Office of Regulatory Management Economic Review Form

Agency name	Virginia Department of Aviation	
Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) Chapter citation(s)	24 VAC 5 - 20	
VAC Chapter title(s)	Regulations Governing the Licensing and Operation of Airports and Aircraft and Obstructions to Airspace in the Commonwealth of Virginia	
Action title	Take-off and landing unmanned aircraft on land owned by a political subdivision or locality of the Commonwealth	
Date this document prepared	21 December 2022	
Regulatory Stage (including Issuance of Guidance Documents)	Proposed (currently under Governor's Review ORM Review Pending)	

Cost Benefit Analysis

Complete Tables 1a and 1b for all regulatory actions. You do not need to complete Table 1c if the regulatory action is required by state statute or federal statute or regulation and leaves no discretion in its implementation.

Table 1a should provide analysis for the regulatory approach you are taking. Table 1b should provide analysis for the approach of leaving the current regulations intact (i.e., no further change is implemented). Table 1c should provide analysis for at least one alternative approach. You should not limit yourself to one alternative, however, and can add additional charts as needed.

Report both direct and indirect costs and benefits that can be monetized in Boxes 1 and 2. Report direct and indirect costs and benefits that cannot be monetized in Box 4. See the ORM Regulatory Economic Analysis Manual for additional guidance.

Table 1a: Costs and Benefits of the Proposed Changes (Primary Option)

(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)

From DPB EIA— "Government rules regarding UAVs are numerous and complex, which makes local regulation very challenging. For example, operation of a UAV in the air (unlike take-off and landing) falls solely under the purview of the Federal Aviation Administration, and local governments and political subdivisions lack authority over this operation. In addition, federal and state entities may have their own regulations in their own areas such as federal and state parks, prisons, etc. However, prior to the legislative mandate, political subdivisions in the Commonwealth lacked authority to regulate UAVs in their jurisdictions. With this action, political subdivisions would have the authority and also a process by which they can develop and establish rules primarily for the timing and location of take-off and landing (rather than operation in the air) of UAVs in their jurisdictions."

Benefits: "The fact that all ordinances and local regulations would have to be reviewed and approved by DOAV prior to their adoption should provide some level of consistency across different political subdivisions, while allowing them to factor in local area considerations. The greater the consistency across localities, the easier it would be for users of UAVs to understand and comply with the local rules.

Although the use of UAVs has many current and potential beneficial uses in civil applications such as photography, cinematography, archeology, surveys, inspections, conservation, hobby and recreation, package delivery, healthcare, journalism, scientific research, search and rescue, agriculture, manufacturing, construction, etc., it also has the potential to pose risks to safety, the environment, security, privacy, etc. For example, in the absence of the recent legislation and the proposed regulation, a drone may take-off or land from a crowded local park, a street, a school backyard, a dense downtown, or near private residences. Potential hazards associated with launching and landing of UAVs were the original concern among the localities as mentioned above. The intent of the mandate and this regulation appears to give localities and political subdivisions an ability to mitigate potential harmful uses or hazards posed by UAVs. Consequently, depending on the specifics of each local and political subdivision ordinance and regulation, a reduction in potential harms from the use of UAVs may be expected."

Costs—"DOAV would likely expend some one-time administrative resources such as staff time to review and approve initial local government ordinances and regulations and ongoing resources for monitoring and subsequent amendments to local rules. Currently, DOAV is absorbing such expenses within its existing resources. However, if

T	T			
	ongoing expenses prove to be non-negligible, the possibility of a future			
	budget request to cover such expenses cannot be ruled out.			
	The users of UAVs would likely lose some flexibility in terms of when			
	and where they can take-off and land their equipment if and when a			
		political subdivision passes an ordinance or regulation. Also, the		
	legislation and this regulation is silent about fees for the use of UAVs,			
	but DOAV states that political subdivisions have inherent powers to			
	assess permit or registration fees if they see fit. Thus, some users may be			
	required to pay some fees in certain jurisdictions. DOAV stated that one			
	of its objectives is to keep any local restrictions on recreational use of			
	UAVs at a minimum. Also, DOAV foresees assessment of fees only on			
	commercial uses. However, it does not appear that DOAV has the			
	authority or the tools to achieve those objectives."			
(2) Present				
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs Direct & Indirect Benefits			
	(a) \$0 (current personnel)	(b) n/a		
(3) Net Monetized	n/a			
Benefit				
(4) Other Costs &	n/a			
Benefits (Non-				
Monetized)				
(5) Information	DPB Economic Impact Analysis			
Sources				

Table 1b: Costs and Benefits under the Status Quo (No change to the regulation)

(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits	This is a new regulation.	Quo (140 change to the regulation)
(Monetized)		
	I	
(2) Present		
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits
	(a) n/a	(b) n/a
(3) Net Monetized		
Benefit	n/a	
(4) Other Costs &	n/a	
Benefits (Non-		
Monetized)		
(5) Information Sources	n/a	

Table 1c: Costs and Benefits under Alternative Approach(es)

(1) Direct & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized)	There are no clear alternative methods that both reduce the adverse impact and meet the intended policy goals.		
(2) Present			
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs Direct & Indirect Benefits		
	(a) n/a	(b) n/a	
(3) Net Monetized	n/a		
Benefit			
(4) Other Costs &	n/a		
Benefits (Non-			
Monetized)			
(5) Information	n/a		
Sources			

<u>Impact on Local Partners</u>
Use this chart to describe impacts on local partners. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 2: Impact on Local Partners

(1) Direct &	From DPB EIA— "The proposed regulation potentially affects all 132		
Indirect Costs &	localities. The legislation and the regulation allow, but do not require		
Benefits	localities to adopt rules governing the take-off and landing of UAVs. In		
(Monetized)	addition, a locality may assess fees for registration or permit to cover its costs if it chooses to establish rules and procedures. Thus, the proposed amendments do not introduce costs for local governments. Although localities with higher population densities may potentially be more inclined to adopt rules on UAVs, on its face the regulation does not appear to particularly affect any locality more than others."		
(2) Present			
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
	(a) \$0	(b) \$0	
(3) Other Costs &	n/a		
Benefits (Non-			
Monetized)			
(4) Assistance	n/a		
(5) Information	DPB Economic Impact Analysis		
Sources			

Impacts on Families

Use this chart to describe impacts on families. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 3: Impact on Families

There are no direct costs to families.		
Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
(a) \$0	(b) \$0	
This regulation would allow for fami	ilies to know where the take- off and	
landing areas are for political sub-divisions, which makes our		
communities safer. Additionally, it allow for the safest, most efficient		
and effective airspace in Virginia.		
DOAV; DPB did not indicate families as being impacted in their EIA.		
	Direct & Indirect Costs (a) \$0 This regulation would allow for familianding areas are for political sub-discommunities safer. Additionally, it a and effective airspace in Virginia.	

Impacts on Small Businesses

Use this chart to describe impacts on small businesses. See Part 8 of the ORM Cost Impact Analysis Guidance for additional guidance.

Table 4: Impact on Small Businesses

(1) Direct &	From DPB EIA— "Of the tens of the	nousands of UAVs that likely exist in	
Indirect Costs &	Virginia, national statistics suggest 35 percent are involved in		
Benefits	commercial uses. Of these commercial drones, some are bound to be		
(Monetized)	used by small businesses."		
	Types and Estimated Number of Small Businesses Affected: "There is no		
	reliable estimate on what portion of	the commercial UAVs may be used	
	by small businesses or what types of	small businesses."	
(2) Present			
Monetized Values	Direct & Indirect Costs	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
	(a) \$0	(b) \$0	
(3) Other Costs &	osts & From DPB EIA— "The proposed regulation allows localities to restrict		
Benefits (Non-	the use of UAVs primarily in terms of time and location. Thus, small		
Monetized)	businesses would be adversely affected as they may lose some flexibility		
	in terms of time and locations where their UAVs can take-off and land		
	when and if the locality adopts such restrictions."		

(4) Alternatives	From DPB EIA— "There are no clear alternative methods that both reduce the adverse impact and meet the intended policy goals."
(5) Information Sources	DPB Economic Impact Analysis

Changes to Number of Regulatory Requirements

For each individual VAC Chapter amended, repealed, or promulgated by this regulatory action, list (a) the initial requirement count, (b) the count of requirements that this regulatory package is adding, (c) the count of requirements that this regulatory package is reducing, (d) the net change in the number of requirements. This count should be based upon the text as written when this stage was presented for executive branch review. Five rows have been provided, add or delete rows as needed. In the last row, indicate the total number for each column.

Table 5: Total Number of Requirements

	Number of Requirements			
Chapter number	Initial Count	Additions	Subtractions	Net Change
TOTAL				

This is a new regulation at the proposed stage (9511) to replace the Emergency Regulation (9225) completed and signed August 2021. 24 VAC 5-20 is to be amended.