LEECH | TISHMAN

Drones Over Communities: Federal Control, Local Impacts, and Paths to Reform

I. Introduction: Drones as the Next Land-Use Conflict

Uncrewed aircraft systems (UAS), commonly referred to as drones, have moved rapidly from novelty to infrastructure. What began with recreational hobbyists has expanded into inspection, mapping, agriculture, emergency response, surveillance, and package delivery. For many communities, this expansion is no longer speculative. Drones now operate at altitudes and frequencies that insert aviation directly into daily residential life, collapsing traditional distinctions between airspace governance and local land use.

Drone package delivery illustrates this shift most clearly, not because it is unique, but because it is the first application to scale nationally through repeatable federal approvals. The legal architecture developed for delivery operations is already being generalized to other drone uses. As a result, the regulatory choices made today will shape how low-altitude airspace is governed across sectors for decades.

This article synthesizes three related analyses into a unified legal framework. It examines how the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approves drone operations, how the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) functions as the primary mechanism for public engagement, why state and local authority has narrowed, and how targeted legal reforms could restore balance between innovation and community protection.

II. The FAA's Drone Approval Architecture

The FAA has integrated drones into existing aviation law rather than creating a bespoke statutory regime. For routine commercial operations, particularly those conducted beyond visual line of sight, the agency relies on air carrier certification, operational waivers, and amended Operations Specifications (OpSpecs). *See 14 C.F.R. pts. 107, 135*. While this framework was designed for conventional aviation, it now governs aircraft that fly at rooftop level over homes, schools, and parks.

Crucially, the operative federal action is not merely certification, but the approval of specific operating areas, routes, and parameters through OpSpecs. FAA environmental reviews for drone delivery operations repeatedly identify the issuance or amendment of OpSpecs as the major federal action triggering NEPA review. *See, e.g., FAA, Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Drone Package Delivery Operations §§ 1.2, 3.1 (2025); FAA, Wing Aviation LLC Central Florida Environmental Assessment § 1.1 (2022); FAA, Zipline International DFW Environmental Assessment § 1.2 (2023).*

III. NEPA as the Primary Community Leverage Point

NEPA does not dictate outcomes, but it structures decision-making. For drone operations, it provides the principal mechanism for communities to obtain information, challenge segmentation, and require consideration of cumulative impacts. *See 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321–4370h; 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.1–1508.1.*

Steven M. Taber, Esq.
Partner

Leader, Aviation & Aerospace
Co-Leader, Environmental

staber@leechtishman.com
424.738.4400

Steve Taber is based in Los Angeles and regularly advises clients on environmental law, aviation and airport development law matters, corporate legal issues, and complex litigation. In his capacity as an attorney for the FAA, Steve was involved with many aspects of the requirements of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs) and FAA enforcement actions.

FAA environmental reviews often rely on applicant-defined limits—such as flights per day or hours of operation—to support findings of no significant impact. At the same time, FAA programmatic documents acknowledge that drone operations are expected to expand geographically and operationally nationwide. *See FAA, Draft Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Drone Package Delivery Operations at 2–3 (2025).*

This tension creates legal vulnerability. NEPA requires agencies to consider connected actions, cumulative impacts, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. *See Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390, 410 (1976); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.1(g).* Where foreseeable expansion is deferred to future approvals, communities may argue that the FAA has improperly segmented a larger federal action into smaller components. *See Thomas v. Peterson, 753 F.2d 754, 758–59 (9th Cir. 1985).*

IV. Noise, Methodology, and the Limits of Existing Metrics

Drone noise presents a paradigmatic mismatch between technology and regulatory tools. FAA analyses rely heavily on Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) metrics developed for high-altitude, transitory aircraft. Drone noise, by contrast, is low-altitude, tonal, repetitive, and often experienced directly overhead.

Emerging research indicates that human response to drone noise differs materially from response to conventional aircraft noise, particularly with respect to annoyance and sleep disturbance. Exclusive reliance on averaged metrics risks understating real-world impacts and undermines public confidence in environmental review.

V. Federal Preemption and the Shrinking Space for Local Control

The FAA increasingly asserts broad preemption over drone operations, citing the need for national uniformity in airspace management and safety. At the same time, local governments retain responsibility for land use, zoning, public health, and quality of life. This creates a structural imbalance: communities are consulted on where drone infrastructure may be sited but largely excluded from decisions about how drones operate once airborne.

Drone delivery makes this imbalance visible, but the same dynamics apply to surveillance, inspection, and future passenger operations. Without recalibration, low-altitude airspace risks becoming a federally managed commons with localized impacts and limited local recourse.

VI. Toward a Rebalanced Legal Framework: Substantive Reforms for Low-Altitude Governance

The regulatory trajectory described above is not an inevitable consequence of technology. It is the product of legal choices—many of them made implicitly through certification practices, environmental review conventions, and expansive assertions of federal preemption rather than through clear congressional direction. If drones are to become a routine presence over communities, the governing framework must evolve beyond procedural disclosure and toward substantive accountability. Several reforms, grounded in existing doctrine, would meaningfully rebalance authority while preserving aviation safety and innovation.

A. Reconsidering Avigation Easements and Low-Altitude Airspace Interests

Federal aviation law has long rested on the distinction between protected navigable airspace and the property interests that attach to land ownership. That distinction developed in an era of transitory overflight at altitude. Persistent, low-altitude drone operations challenge those assumptions. Courts have repeatedly recognized that landowners retain protectable interests in the immediate reaches of airspace necessary for the use and enjoyment of land, particularly where overflight is frequent, low, and intrusive.

A recalibrated approach would acknowledge a protected property interest in low-altitude airspace—whether defined by altitude bands or functional use—subject to reasonable public servitudes. Such recognition would not prohibit drone operations, but it would require operators to internalize their impacts through routing choices, designated aerial corridors, or negotiated avigation easements. The result would be a land-use-informed airspace regime rather than a blanket assumption of aerial permissibility.

B. Restoring Local Time, Place, and Manner Authority

The FAA's increasing reliance on field preemption has left municipalities uncertain about their ability to respond to localized impacts. Yet land use, noise management, and protection of sensitive sites have historically fallen within state and local police powers. A statutory clarification preserving local authority to adopt reasonable, non-discriminatory time, place, and manner restrictions—so long as they do not conflict with federal safety standards—would restore a familiar constitutional balance.

Such an approach would allow communities to address drone operations over schools, hospitals, wildlife refuges, or during nighttime hours without fragmenting the national airspace system. It would also align drone governance with longstanding First Amendment and land-use frameworks that accommodate both national interests and local conditions.

C. Establishing Strict Liability for Ground Impacts

Existing tort doctrines place a substantial evidentiary burden on individuals harmed by drone malfunctions, particularly where autonomous systems, proprietary software, and opaque operational data are involved. A strict-liability regime for commercial drone operations would better reflect the risk allocation principles traditionally applied to ultrahazardous or highly regulated activities.

Under such a framework, operators would be responsible for damage or injury caused by their operations regardless of fault, subject to traditional defenses. This approach would promote investment in redundancy, conservative routing, and insurance coverage while ensuring prompt compensation for affected residents.

D. Embedding Privacy-by-Design and Data Minimization

Modern drones rely on sophisticated sensors that inevitably capture information about people and property on the ground. Even when surveillance is not the purpose of flight, incidental data collection raises persistent privacy concerns. Regulatory reliance on operator assurances is unlikely to sustain public trust.

A privacy-by-design regime would require real-time minimization of non-essential data through blurring, deletion, or anonymization, coupled with strict limits on retention and secondary use. Embedding these requirements at the design and certification stage would align drone operations with emerging privacy norms while reducing community resistance to deployment.

E. Developing Drone-Specific Noise and Acoustic Standards

FAA noise analysis remains anchored in metrics developed for high-altitude, transitory aircraft. Drone noise is qualitatively different: tonal, repetitive, and experienced at close range. Averaged decibel metrics often fail to capture annoyance, sleep disruption, and cumulative disturbance.

The development of drone-specific acoustic standards—incorporating tonal characteristics, event frequency, and time-of-day sensitivity—would allow environmental review to reflect lived experience. Communities could then establish enforceable noise budgets, ensuring that operational growth does not outpace social tolerance.

F. Ensuring Meaningful Public Access to Remote Identification

Remote identification requirements are intended to promote accountability, yet their benefits are largely inaccessible to the public. Without a practical means of identifying operators, residents have little recourse when operations violate applicable rules.

A publicly accessible identification system—designed for ordinary users rather than regulators—would enhance transparency, deter misuse, and support targeted enforcement. Accountability, in this context, is not punitive; it is foundational to legitimacy.

G. Affirming Local Zoning Authority and Revenue Sharing

Drone operations depend on ground infrastructure: hubs, nests, charging stations, and staging areas. These facilities implicate traditional zoning authority and impose localized burdens. Allowing municipalities to zone, fee, or tax such facilities—and to direct revenues toward mitigation—would ensure that communities share in the economic benefits of low-altitude commercialization.

Revenue-sharing mechanisms would also fund noise mitigation, enforcement capacity, and public amenities, transforming drone integration from an unfunded mandate into a negotiated land-use decision.

VII. Doctrinal Pressure Points: Courts, NEPA, Noise, and Legislation in Convergence

The legal friction surrounding low-altitude drone operations is not confined to a single doctrinal lane. Rather, it arises at the intersection of constitutional property principles, administrative law, environmental review, and statutory preemption. Understanding how these strands interact is essential to anticipating where doctrine is likely to move—and where reform efforts are most likely to succeed.

A. Courts and the Reemergence of Low-Altitude Takings Analysis

Judicial treatment of aviation has historically emphasized transitory overflight at altitude. Drones disrupt that baseline. Persistent, low-level operations that hover, loiter, or repeatedly traverse the same corridors raise questions that courts have not squarely confronted since the early takings cases involving military aircraft. As drone operations become more common, courts will increasingly be asked to distinguish between incidental overflight and functional occupation of airspace. That inquiry will necessarily draw on nuisance, trespass, and takings principles, particularly where operations interfere with the use and enjoyment of land.

The likely doctrinal inflection point is not categorical prohibition, but compensation and accommodation. Courts are well positioned to recognize that federal authorization does not extinguish all private property interests, especially where impacts are concentrated and foreseeable. In this respect, litigation may do what regulation has not: force clarity at the lowest altitudes.

B. NEPA as a Structural Check on Incrementalism

NEPA's relevance to drones extends beyond disclosure. The statute is one of the few mechanisms capable of forcing the FAA to confront the cumulative consequences of serial approvals. Drone delivery provides the template: individual approvals are framed as limited, yet the agency simultaneously acknowledges nationwide scaling.

As courts continue to scrutinize segmentation and cumulative impacts in other infrastructure contexts, drone approvals present a textbook case for doctrinal development. Where foreseeable expansion is deferred to future OpSpecs amendments, NEPA doctrine supplies a principled basis for requiring broader analysis earlier in the decision-making process. In that sense, NEPA is not merely procedural friction; it is a temporal discipline imposed on agencies inclined toward incrementalism.

C. Noise Methodology as the Weakest Technical Link

Noise analysis remains the most technically vulnerable aspect of FAA drone review. The continued reliance on legacy metrics developed for fundamentally different aircraft exposes agency decisions to challenge not because of policy disagreement, but because of methodological mismatch. Courts have historically deferred to agency expertise, but that deference is contingent on reasoned explanation and a rational connection between methodology and real-world effects.

As empirical research on drone acoustics matures, the gap between lived experience and regulatory metrics will become harder to justify. This creates an opening not only for litigation, but for administrative reform. Updating noise standards is among the least disruptive yet most legitimacy-enhancing steps available to regulators.

D. Legislative Reform as the Missing Integrator

Ultimately, courts and NEPA can only do so much. Both operate reactively and episodically. The most durable solutions will require legislative clarification—particularly with respect to the scope of federal preemption and the preservation of local authority over time, place, and manner impacts. Absent such clarification, municipalities will continue to operate in a zone of uncertainty, and disputes will be resolved through uneven litigation rather than coherent policy.

Legislation need not displace federal safety authority to be effective. Narrow amendments that affirm local zoning power over ground infrastructure, authorize reasonable operational constraints, and modernize liability and privacy standards would significantly rebalance the system without fragmenting the airspace.

VIII. Conclusion: Drones as a Governance Test Case

Low-altitude drone operations represent a stress test for aviation law itself. The existing framework was built for speed, altitude, and transience—not persistence, proximity, and ubiquity. Drone delivery has merely exposed that mismatch sooner than other applications will.

Whether drones ultimately integrate smoothly into American communities will depend less on technological capability than on legal legitimacy. That legitimacy will be earned only if federal authority is exercised transparently, environmental review is commensurate with real-world impacts, noise and privacy are addressed with modern tools, and local communities are treated as participants rather than obstacles. How the law responds to drones will signal how it intends to govern the next generation of low-altitude aviation.

Drone delivery is not the end state; it is the beginning. The legal framework now emerging will govern inspection, surveillance, emergency response, and future passenger systems. NEPA remains a critical safeguard, but it cannot substitute for substantive governance.

The central question is whether low-altitude airspace will be treated as an unregulated byproduct of innovation or as a shared space requiring democratic accountability. Rebalancing federal authority with local participation is not an obstacle to progress; it is a prerequisite for legitimacy in the next era of aviation.

Contact Steve Taber

For more information about sustainable aviation fuel, or other aviation and environmental law concerns, contact Steven M. Taber.

Steve is a Partner and Leader of Leech Tishman's Aviation & Aerospace Industry Group, and also Co-Leader of the firm's Environmental Practice Area. Steve is based in the Los Angeles office and can be reached at 424.738.4400 or staber@leechtishman.com.