UASRCC MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, December 19, 2012


ABSENT: J. Weinstein, J. Paukert, K. Porter, P. Welte, E. Nierode

S. Morrison called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Discussion of Community Standards- S. Morrison had three items that he felt may need to be addressed; What is the community’s current expectation of privacy, how would UAS affect that expectation, and in light of potential UAS use how will communities change.

C. Juntunen stated that we live in an area that may have more concern for privacy than other parts of the nation. This committee is to deal with UND UAS research which is working with Sheriff’s Department since that is what is on the applications. M. Nelson stated that need to focus on the equipment that is on the proposals not what could be used in the future because the technology is always changing. Future applications could be from a private agency working with UND. B. J. Maxson stated that privacy is an issue and nothing will be done that would validate privacy. B. Milavetz stated at this time no one really knows what the capabilities are of the smaller UAS. M. Nelson stated that privacy is an issue with everyday procedures with law enforcement. B. Milavetz had met with A. Frazier a few weeks ago to discuss notification when a UAS is being used in an area. B. J. Maxson stated in disaster scenarios police presence will already be known. B. Milavetz stated what people are concerned about is surveillance. A. Frazier stated that there won’t be any covert surveillance performed. A. Frazier stated he has been in contact with someone regarding reverse 911 to be used for notification. The authorization from the FAA requires that the deployment be within the line of sight which would alleviate the concern for some on privacy. B. Milavetz asked A. Frazier if recording would be used in all scenarios. C. Juntunen suggested having a grid that may make it easier for reviewing applications. S. Morrison stated it will be a constantly evolving system. Discussed that the application will be modified which may better answer questions of the committee. Would like to develop a protocol for the committee that will help those applying to know what the committee is looking for when applying. A. Frazier stated to make protocols with current technology and not to predict in the future where technology may be. Stated that currently technology and what is listed on the applications won’t show fine detail. It was discussed how UAS could be used in different areas other than with law enforcement. B. Milavetz said would like to have review process developed enough that if someone comes wanting to do research that would know what is required by looking at the checklist. P. O’Neill asked how many applications have currently been submitted. A. Frazier has submitted four applications. He discussed what they are. Disaster Assessment, Search for Person (lost & suspect), Traffic Accident, and Traffic and Crowd Control. A. Frazier briefly discussed each application and what they are wanting to look at. B. Milavetz suggested to the committee to have set protocols and how focused each will be. M. Nelson stated that by this research being done it will help law enforcement decide if it is a viable tool to use. S. Morrison said it is good to discuss what our concerns are that will allow to make a predictable reason system that would be used. Discussed that if someone conducts research outside of the parameters that were on the application the committee could pull the research. M. Nelson stated that whatever the committee decides may also have protocol that also needs to be enforced when dealing with
law enforcement. Discussed may want to have annual review of research to make sure being within the protocols. Discussed that the UAS pilots won’t be acting as law enforcement only as pilot. The officer at the scene would get the SD card after flight. S. Morrison would like to see by the end of academic year a document with bylaws, voting protocols, and principles of privacy. Don’t need to have now in order to review applications. C. Juntunen asked what would be the difference between evidence and data. J. Jenkins stated that scholarly work is owned by the author. A. Frazier stated that law enforcement would be owner of the pictures/videos but UND would have ownership of the data collected. A. Frazier originally stated to wait till next meeting to review applications but would like to begin some missions. G. Lloyd asked if the UAS was in use and had complications and caused damages what would be the university’s role in addressing it. J. Jenkins stated it would be covered by UND. S. Morrison stated can review applications and request more information if needed. G. Hoover motion to consider applications after lunch, B. J. Maxson second the motion. Motion passed.

2. UAS Presentation-A. Palmer gave presentation that he will be giving the Governor’s cabinet. Discussed the different tiers of UASs. Those that UND have and the ones that are at the GFAFB. UND is the only place outside of DOD that has capability of flying from multiple sites. G. Lloyd asked what other countries are using UAS. A. Frazier discussed the flight time that is on the airframes before having to change batteries. He also discussed speed of the airframes and at what wind speed they would be unable to fly. A. Palmer stated that North Dakota is currently in the running to be one of six national test sites.

The Committee reconvened after lunch to discuss a proposal submitted by Alan Frazier, Assistant Professor, Aviation, entitled, Law Enforcement Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research Project: Disaster Scene Assessment. A. Frazier joined the committee via teleconference to discuss his proposal.

P. O’Neill asked A. Frazier what type of time frame he is looking at to get the project started. A. Frazier reported that he received approval on a Certificate of Authorization (COA) from the FAA. Once the UASRCC committee approves this application, he will be able to begin his research. A. Frazier indicated that he had discussed with B. Milavetz regarding training still being able to continue even though missions hadn’t been approved. There is a commitment to quarterly training required by FAA to keep COAs current. A. Frazier indicated that pilots will still be flying to maintain training requirements but won’t be flying research missions. B. Milavetz said the purpose of this committee is to eventually capture everything related to UAS. B. Milavetz indicated that he would like A. Frazier to submit documentation regarding training that would be approved on a yearly basis unless changes are made. G. Hoover stated that he is concerned about the training having approval from the private property owners. A. Palmer clarified that by having a COA, a UAS is already approved to fly in that area. Discussion continued on the use of UAS in training versus research. S. Morrison reviewed the committee charter which indicated that the focus of the committee is on research, not training. S. Morrison indicated that an amendment to the charter could be proposed if the committee feels it’s necessary in the future. P’ O’Neill stated if training violated the principles of this committee, it could be looked at then and an amendment could be made to the charter.

The committee turned to the review of A. Frazier’s application. A. Frazier reported on his disaster assessment application. The information that A. Frazier is interested in is of the total number of pictures that were taken, how many were helpful and or useful. G. Hoover asked who would be the one to decide which images would be deleted. A. Frazier stated it would be the sensor system operator that would delete pictures that were unusable in the field. Detailed discussion followed about the need to retain images that may have implications for criminal
cases. P. O’Neill asked what the difference is in images taken between 400 and 1000 feet. B. Milavetz indicated that it would be helpful for committee members to review actual pictures/video taken from different altitudes to see what is visible and in how much detail. B. Milavetz stated that provisions for notification of property owners aren’t listed in the application. A. Frazier agreed that property owners should be notified, but thought it may be difficult in some rural areas where property boundaries and ownership aren’t always easy to locate. B. Milavetz stated that something may be put into the newspaper that a UAS may be used in some cases. E. Plummer stated that if signage is put out it shows attempt to notify those in the area. J. Jenkins asked if only working with live scenes or simulated scenes, and A. Frazier indicated that the proposal is for live scenes only; creation of simulated scenes is not being considered at the present time.

A. Frazier left the meeting to allow committee members to discuss the merits of the proposal and decide on approval.

Discussion turned again to the use of images in criminal cases. M. Nelson indicated that the subcommittee reviewing the application for potential revisions should consider including questions on the deletion and retention of all research data. M. Bowles questioned whether there was adequate discussion of privacy protections on the application. Committee member agreed that that rural and urban may need to be more defined to assure that the researcher knows there may be different procedures that need to be followed depending on the area. P. O’Neill moved to approve the research with changes discussed by committee (see below for complete list). BJ Maxson seconded the motion. The motion passed with 8 Members voting approval, 0 Members voting disapproval, and 0 Members abstaining. Discussion followed about handling of the application once revisions are submitted by A. Frazier.

A. Frazier was contacted via telephone, and S. Morrison told him that his application was approved pending submission of revisions.

Disaster Scene Assessment Comments to Address:
1. More detailed description of how the PI will manage, collect, and dispose of data (data management)
2. Attach approved COA for Dragonflyer and the COA applications for the other research proposals.
3. Attach the spreadsheet of variables (risk factors) that pilots use to determine safety to fly mission.
4. A discussion of the anticipated height at which images will be captured. The committee understands there is a wide range of altitudes from which images can be obtained, but would like a discussion of what altitudes the PI believes would be most useful to meet the goals of the research.
5. Individualize the applications to more clearly reflect what the mission is. Currently, the proposals are almost identical. Proposals should be individualized with greater detail provided for each specific area of research.
6. The end date for the research should correspond to the expiration date of the COA.
7. The PI should discuss notification provisions – how will the public and private landowners be notified (mechanism for notification, length of time for notification prior to mission, etc.).
8. Application should be modified for Dragonflyer use only since the COA for this airframe has been approved. Once additional COAs have been approved an amended application should be submitted with these additional airframes.
9. Regarding existing applications expected to be reviewed at an upcoming meeting, the committee felt that there should be separate applications submitted for searching for lost
persons versus searching for criminal suspects due to the different nature and goals of the searches.
10. The PI is also encouraged to update remaining applications based on above to expedite the review process for them.

The next meeting will focus on the other applications that have been submitted by A. Frazier. J. Solheim will send out a poll to determine committee members’ availability. Any additional agenda items should be sent to S. Morrison.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Julie Solheim
Administrative Assistant, Research Development and Compliance