

NetChoice *Promoting Convenience, Choice, and Commerce on The Net*

Carl Szabo, Senior Policy Counsel
1401 K St NW, Suite 502
Washington, DC 20005
202-420-7485

www.netchoice.org



January 23, 2017

Mayor Buddy Dyer
Orlando City Council
City Hall
400 S. Orange Avenue
PO Box 4990
Orlando, FL 32802-4990

RE: **Opposition to Ordinance 87 – An Act relative to the use of drones**

Dear Mayor Dyer and members of Orlando City Council,

We ask you not to advance Ordinance 87.

We agree with the intent to install reasonable regulations regarding the use of drones. However, Ordinance 87 creates unintended consequences to legitimate personal and commercial uses of drones.

Drones hold tremendous promise for businesses, professionals, and hobbyists. In areas like real estate, security, agriculture, architecture, engineering, and delivery, drones can provide significant commercial benefits to consumers and businesses in both rural and urban areas.

However, passing Ordinance 87 would prevent Orlando residents from exploring many of these opportunities.

For example, Ordinance 87 could block:

- Orlando residents from flying a drone in their own backyard if they live within a football field's distance of a park.
- Realtors from using a drone to take pictures of a townhouse that is within a football field of a school.
- News media from filming a parade or march unless it the city authorizes the press
- Insurance agents from using a drone to survey an accident scene within a football field of a police substation.
- Film makers from taking photographs of the city skyline unless taken from very specific locations or first obtaining a permit.
- A drone operator from making an emergency landing unless such landings occur in a designated part of the city.

Fortunately, Orlando has existing laws that already protect the privacy and safety of residents. For example, laws addressing assault,¹ battery,² and violations of privacy³ are already fully applicable to the use of drones in Orlando.

¹ Fl. Stat. §784.011

² *Id.* § 784.048

³ *Id.* § 810.14

While this Ordinance fails to fully address critical infrastructure, the US Department of Transportation is set to act on § 2209, which provides states and localities to petition the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) to certify no-fly zones over things such as infrastructure.

Clearly, the prohibitions in Ordinance 87 are unnecessary, and the bill's unintended consequences will harm Orlando businesses and citizens.

Instead of passing Ordinance 87 we suggest working to advance the "Unmanned Aircraft Systems Act" (UASA) at the state level. The UASA is based on existing Michigan Law (SB 992 2016).

The UASA, available at NetChoice.org/DroneModel, enables the safe and lawful operation of drones by promoting accountability of operators, protecting privacy and property rights, and prescribing penalties for interference with first responders.

While we ask that you not adopt Ordinance 87, we welcome the opportunity to work with you on reasonable regulations that allow all to prosper.

Sincerely,



Carl Szabo

Senior Policy Counsel, NetChoice

NetChoice is a trade association of e-Commerce and online businesses. www.netchoice.org