UASRCC MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, March 30, 2016. Tech Accelerator-Training Room


Others Present: Chris Theisen, (Northern Plains UAS Test Site), Doug Olsen, (Aviation)
Sarah Lovas (Trail County-Representative), Matt Dunlevy (BPA-Sky Scopes)

ABSENT: B. Gengler, A. Palmer, C. Juntunen, P. O'Neill, P. Haga

T. Heitkamp called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

Announcements.

- T. Heitkamp asked S. Lovas if there was any new information on work in Hillsboro. S. Lovas reported COA approved and hoping on flying the first part of May. Discussed issue with data privacy if it is owned by NDSU since there is public grant money involved it would be public. Has been working on getting it resolved.

- T. Heitkamp stated that C. Juntunen has stepped down from the committee being she is now the Interim Dean of Education and Human Development. T. Heitkamp stated will work with VPR to get someone else appointed in her place.

- D. Olsen stated that A. Palmer will be retiring and said he was appointed as being part of the Center of Excellence which is now under Aviation. Discussed his appointment to the committee was as a faculty member. He had been on the committee since its conception. D. Olsen stated would be willing to serve on the committee.


2. UAS Traffic Management Update. D. Olsen discussed what was approved in December. He stated that all test sites will be testing the software and flying on April 19-21. Being he already has approval for flying the test flights he is now looking for approval for data that may be collected and sensor systems used. As was previously discussed he passed around information of the contact he has had with the land owners. At this time has verbal approvals from most of the land owners in the flight area. M. Nelson motion to continue. A. Frazier discussed sending a certified letter to those that he has been unable to contact and get a verbal approval. M. Nelson motion for approval that a certified letter be sent to all landowners where flying over. B. Huschle seconded the motion. Motion passed. T. Heitkamp asked D. Olsen to send a copy of the letter to her which will be sent to the committee for review. C. Theisen asked about the letters, if they would always need to be sent out. A. Frazier suggested only for missions under 500ft would letters need to be sent.

3. Annual Privacy Review. C. Theisen reported that the Power point that was previously sent out was what he presented to the US Authority Board. There is an agreement with the FAA that annually needs to give a privacy review at a public meeting. Discussed there were 168 flight last year and 79 in 2014, and more flights this year.
4. **Update on Test Site.** C. Theisen reported there are projects with Grand Sky and there is signing today to work with the AFB. Working on a COA that is covering 60 nautical mile radius from the radar at the GFAFB. Technical Interchange meeting the week of April 25th were representatives from the other test sites as well as the FAA will be meeting. G. Lloyd asked how the test site here compares to the other five sites. C. Theisen stated there are more flights being performed in Virginia but their flights are short flights mostly for media. More capabilities are here due to the relationship with the FAA.

5. **Charter.** M. Bowles reported she worked with K. Porter, J. Jenkins and C. Theisen on reviewing the charter. Discussed the changes and the reason for them. Other suggestions were made. Discussed email vote, should it be in the charter. A. Frazier motion to table till the next meeting to approve the charter with the changes and the suggestions. G. Lloyd seconded the motion. T. Heitkamp thanked those that worked on the charter. A. Frazier asked that the charter changes be table till the next meeting so can see the charter complete with the suggested changes.

6. **Other Matters Arising.** A. Frazier said from the last meeting a category systems would help smooth the approval process. Reviewed categories for airframes and sensor systems. It was just a draft with 3 categories, could be more but not less. Discussed i.e... If application was approved fell within category II they could change airframe and sensor system as long as fell in the same category or category I without having to come back to the full committee for approval of the changes. If going to a higher category would need to be approved by the committee to get category III approval. Asked committee to review and will discuss at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Next Meeting-April 20, 2016 at 8:30-10:30 a.m.-Tech Accelerator -Training Room