

Michele King

From: Clerk of the Board
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 2:03 PM
To: Michele King
Subject: FW: SCVWD Agenda Comment Form

From: system-generated@valleywater.org <system-generated@valleywater.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 11:53 AM
To: Clerk of the Board <clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org>
Subject: SCVWD Agenda Comment Form

Submitted on Tue, 05/05/2020 - 11:52 AM

Submitted values are:

Name

Doug Muirhead

Address

Morgan Hill, California

Email

doug.muirhead@stanfordalumni.org

Board Meeting Date

2020-05-12

Agenda Item Number

6.1

I would like to

No Position--Comment Only

Comment Form

Dear Board of Directors,

I am not opposed to UAV aerial surveying and mapping nor to creation of images and videos of District facilities and property. I do want to provide some additional context and request some clarifications for continued and expanded use of UAVs.

Staff notes discontinuation of the original model of UAV and substitution of a different platform of UAV which was more expensive, provided a more stable airframe, and had a better camera and more options for future requirements.

Following the Board's April 9, 2019, approval, I submitted some questions and comments to Ngoc Nguyen who then asked Kris Puthoff (unit manager of Land Surveying & Mapping Unit) to respond. So what I say today is based on those responses. There has been no update to the December 2018 Flight Operations Manual. In my Q&A, staff did say that the manual is a dynamic document and will be updated and improved as we learn more about UAVs, public interaction and FAA changes.

1) Under Aircraft Noise Abatement, I commented that the manual goes into considerable detail on the effects of wind (see Appendix 1: Beaufort Scale), but did not provide either a table of relative noise levels nor an audio recording of what one of these UAVs actually sounds like.

Staff responded "In an urban environment they are undetectable at the typical flight altitudes of 200-250' and in rural environments they can only be heard when overhead."

Staff also provided the manufacturer specs of the original model. Is the staff response still appropriate for the new UAV model?

2) Under Protection/Annoyance, I commented that there is no mention of impact on wildlife, either from noise or from the unexpected presence of this "strange bird".

Staff responded that "birds do not seem bothered by UAVs" and provided this reference: paper by David Shultz, "Drones Don't Faze Birds".

3) Under Privacy, the manual states that a request from a member of the public to delete personal data gathered by video or picture, "do so, if possible". I would like to see the policy and how the public would know it exists. I would also like to see a report periodically on how many requests were received and their disposition. As an example, Gilroy has an Open Government ordinance that requires a quarterly report on all Public Record Requests and their disposition.

4) The Staff memo states use of the UAVs for Public Information provided quality perspectives and capabilities not previously possible. I do not know how far the District has taken its Open Data portal. I know that some GIS data is publicly available. While you may want to restrict data gathered for Engineering purposes, I see no reason to limit availability of data obtained for Presentation purposes. There would be a one-time cost of putting images up on the web.

Staff's previous response to this comment was

"All of our data is available through Public Records".

5) At times, facial recognition concerns are discounted due to camera resolution. This is only meaningful using today's technology limits.

6) Staff notes meeting with Security Services to discuss their needs and possibilities of uses for the UAVs and developed a method for live streaming video footage from the UAV to Emergency Operations Center. Two staff attend a training given by the Los Angeles Sheriff Department to learn how to use the UAV in support of law enforcement ground teams inside dwellings and in urban environments.

Question: Are you offering to support non-District law enforcement with

your UAVs? If so, are there any limits when so deployed?

7) National Institute of Standards and Technology issued a press release dated December 04, 2018 titled "NIST Performance Tests for Aerial Response Robots Become National Standard". This described National Fire Protection Association NFPA 2400, "Standard for Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) Used for Public Safety Operations". That standard included a suite of 10 aerial test methods developed by NIST that quantitatively measures both the system capabilities of the drone and the proficiency of the pilot in carrying out five basic maneuvers, including accurate landing, vertical climbing, and straight and level flying. There also were five functionality test methods, including circular orbits to identify objects from afar and spiral maneuvers to conduct close-range inspections. The December 2018 Flight Operations Manual does not list this standard in its References.

Thank you as always for your consideration.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK