UASRCC MEETING MINUTES

Friday, November 16, 2012 Twamley 305

PRESENT:  M. Bowles, J. Jenkins, A. Palmer, K. Larsen-Schmidt, A. Frazier, P. O’Neill
C. Juntunen, B. Milavetz, M. Nelson (for J. Packett), J. Paukert, G. Hoover,
S. Morrison, E. Plummer

ABSENT:  E. Nierode, P. Welte, K. Porter, B.J. Maxson, J. Weinstein, G. Lloyd

S. Morrison called the meeting to order at 10:30.

1. Convene- S. Morrison created an agenda which hopes to get through most of the items. Three
tracks first are what drones are, what privacy issues there are with drones. Second how does
the committee want to vote on application forms, and third considering applications? Said can
look at applications without having a policy to make sure research can take place. G. Hoover
said that when looking at applications will find issues and important to review so research can
be performed.

2. Review of charter- S. Morrison met with P. Johnson and agreed it was a good start. Asked
committee if there were any issues that need to be addressed or were unclear.
• Palmer made suggestion research, training and operations.
• K. Larson-Schmidt asked if it is just applied to UND students/staff. B. Milavetz explained that
any research involving UND UAS would be under this charter. If work is contracted through
UND it would also fall into this category.
• K. Larson-Schmidt asked regarding who determines community values/standards as stated in
the charter. It was clarified that this committee will define that. M. Nelson discussed how the
community standards/values will be different depending on community size so what is adapted
here will be different than what may be used in larger area such as New York. A. Frazier stated
that everyone should have some idea of community standards. C. Juntunen stated having a
public education may be needed regarding UAS. May just want to focus on North Dakota and
Northern Minnesota at this time since not sure of community standards in other areas. M.
Nelson asked if that would limit research if someone wanted to go outside ND and MN. A.
Frazier stated it will be reviewed on a case by case basis.
• M. Nelson asked if establishing policy or best practices for urban and or rural applications. S.
Morrison stated that this committee can establish principles when reviewing applications.
• S. Morrison would like bylaws written to have written rules that everyone abides by as to not
discriminate. Then applications that aren’t accepted the applicant will know why.
• J. Paukert asked about the statement regarding research being reviewed by other committees
and may be denied. B. Milavetz discussed that may need review by i.e. IRB for human or
animal research. If the research isn’t in the best interest of the university it may be denied.
• C. Juntunen asked how this will pertain to tribal lands and their jurisdiction limitations.

3. National Interest in Committee- A professor from Oxford College contacted VPR regarding this
committee. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism has contacted S. Morrison. The
committee is becoming known across the country from the press release.

4. Revise Application Form- From the last meeting it was discussed to revise the application from
and J. Weinstein has volunteered to work on the form with S. Morrison. S. Morrison proposed a
subcommittee of J. Weinstein, S. Morrison and one other member. B. Milavetz suggested having two additional members. One from Odegard and one first responder. S. Morrison amended to have subcommittee to have four members. Stated that even while working on the application will not stop any current applications from being reviewed. C. Juntunen asked why the application was to be revised. S. Morrison stated that more information is needed to make informed review. P. O’Neil motion to have a subcommittee of four members. B. Milavetz second the motion. Motion passed unanimously. E. Plummer volunteered to be member as a first responder and A. Frazier from Odegard.

5. Legal Subcommittee- Thought that it may be a good idea to have a subcommittee to discuss legal issues that may arise. How to deal with community standards and tribal lands. Would like a standing subcommittee to make sure that UND abides by the law. J. Jenkins and S. Morrison volunteered to be on the committee. M. Bowles suggested to maybe having someone from outside to the committee who would have expertise on tribal laws. J. Jenkins asked if airspace is superseded by federal law. C. Juntunen said that UND has an obligation to maintain respectful relationship with the tribal communities. S. Morrison will check at the law school if there is anyone that would be able to work on the subcommittee that has knowledge of the tribal laws. G. Hoover motion to have subcommittee and that the chair to find member for tribal issues. K. Larson-Schmidt second the motion. A. Frazier suggested may want to include someone from Odegard who has knowledge of aviation law. Motion passed unanimously. J. Paukert asked if something was to happen with the UAS would the committee be protected. B. Milavetz stated all members of the committee are covered under UND’s policy. J. Jenkins looked up the state policy on liability of the committee; this would be a committee of the state that would be covered under the statute even if not a UND employee.

6. By-laws- S. Morrison would like to start thinking of establishing by-laws. The by-laws would discuss voting, how to receive applications, what happens when an application is rejected or returned for more information, what happens when someone uses a UAS and violates what the committee has said can or cannot be done. S. Morrison spoke to the VPR and she felt by-laws would be appropriate. Would like one document with the by-laws written as they are agreed upon in the meetings. B. Bowles agreed she would compile the list. Motion to appoint M. Bowles to compile the by-laws was made by J. Paukert. K. Larson-Schmidt second. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Principles- S. Morrison stated that a lot of the issues have been discussed. To what extent do we want to protect privacy? Another area is facilitation of the applications and how fast to move through the applications. A. Palmer stated that AUVSI has a written code of conduct on UAS operations in dealing with privacy and it could be something to start with. A. Frazier also stated that the publication from the ACLU also has information that should be helpful. Any other items that members feel will be helpful, to email Julie and she will send it out the committee and they can be discussed at future meetings. K. Larson-Schmidt stated that if anyone hears anything in the news or in the community regarding UAS research that would be helpful to share with the committee. P. O’Neill asked what kind of policy or procedures needs to be in place if it is an open-forum meeting. Discussed if meetings needs to be announced. J. Jenkins looked up what needs to be done regarding open meetings. As long as the committee provides a contact person to the President’s office but wouldn’t need to be announced. Anyone could come to the meeting but they wouldn’t have the right to speak. Anyone could request the meeting minutes but B. Milavetz stated that names wouldn’t be used. J. Jenkins stated that the meeting could be closed if there is discussion of third party information. C. Juntunen had questions regarding the privacy policy as written in the applications. Cameras could pick up information/video of items that aren’t relevant to the research but are recorded of unlawful acts. A. Frazier stated that his
projects such as searching for a missing person will fly at a higher altitude than that of i.e. active shooter in home or school then it may fly lower to locate person. Discussed Fourth Amendment rights and some may view it being violated with UAS. The committee could deny applications if they feel it is in violation of privacy.

P. O’Neill suggested having a day to schedule a meeting to further discuss the issues and to get to A. Frazier’s applications. S. Morrison said that there are areas that need to be discussed.

- Need to understand UAS capabilities
- Understanding legal implications
- Community standards

B. Milavetz stated that data management also needs to be addressed regarding the recorded information. S. Morrison asked the committee to think of questions they may have and to send them to him or Julie to have addressed at the next meeting. A whole day will be scheduled but may end early if get done what is needed.

M. Nelson asked if there were ethical issues on A. Frazier’s applications that need to be address or if they could be reviewed now. Discussed what vote is needed to approve an application. Since the committee is large a motion was made that the simple majority of the voting members which would be 8 would be needed to approve an application. S. Morrison motion, G. Hoover second. C. Juntunen asked if tie what occurs. B. Milavetz stated that the presenter of the application would be present and would be able to answer questions at that time but not at the time during discussion and/or vote. If applications is sent back for more information and still comes to a tie vote it may be terms to deny application. Motion passed unanimously. Minutes would be sent along with the application to state why denied and they would be able to resubmit and make changes as suggested by the committee. The minutes wouldn’t be specific with names it would just have discussion, issues, etc…. why application wasn’t approved.

8. Applications- Unable to review at this time since there isn’t a quorum of voting members. J. Paukert stated that when reviewing the applications the questions will come instead of having questions ahead of time. A. Frazier will be at the beginning of the meeting to be present in case need more questions answered. Will step out during deliberation. S. Morrison will set up an agenda for the next meeting. M. Nelson stated it will be impossible to contingency plan for every application so will need to get scope from presenter and determine what level of acceptable risk the committee is going to take. A. Frazier suggested at the next meeting to brief on cases that have already taken place. K. Larson-Schmidt stated that a lot of the issues is regarding privacy and mandated reporting if needed.

9. Deadline to respond to applications-There currently isn’t a deadline to respond to applications in the charter. Currently there are no set dates for future meetings which makes it hard to have a deadline since meetings are scheduled as needed. C. Juntunen stated by putting a timeline on the committee may not be a good idea since it would limit them. K. Larson-Schmidt suggested putting into the application if there are time constraints on when the research needs to be performed. There won’t be a deadline on decisions.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm