini (a consumer drone that we have repurposed for its effectiveness indoors for tactical use) to observe the suspect was down and unarmed. He was no longer a threat and a tactical team was sent into the house to take him into custody and render aid, saving the suspect's life. Had the team not had that drone, they would have proceeded with a gas plan to try and get the suspect to exit, but the suspect would have bled out and died. 3) The capabilities of drones by US drone manufacturers and those that would be considered NDAA compliant, are dramatically inferior in capability and price than those produced by DJI and Autel. Thermal resolution, flight time, weather rating, ability to fly at night, zoom capabilities, ease of use of the piloting software, setup and accessories are all inferior at this point in time. I would venture to say that the US is about 3-5 years behind where DJI and Autel are in capability. Again, we are agnostic and not saying an agency should buy one or the other, I am just touting the real world specifications of the drone for public safety incidents. Fewer lost or missing people would be found as lower thermal resolution is not as conducive to locating subjects. There have been more incidents of "Flyaways" with US made drones that I have seen with my own eyes. I have never seen an incident of a flyaway with a DJI or Autel drone to date. This puts the entire operation at risk as efforts would then have to be made to mitigate risk to manned aviation, other air traffic, locate and recover the drone while still attempting to push on with the legitimate public safety incident the drone team is on scene for in the first place. 4) The state of Florida banned all drones but those on the Blue UAS list as a knee jerk reaction to US drone lobby efforts and that turned out to be a catastrophe that the state senate regretted. Some agencies testified during a hearing after the fact that they had numerous issues with the US made Blue Drones they were forced to buy and have to ground millions of dollars worth of drones they have effectively been using for years. One agency mentioned that a Blue list drone spontaneously combusted in the back of his patrol vehicle, putting his life in danger without even flying it. 5) The cost to get rid of all of an agency's current drone platforms and accessories, and then purchase, train and become effective with a completely new and less effective platform would be a very large barrier for entry. For a drone with relatively close, but not the same capabilities, we often see a 3x-5x cost difference from DJI/Autel to US drone manufacturers, and this is just to purchase the drone. It doesn't cover training, the cost per officer on straight/Overtime to train and the curve for effective deployment. I venture to guess that a lot of agencies might just shutter their programs altogether. This would potentially take a life-saving tool out of the hands of public safety professionals. With all these listed reasons on why passing a bill like this would be detrimental to lives in Missouri, let me chat briefly about what we SHOULD be legislating, instead of an actual platform. We should be looking at a piece of legislation that instead prohibits actual bad behavior, like the unwarranted transmission of data against a user's permission or knowledge to a country of concern. This can be accomplished with current fleets by not taking the remote controller online in the first place or not connecting it with an agency's network at all. Teams can also use a third party flight application and not use the native flight application if they so choose. There are Type II SOC II applications that are secure according to Department of Defense standards. Lastly, I am happy to chat with any house member that has any questions about how drones are used to make communities safer in this day and age. They have been a game changer for public safety agencies to provide excellent service to their communities at a fraction of the cost to manned aviation and human life. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this extremely important bill and hope you all have a wonderful week! Jon Beal President & Chief Executive Officer Law Enforcement Drone Association jonb@leda.us.org



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1415		DATE: 4/3/2024
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Homeland Security		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: PAUL WAGNER		PHONE NUMBER: 573-529-7195
REPRESENTING: COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 717 WESTPORT DRIVE		
CITY: COLUMBIA		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65203
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/3/2024 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		