

Student Works

Fall 2017

United States Drone Laws

Jacob Crittenden
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/student-works>



Part of the [Aeronautical Vehicles Commons](#), [Air and Space Law Commons](#), [Multi-Vehicle Systems and Air Traffic Control Commons](#), and the [Other American Studies Commons](#)

Scholarly Commons Citation

Crittenden, J. (2017). United States Drone Laws. . (). Retrieved from <https://commons.erau.edu/student-works/59>

This Undergraduate Research is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Works by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

UNITED STATES DRONE LAWS

Jacob Crittenden, Aerospace Engineering COE/UAS COA

Advisor: Dr. Sarah Nilsson, Aeronautical Science COA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Laws	1
1.0 Laws by state	3
1.1 Alabama	3
1.2 Alaska	3
1.3 Arizona	4
1.4 Arkansas	4
1.5 California	4
1.6 Colorado	4
1.7 Connecticut	5
1.8 Delaware	5
1.9 Florida	5
1.10 Georgia	5
1.11 Hawaii	6
1.12 Idaho	6
1.13 Illinois	6
1.14 Indiana	6
1.15 Iowa	7
1.16 Kansas	7
1.17 Kentucky	7
1.18 Louisiana	7
1.19 Maine	7
1.20 Maryland	8
1.21 Massachusetts	8

1.22	Michigan	8
1.23	Minnesota	8
1.24	Mississippi	8
1.25	Missouri	8
1.26	Montana	9
1.27	Nebraska	9
1.28	Nevada	9
1.29	New Hampshire	9
1.30	New Jersey	9
1.31	New Mexico	9
1.32	New York	9
1.33	North Carolina	9
1.34	North Dakota	10
1.35	Ohio	10
1.36	Oklahoma	10
1.37	Oregon	10
1.38	Pennsylvania	11
1.39	Rhode Island	11
1.40	South Carolina	11
1.41	South Dakota	11
1.42	Tennessee	11
1.43	Texas	12
1.44	Utah	12
1.45	Vermont	12

1.46	Virginia	13
1.47	Washington	13
1.48	West Virginia	13
1.49	Wisconsin	13
1.50	Wyoming	14
2.0	References	15

General Drone Laws and Guidelines

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been directed by Congress to make regulations for Unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) to ensure the safety of flight, the public, and property in the United States. The FAA was given the authority to regulate airspace use and under 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b) is tasked with “developing plans and policy for the use of the navigable airspace and assign by regulation or order the use of the airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace.” Underneath that federal law, the FAA is further in charge of making air traffic laws and regulations to identify aircraft, as well as overseeing flight safety. The result has been the FAA’s oversight over all matters pertaining to aviation within the United State.

From section 333 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, requirements for the safe operation of UAS operations in the national airspace (NAS) were investigated by Congress. The FAA followed in 2015 with a proposed framework of regulations for commercial small UAS (under 55 lbs) in their Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. These regulations would allow routine use of commercial UAS while also allowing the FAA to have oversight of future technologies. Included in the proposal are hours of operation, line-of-sight restrictions, maximum altitude, certification for UAS pilots, UAS registration and identification, and miscellaneous limitations. Consistent with this authority, the FAA has required the registration of UAS to help protect public safety, aide in the enforcement of the safe operation of UAS, and place accountability and responsibility on the small UAS community. Since the FAA is the official Federal agency with oversight over the NAS, any further regulation over airspace needs to be approved by the FAA.

The general FAA Safety guidelines for UAS are as follows:

- Fly at or below 400 feet
- Be aware of airspace requirements and restrictions
- Stay away from surrounding obstacles
- Keep your UAS within sight
- Never fly near other aircraft, especially near airports
- Never fly over groups of people
- Never fly over stadiums or sports events
- Never fly near emergency response efforts such as fires
- Never fly under the influence of drugs or alcohol

There also exists the Special Rule for Model Aircraft, which applies to model and hobby aircraft only. To fly under this rule, all the following conditions must be met:

- the aircraft is flown strictly for hobby or recreational use
- the aircraft is operated in accordance with a community-based set of safety guidelines and within the programming of a nationwide community-based organization
- the aircraft is limited to not more than 55 pounds unless otherwise certified through a design, construction, inspection, flight test, and operational safety program administered by a community-based organization
- the aircraft is operated in a manner that does not interfere with and gives way to any manned aircraft
- when flown within 5 miles of an airport, the operator of the aircraft provides the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport) with prior notice of the operation (model aircraft operators flying from a permanent location within 5 miles of an airport should establish a mutually-agreed upon operating procedure with the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower [when an air traffic facility is located at the airport])

If the aircraft is not flown exclusively under the Special Rule for Model Aircraft the aircraft must be registered with the FAA. Registration applies to UAS weighing between 0.55 and 55 pounds. To register you must be over 13 years of age, be a US citizen, and supply an email address, credit or debit card, physical and mailing addresses, and make and model of the aircraft if it is for non-model purposes. If the aircraft weighs more than 55 pounds, the aircraft must be registered with further regulations which can be found on the FAA website under 14 CFR Part 47.

As stated above, any further regulation beyond the Safety guidelines, Special Rule, and registration of aircraft that a state or local government wants to impose must be approved by the FAA. The rest of this document serves to compile the laws of each state regarding UAS operation.

1.0 Drone Laws By State

In the following sections, brief captions and commented summaries for the laws pertaining to UAS operation in each state are documented. In some of these states there are ordinances that have been approved by the FAA. Also included are further regulations the state itself have felt were needed to be added such as restrictions on law enforcement, hunting and fishing, and weaponizing of UAS that do not require FAA approval. This document is current as of December 2017 and may need to be updated as new proposed laws are passed. This document does not serve as a complete compilation of the laws for each state.

1.1 Alabama

The state of Alabama continues to follow the FAA guidelines and safety regulations. Further specific restrictions were approved by the FAA in the City of Oxford. The Oxford City Council's ordinance prohibits drones from flying over city-owned property. The ordinance is in place to prohibit the possibility of flying over large crowds, which the FAA already controls, but allows the city to control it at a local level with their law enforcement agency. An exemption can be approved by the city's police chief. A resolution was passed by Alabama's House of Representatives to recognize Huntsville as a potential location for a UAS Test Site.

1.2 Alaska

The state of Alaska is an approved test site for UAS by the FAA. The state has been extensively researching UAS usage and development at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. This was allowed by House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 6, passed in 2013, which also formed a Task Force on Unmanned Aircraft Systems. This Task Force served to form recommendations and legislation to protect privacy from UAS operations and report its findings to the State. The period of the Task Force has been extended to exist and continue its purpose through the present day by HCR 15 and SCR 4. House Bill (HB) 255, passed in 2014, created laws for law enforcement use of UAS as well as data collection by UAS. Under the law, the following provisions are placed:

- FAA authorization is obtained by the agency before flight
- Operators are trained and certified
- Flight records are kept
- The community can be involved in the development of agency policies
- UAS can be used in non-criminal investigations pursuant of a search warrant
- UAS images can be kept by law enforcement for training and/or to be used in a case if needed

House Joint Resolution (HJR) 5 recognizes the Academy of Model Aeronautics as the main advisory to safety guidelines and best practices. Finally, HB 256 places the Department of Fish and Game in charge of evaluating the use of UAS for cost effectiveness and safety in comparison with manned aircraft.

1.3 Arizona

The State of Arizona is home to one of the more major aerospace transportation hubs in the United States, Sky Harbor in Phoenix. The Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport has its own page to notify users of UAS on guidelines to follow and procedures to follow. It is required to notify any nearby airports of a planned flight anywhere in or around Phoenix. In Arizona, it is illegal to fly any UAS that may interfere with emergency service operations such as law enforcement or firefighter. There also exists a law prohibiting the use of UAS near any critical facility (see Title 13 on the Arizona state legislation page). Arizona mostly had laws that formally recognize the FAA regulations having the primary jurisdiction over UAS operation. Like Alabama, some city ordinances exist in Pima County, Paradise Valley, Phoenix, Mesa, and Scottsdale. Furthermore, UAS are prohibited as an aide in hunting activities.

1.4 Arkansas

Arkansas has only placed expansions to its existing laws to include UAS. For instance, HB 1349 amended the offenses of voyeurism and video voyeurism to include UAS. In the same manner, HB 1770 expands upon existing regulation of aeronautics to include some circumstances of UAS use and provide criminal penalties. HB 1770 prohibits the use of UAS for data and image collection of a critical facility without consent.

1.5 California

Most California bills introduced in relation to UAS have not been passed. California Assembly Bill 856 expands upon privacy rights to prohibit the use of UAS for image capturing or invasion of privacy without consent. Like in Arizona, UAS may not interfere with first responders during emergencies (AB 1680). California goes one step further by protecting a first responder who disables or damages a UAS that was in interference. Finally, SJR 18 formally requests the operation of UAS by farmers and rangers under FAA regulations as specified. Some ordinances have been enacted in Barstow, Berkeley, Daly City, Las Angeles, and Rancho Mirage.

1.6 Colorado

The FAA rules and regulations are the main laws regarding UAS in Colorado. HB 1070 gives Public Safety Agencies the task of studying drone use for integration within most local and state government functions. These functions include firefighting, search and rescue, accident reconstruction, crime scene documentation, emergency management, and emergencies involving significant property loss, injury or death—specifically studying privacy concerns, costs, and deployment speed in each case. In addition to HB 1070, hunting with UAS is illegal in Colorado, and Cherry Hills Village and the town of Deer Trail both have ordinances over the use of UAS.

1.7 Connecticut

The only further regulation on UAS other than the FAA's laws is SB 975. SB 975 prohibits municipalities from owning, using, and regulating drones. However, under the bill, it allows a water company municipal to regulate or prohibit the use of UAS over that municipal's public water supply and land.

1.8 Delaware

Delaware has passed HB 195 prohibiting UAS over sporting events, concerts, auto races, festivals, and events with more than 5000 people in attendance. This is essentially the same as the FAA regulation in place in which it is prohibited to fly above crowds of people. The bill does prohibit flying over critical infrastructure like some states regulations already discussed. Doing so has criminal punishments laid out by the bill.

1.9 Florida

Further regulation and definitions for UAS exist in Florida. For instance, SB 832, which was substituted for HB 1027, discusses further regulations on UAS operations. Local governments cannot regulate UAS, but ordinances can be enforced if they are not specifically related to UAS. Under the law UAS are forbidden from operating over or near critical infrastructure with exemptions for government or commercial operational purposes and contracted infrastructure inspection. UAS cannot be weaponized in the state of Florida, also under SB 832. Another law in effect is SB 92, which expands upon privacy laws and adds UAS into those regulations. Under the law, unwarranted surveillance by a law enforcement agency is prevented and a law enforcement agency may only use UAS under a warrant, terrorist threat, or is required by the situation for search and rescue or to prevent the loss of life. Evidence gathered without a warrant is dismissed. Finally, ordinances exist in Bonita Springs, Orlando, Miami, Palm Beach, Key West, Defuniak Springs, and Aventura that have been approved by the FAA. The Palm Beach ordinance needs revision due to FAA preemption. Also, there are potential ordinances to come in Flagler Beach and Ponce Inlet.

1.10 Georgia

In Georgia there exists an Unmanned Aircraft Technology Commission which advises the governor on rules on the state level. From this Commission, HB 481 has been formed which defines UAS and preempts local law enforcement agencies from passing further UAS regulations. It allows for the regulation of the launch or landing of UAS on public land by the state or local government (e.g. public parks). The city of Augusta and Cherokee County have both passed ordinances regarding UAS operations.

1.11 Hawaii

The State of Hawaii has passed SB 2608 beyond the FAA's regulations. SB 2608 prohibits surveillance by the public using UAS but gives law enforcement certain freedoms with UAS regarding surveillance, provided certain conditions are met. One such condition is

that all law enforcement and court agencies report the UAS activities when used. Also, the use of model aircraft for commercial, hobby, or recreational purposes is exempt from further regulation.

1.12 Idaho

The state statute 21-213 exists in Idaho for privacy purposes. It furthers on a previous law existing in Idaho to include the use of UAS in surveillance, observation, image capturing, facility inspection, law enforcement activities, and hunting. UAS can be used for inspection of a facility if the owner so chooses to utilize one. Warrants are required to be obtained for law enforcement to use UAS. It is illegal to hunt or pester animals with a UAS.

1.13 Illinois

In Illinois, it is prohibited to use UAS to interfere with hunting or fishing through HB 1652. Also, law enforcement are placed under much of the same sanctions as other states with SB 1587. For example, warrants are required to use to gather evidence. An additional clause is in effect in SB 1587 in which all information gathered by UAS must be destroyed within 30 days, unless there is reasonable suspicion that it contains sufficient evidence to criminal activity. Law enforcement agencies are also required to report the number of UAS owned by that agency, if any. SB 2937 continues this pattern by regulating law enforcement's use of third parties to gather evidence. Warrants are still required to use a third party to obtain evidence and, if any evidence is voluntarily shared, it must be treated the same under the 30-day clause. Lastly, under SB 44, a Task Force is formed to evaluate commercial and private use of UAS, privacy rights and general regulations for safe UAS operations, and to advise on legislature to be passed. Ordinances are in place in Chicago, Evanston, Village of Manhattan, and Schaumburg.

1.14 Indiana

In Indiana, similar laws exist regarding hunting (HB 1246), UAS pictures and videos of traffic collisions (HB 1013), and law enforcement use of UAS (HB 1009). Under HB 1009, law enforcement are required to obtain a warrant before using UAS. Also, any unpermitted surveillance is prohibited. The last form of regulation on UAS is SB 299. In SB 299, a sex offender is prohibited from using a UAS to follow, contact, or take photos or videos of someone. Also, the interference of public safety operations is unlawful. Under SB 299, voyeurism by using UAS is prohibited as well.

1.15 Iowa

HF2289 was introduced in Iowa to place regulations on UAS use in law enforcement activities. Through the law, it is illegal for a state agency to use UAS to enforce traffic laws or in a criminal court case without a warrant. Also, though HF 2289, the

department of public safety is tasked with creating guidelines for UAS. Iowa City has passed an ordinance to place further regulations on UAS beyond the FAA's oversight.

1.16 Kansas

In Kansas, SB 319 expands the definition of harassment in the Protection from Stalking Act to include certain uses of UAS. Also, SB 249 was passed to promote research and development of UAS in educational institutions and the focus of those programs to be used in law enforcement agencies. Wichita City has an ordinance in place that was approved by the FAA.

1.17 Kentucky

In Kentucky, HB 540 was passed to allow commercial airports to prepare unmanned aircraft facility maps. These maps show where UAS may operate around airports. The bill also prohibits reckless usage of UAS which poses a serious risk of damage to life or property. The law explicitly states that it does not apply to commercial UAS flying under FAA regulations.

1.18 Louisiana

Other laws for UAS exist in the state of Louisiana beyond the FAA rules and regulations. SB 69 was passed to give the state exclusive oversight over UAS regulations. SB 73 gives law enforcement and fire departments immunity if a UAS is disabled if it endangers public or officer safety. Also under SB 73, using a UAS to cross a police cordon is considered the obstruction of justice. HB 335 passed by the state allows the establishment of registration and licensing fees for UAS under \$100. HB 635 expands upon previous laws to include the use of UAS in voyeurism laws. SB 141 states that the invasion of privacy by using a UAS for unwarranted surveillance is considered criminal trespassing under certain circumstances. This law is also expanded upon in HB 19 to include surveillance or gathering information of schools and correctional facilities. A redundant law, HB 1029, reiterates the need for written consent of a facility's owner for surveillance or image capturing. Finally, SB 183 allows for the use of UAS in agricultural commercial operations with some regulations.

1.19 Maine

In Maine, Legislative Document (LD) 25, now Public Law Chapter 307, regulates domestic unmanned aerial vehicle use. It requires law enforcement agencies receive approval before acquiring UAS and a warrant before using UAS for a criminal investigation. Law enforcement is required to fly in accordance with all FAA requirements and guidelines. There also exist ordinances in the Maine State Park and the City of Chicopee, and the City of Waterville is considering their own ordinance to propose.

1.20 Maryland

Maryland is a FAA approved and chose UAS test site. SB 370 went into effect on July 1, 2015 and specifies that only the state has jurisdiction over laws regarding UAS and that all other county and municipal laws are preempted. The bill also explores the benefits of using UAS.

1.21 Massachusetts

The City of Northampton has an ordinance which is in place. This is the only official law soundly in place other than the FAA's regulations after some laws have been struck down and others are awaiting revision.

1.22 Michigan

Like other states above, the State of Michigan has exclusive oversight of UAS regulations under SB 992. This bill formally identifies the FAA regulations for commercial regulation and permits hobbyist operation if conducted in compliance with federal law. The interference of emergency services, harassment of an individual, violation of a restraining order, or invasion of privacy by using a UAs is unlawful under SB 992. Sex offenders are also prohibited from using UAS to follow, contact or photograph someone they are prohibited from contacting. A task force was also developed under this law to act in the same way as other task forces mentioned. Also like other states, it is illegal to hunt with or interfere with someone who is hunting by using a UAS. These provisions are stated under SB 54 and SB 55. East Lansing City has an ordinance in effect.

1.23 Minnesota

In Minnesota, the City of St. Bonifacius has its own ordinance beyond the FAA. There are no further regulations.

1.24 Mississippi

The State of Mississippi has passed SB 2022, effective as of July 1, 2015. This law prohibits voyeurism attempts using UAS and the use of a UAS to capture image of another without consent. This activity is now considered a felony. Otherwise, the FAA regulations are the only other regulations in place.

1.25 Missouri

Nothing more than the FAA regulations exist for the state of Missouri as of the present day.

1.26 Montana

In Montana, HB 644 was passed to protect firefighting services. Also, SB 196 places limitations on law enforcement using UAS and using the data collected from UAS in a prosecution or court of law. The evidence collected by a UAS *can* be used if it was obtained with a search warrant.

1.27 Nebraska

In Nebraska, the state capitol has its own guidelines to follow in addition to the FAA's authority. Otherwise, following the FAA regulations is all that is required in Nebraska.

1.28 Nevada

In the state of Nevada, some laws are consistent with other states regarding law enforcement. Warrant clauses, the prohibition of UAS operation under specific circumstances, a required registry of UAS owned by public agencies, and state oversight of UAS regulations by law enforcement are all defined under AB 239. Under this law the Department of Transportation is required to propose regulations defining the permitted use of UAS by public agencies and punishments for unlawful operation are also constructed. AB 239 and AB 11 also define the limits of use of UAS around critical facilities.

1.29 New Hampshire

SB 222 protects wildlife by prohibiting the use of UAS to hunt, fish, or trap. Otherwise, New Hampshire has not passed any further regulations.

1.30 New Jersey

New Jersey follows the FAA regulations except with added ordinances in Garfield, Bernards Township, and Chatham.

1.31 New Mexico

There are no further regulations than the FAA statements in New Mexico.

1.32 New York

Most New York laws have died or are not passed to place further regulations on UAS. However, Orchard Park has an ordinance in place, Syracuse has a resolution, and in New York City the complete use of UAS is banned.

1.33 North Carolina

North Carolina has placed regulation on both commercial and model UAS. HB 128 prohibits the use of UAS around prisons and correctional facilities with defined boundaries. HB 337 is the law that places commercial operation limitation on model aircraft as well and states: exemptions from permitting requirements; the age for a commercial UAS permit; looser UAS restrictions for the use in emergency management; and permission for private and commercial operators to aid law enforcement with emergency operations. In North Carolina, sections in General Statute 14 define crimes by UAs, interference with manned aircraft by UAS, unlawful possession and use of UAS, and the unlawful distribution of images by UAS. SB 402 was passed to prevent state and local personnel from using UAS unless approved by the Department of Transportation and gives the Department of Transportation the oversight of information gathered in this manner. SB 744 places further regulation on the use of UAS for surveillance, privacy matters regarding UAS, imaging technologies allowed to be used on UAS, and law enforcement use of UAS, and defines the penalties for unlawful use of UAS. SB 446 furthers on SB 402 by giving the state's Chief Information Officer the jurisdiction over the purchase and use of UAS by the state and modifies some laws to be in line with the FAA. The town of Nag's Head has an ordinance in place approved by the FAA.

1.34 North Dakota

The Senate of North Dakota signed HB 1328 into law to place surveillance limitations on UAS. Furthermore, HB 1018 attempted to restructure the oversight of UAS while allowing exemptions to be granted. In North Dakota, it is illegal to carry a weapon or explosive on a UAS. However, law enforcement is trying to appeal this law to be able to arm their UAS platforms. Lastly, Grand Forks has placed an ordinance on UAS within the city limits.

1.35 Ohio

The Ohio General Assembly signed HB 292 to create an Aerospace and Aviation Technology Committee to research and develop new technologies for UAS. The city of Cleveland also has an ordinance in place to allow local law enforcement to have some oversight over UAS operations.

1.36 Oklahoma

In Oklahoma, only HB 259 exists beyond the FAA regulations which pertains to UAS operation within 400 feet of critical infrastructure.

1.37 Oregon

In Oregon, by HB 4066 the armament of, reckless interference of an aircraft with, and certain uses of UAS are prohibited to include the use by public bodies without following

certain policies and the use near critical infrastructure. There are fees for the registration of UAS in effect under SB 5702. Also, with HB 2710 law enforcement agencies need a warrant to operate a UAS, must register it with the Department of Aviation, and there are further regulations on placing a weapon on a UAS and flying over private property. As is common among many states, the use of UAS in any hunting or game catching activity is prohibited by HB 2534. HB 3047 furthers on weaponized UAS by allowing only non-lethal projectiles to be used if the UAS is used under specific FAA approval. This bill also allows the reconstruction of an accident scene using UAS and places further privacy regulations on UAS while defining penalties for unlawful operation.

1.38 Pennsylvania

In Pennsylvania, the city of Pittsburgh, East Goshen Township, and Chester County have ordinances in place as approved by the FAA to expand upon their own regulations.

1.39 Rhode Island

In Rhode Island, other than the FAA, the state and the Rhode Island Airport Corporation are the only entities with jurisdiction over UAS regulations through HB 7511 and SB 3099. Other than these pieces of legislature, no official laws have been passed to place further regulations on UAS.

1.40 South Carolina

South Carolina only has the FAA regulations in effect and no additional laws to follow.

1.41 South Dakota

South Dakota requires that FAA regulations are followed and prohibits the use of drones over jails, over military facilities, to deliver contraband, and unwarranted surveillance. These provisions are defined in SB 80 along with the crime level for each situation. Furthermore, SB 22 exempts UAS under 55 pounds from UAS registration requirements. Last, Aberdeen has a city ordinance in place over the operation of drones as approved by the FAA.

1.42 Tennessee

In Tennessee it is allowed by HB 2376 for UAS to be used by private institutions and higher education beyond just law enforcement. As in other states it is illegal to fly UAS near critical infrastructure. SB 796 defines the allowable bounds in which UAS may be used by law enforcement such as with a warrant, to counter terrorist attacks, and if swift action is needed to save a life. SB 1777 prevents the use of UAS in hunting or to film someone hunting or fishing without their consent. SB 1892 in Tennessee is a statute to protect privacy rights and to prohibit the use of UAS for surveillance of an

individual or their property. The last legislative document, HB 153, prohibits UAS use around open-air events, fireworks displays, and correctional facilities.

1.43 Texas

The Texas government has defined under Code 423-00219 legitimate commercial UAS operations and protects the privacy of individuals from photography or film without consent. HB 912 places limitations already discussed on law enforcement, as well as in oil pipeline safety and oil rig protection. Also under 912, the Department of Public Safety is named as the presiding body over adopting rules for the use of UAS by law enforcement and the reporting of the use of those UAS. The reporting rules were modified under HCR 217 to better streamline the process. HB 3628 allows for the creation of rules governing UAS in the Capitol Complex. HB 2167 permits certain professions to use UAS images if no individuals may be identified in the image. HB 1481 prevents the operation of UAS near critical infrastructure as seen in many states so far. SB 840 allows telecommunications use of UAS, however, only law enforcement may use them within 25 miles of the border if the images are of real property. This law broadens the use of UAS in insurance claims if the operator is FAA certified. HB 1424 serves as a limitation to UAS over prisons and sports venues. Finally, HB 1643 elaborates on the critical infrastructure definition to include additional facilities.

1.44 Utah

Utah has similar laws to all the above states. HB 217 protects livestock from UAS operations that are knowingly carried out to harm the animal, while HB 126 prohibits UAS from areas around wildfire operations. HB 3003 furthers on 126 by making punishments more severe and by allowing the disabling of UAS near wildfires. SB 167 places the regulations already seen for law enforcement use of UAS on Utah agencies regarding the need of a warrant and the use of data submitted by a third party, as well as reporting procedures by these agencies of their use of UAS and data obtained. With data collection, HB 296 allows for the use of UAS data in search and rescue missions in remote areas as well as the testing of UAS in open areas and by law enforcement. The most extensive of Utah regulations is SB 111 which adds UAS to many existing laws, gives the state government preemption over all UAS related laws, requires law enforcement records to be kept, prohibits weaponizing UAS, and places limitations on UAS flight. As defined by the FAA, SB 111 reiterates visual line of sight, airspace limitations, prohibits flying in interference of manned aircraft or manned aircraft bases or ports. Also, SB 111 protects commercial and educational use of UAS in correspondence with FAA regulations as well as defines voyeurism further to include UAS.

Ski Resorts and Ski areas in Utah have placed ordinances or no fly zones for UAS to protect the public in peak seasons.

1.45 Vermont

Vermont has passed SB 155 beyond the FAA regulations. This bill regulates the use of UAS by law enforcement agencies and requires these agencies to report annually on

using drones. In addition, it makes the armament of UAS illegal. Otherwise, the FAA regulations are the only statutes in effect.

1.46 Virginia

The State of Virginia has exclusive oversight over UAS regulation and HB 412 prevents the regulation of UAS by localities. HB 2350 prohibits trespassing with a UAS for voyeurism activities. SB 873 was passed to protect fire operations and prevent the operation of UAS around an emergency incident. By HB 2125 and SB 1301, law enforcement agencies are required to obtain a warrant before their use of UAS. Charlottesville has passed an Anti-drone Resolution to prevent the use of UAS within the city limits.

1.47 Washington

In Washington, King County and Pierce County have their own ordinances in effect beyond the FAA's ruling. Otherwise, the FAA laws are the main source of regulation for the state of Washington.

1.48 West Virginia

West Virginia has enacted 2 main pieces of legislature. SB 9 adds article 29 to the Code of West Virginia to include UAS. Under SB 9, law enforcement is regulated in their use of UAS as already seen—warrants, documentation or record of the flights and data obtained, etc.—and providing the specific ways law enforcement may use UAS. Last under SB 9 is the jurisdiction of the West Virginia Aeronautics Commission to advise the state on rules regarding UAS. The second piece of legislature is HB 2515, which prohibits hunting with the aid of UAS.

1.49 Wisconsin

Wisconsin has numerous chapters, ordinances, and laws in effect regarding UAS. The chapters in place are 114, 175, 941, 942, and 29. Chapter 114 limits flying and landing of UAS, limits the operation of UAS, defines penalties for damages by UAS, defines penalties for intoxicated and reckless flying of UAS, and permits local regulation of UAS. Chapter 175 places restrictions on the use of drones by law enforcement. Chapter 941 prohibits the possession of a weaponized drone. Chapter 942 defines drone crimes regarding blackmail, privacy, and civil liberties. Finally, chapter 29 prohibits the use of UAS to interfere with hunting and fishing. AB 670 is a public act to prohibit the use of drones over jails and gives local entities the power to limit where drones may be flown. SB 338 furthers on chapter 29 to place penalties for interference. SB 196 expands upon chapter 175 by requiring law enforcement to obtain a warrant to use UAS and prohibits weaponizing a drone or using a drone to interfere with another person's privacy. Antigo, Chetek, Green Bay, and Outagamie County all have ordinances in place.

1.50 Wyoming

In Wyoming, the FAA's rulings are expanded upon in SB 170. In this bill, the Wyoming Aeronautics Commission is tasked with creating regulations on where UAS can launch and land and on the operation of UAS in coordination with UAS industry and local governments. The FAA preempts any commission rulings over UAS in navigable airspace as stated in the law. Also, the operator is prohibited from landing a UAS on someone else's property, but is permitted to fly over their own property.

2.0 References

Nilsson, S., JD, PhD, MAS. (n.d.). Drone. Retrieved from <http://www.sarahnilsson.org/drone/>

United States Department of Transportation. (2017, February 10). Becoming a Pilot. Retrieved from
from
https://www.faa.gov/uas/getting_started/fly_for_work_business/becoming_a_pilot/