Office of Regulatory Management

Economic Review Form

| Agency name | Department of Motor Vehicles | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Virginia Administrative | 24 VAC 20-82-20 | | |
| Code (VAC) Chapter | | | |
| citation(s) | | | |
| VAC Chapter title(s) | Overload permit requirements | | |
| Action title | Amend 24VAC20-82-20 to remove certain outdated | | |
| | requirements | | |
| Date this document | 4/5/24 | | |
| prepared | | | |
| Regulatory Stage | Fast-Track | | |
| (including Issuance of | | | |
| Guidance Documents) | | | |

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)

| Tubic Tu. Costs and | Denents of the Froposeu Ch | <u> </u> | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| (1) Direct & | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. | | | |
| Indirect Costs & | The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement | | | |
| Benefits | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that | | | |
| (Monetized) | would present any di | | | |
| | Indirect Costs: Describe the | indirect costs of the proposed change. | | |
| | | of the removal of expired decal requirement | | |
| | 1 | 20 does not introduce any changes that | | |
| | | direct monetized costs. | | |
| | | e direct benefits of this proposed change | | |
| | here. | and the state of the proposition of the state of the stat | | |
| | | of the removal of expired decal requirement | | |
| | | 20 does not introduce any changes that | | |
| | | rect monetized benefits. | | |
| | 1 | he indirect benefits of the proposed change. | | |
| | | of the removal of expired decal requirement | | |
| | | 20 does not introduce any changes that | | |
| | | direct monetized benefits. | | |
| | would present any in | direct monetized benefits. | | |
| (2) Present | | | | |
| Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs | Direct & Indirect Benefits | | |
| | (a) \$0.00 | (b) \$0.00 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| (3) Net Monetized | \$0.00 | | | |
| Benefit | | | | |
| (4) Other Costs & | (4) Other Costs & The repeal of the of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 | | | |
| Benefits (Non- | 1 | the regulatory burden on motor carrier | | |
| Monetized) | | is requirement. Additionally, while DMV | | |
| Wionetized) | 1 2 | * | | |
| | does not have specific data related to the time spent by motor carrier | | | |
| | businesses removing expired decals from vehicles, it can infer that the | | | |
| | removal of this regulatory requirement will save motor carrier businesses money by eliminating any payroll costs associated with employees | | | |
| | removing expired decals from vehicles. | | | |
| (5) Information | None. | III VEHICIES. | | |
| (5) Information | none. | | | |
| Sources | | | | |
| | | | | |

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

| (1) Direct & | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. | |
|------------------|---|--|
| Indirect Costs & | Maintenance of the status quo would not present any direct | |
| Benefits | monetized costs. | |
| (Monetized) | Indirect Costs: Describe the indirect costs of the proposed change. | |
| | Maintenance of the status quo would not present any indirect | |
| | monetized costs. | |

| | Direct Benefits: Describe the direct benefits of this proposed change here. Maintenance of the status quo would not present any direct monetized benefits. Indirect Benefits: Describe the indirect benefits of the proposed change. Maintenance of the status quo would not present any indirect monetized benefits. | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| (2) Present | D' + 0 I 1' + C + | Di de la li de la Ca | | | |
| Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs | Direct & Indirect Benefits | | | |
| | (a) \$0.00 (b) \$0.00 | | | | |
| (3) Net Monetized Benefit | \$0.00 | | | | |
| (4) Other Costs & Benefits (Non-Monetized) (5) Information Sources | Maintenance of the status quo represents an increased regulatory burden when compared to the proposed regulatory change. Under the status quo, motor carrier companies would continue to be required to remove expired decals from their vehicles. Additionally, while DMV does not have specific data related to the time spent by motor carrier businesses removing expired decals from vehicles, it can infer that the maintenance of the status quo would represent an increased financial burden on motor carrier businesses by continuing to impose any payroll costs associated with employees removing expired decals from vehicles. None. | | | | |
| Sources | | | | | |

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

| (1) Direct & | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Indirect Costs & | As the sole alternative is the status quo, the alternative approach | | | |
| Benefits | would not present an | y direct monetized costs. | | |
| (Monetized) | Indirect Costs: Describe the | indirect costs of the proposed change. | | |
| | As the sole alternativ | e is the status quo, the alternative approach | | |
| | would not present an | y indirect monetized costs. | | |
| | Direct Benefits: Describe the direct benefits of this proposed change | | | |
| | here. | | | |
| | As the sole alternative is the status quo, the alternative approach | | | |
| | would not present any direct monetized benefits. | | | |
| | Indirect Benefits: Describe the indirect benefits of the proposed change. | | | |
| | As the sole alternative is the status quo, the alternative approach | | | |
| | would not present any indirect monetized benefits | | | |
| | _ | - | | |
| (2) Present | | | | |
| Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs Direct & Indirect Benefits | | | |

| | (a) \$0.00 | (b) \$0.00 | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| (3) Net Monetized Benefit | \$0.00 | | | |
| (4) Other Costs & Benefits (Non- Monetized) | There are no additional non-discussed above. | are no additional non-monetized costs or benefits outside what is sed above. | | |
| (5) Information Sources | None. The sole alternative is | s maintenance of the status quo. | | |

Impact on Local Partners

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

| Table 2. Impact on Local I artifely | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| (1) Direct & | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. | | | |
| Indirect Costs & | The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement | | | |
| Benefits | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does | not introduce any changes that | | |
| (Monetized) | would present any direct cos | ts to local partners. | | |
| | Indirect Costs: Describe the indirect | costs of the proposed change. | | |
| | The proposed repeal of the re | emoval of expired decal requirement | | |
| | | s not introduce any changes that | | |
| | would present any indirect co | • | | |
| | Direct Benefits: Describe the direct | * | | |
| | here. | 8- | | |
| | | emoval of expired decal requirement | | |
| | 1 1 1 | * * | | |
| | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that | | | |
| | would present any direct benefits to local partners. | | | |
| | Indirect Benefits: Describe the indirect benefits of the proposed change. The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement. | | | |
| | The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement | | | |
| | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that | | | |
| | would present any indirect benefits to local partners. | | | |
| (2) Present | | | | |
| Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs | Direct & Indirect Benefits | | |
| | (a) \$0.00 | (b) \$0.00 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| (2) Other Casts % | \$0.00 | | | |
| (3) Other Costs & | \$0.00 | | | |
| Benefits (Non- | | | | |
| Monetized) | | | | |

| (4) Assistance | As the proposed regulatory action does not present any direct or indirect costs or benefits to local partners, no assistance is required. |
|-------------------------|---|
| (5) Information Sources | None. The repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 VAC 20-82-20 imposes no additional benefit or burden specific to local partners. |

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

| Table 3. Impact on | i willing | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| (1) Direct & | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. | | | |
| Indirect Costs & | The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement | | | |
| Benefits | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that | | | |
| (Monetized) | would present any direct cost | ts to families. | | |
| | Indirect Costs: Describe the indirect | costs of the proposed change. | | |
| | The proposed repeal of the re | emoval of expired decal requirement | | |
| | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does | not introduce any changes that | | |
| | would present any indirect co | osts to families. | | |
| | Direct Benefits: Describe the direct b | | | |
| | here. | | | |
| | The proposed repeal of the re | emoval of expired decal requirement | | |
| | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does | not introduce any changes that | | |
| | would present any direct ben- | | | |
| | Indirect Benefits: Describe the indire | | | |
| | | moval of expired decal requirement | | |
| | from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that | | | |
| | would present any indirect benefits to families | | | |
| (2) Present | | | | |
| Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs | Direct & Indirect Benefits | | |
| Wionetized values | (a) \$0.00 | (b) \$0.00 | | |
| | (a) \$0.00 | (0) \$0.00 | | |
| | | | | |
| (3) Other Costs & | (2) Odlan Carta 8 60 00 | | | |
| Benefits (Non- | \$0.00 | | | |
| Monetized) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| (4) Information | None. The repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 | | | |
| Sources | VAC 20-82-20 imposes no additional benefit or burden specific to | | | |
| | families. | | | |
| | • | | | |

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 & Indirect Costs & Benefits (Monetized) | Direct Costs: Describe the direct costs of this proposed change here. The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that would present any direct monetized costs to small businesses. Indirect Costs: Describe the indirect costs of the proposed change. The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | would present any indirect m Direct Benefits: Describe the direct b | not introduce any changes that onetized costs to small businesses. benefits of this proposed change | | |
| | here. The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that would present any direct monetized benefits to small businesses. The non-monetized direct benefit to small businesses is discussed below. Indirect Benefits: Describe the indirect benefits of the proposed change. The proposed repeal of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 VAC 20-82-20 does not introduce any changes that would present any indirect monetized benefits to small businesses. | | | |
| (2) Present Monetized Values | Direct & Indirect Costs | Direct & Indirect Benefits | | |
| | (a) \$0.00 | (b) \$0.00 | | |
| (3) Other Costs & Benefits (Non- Monetized) | As discussed above, while DMV does not have specific data related to the time spent by motor carrier businesses removing expired decals from vehicles, it can infer that the removal of this regulatory requirement will save small motor carrier businesses money by eliminating any payroll costs associated with employees removing expired decals from vehicles. | | | |
| (4) Alternatives | As discussed above, the sole alternat | ive is maintenance of the status quo. | | |
| (5) Information Sources | None. | | | |

Changes to Number of Regulatory Requirements

Table 5: Regulatory Reduction

For each individual action, please fill out the appropriate chart to reflect any change in regulatory requirements, costs, regulatory stringency, or the overall length of any guidance documents.

Change in Regulatory Requirements

| VAC Section(s) | Authority of Change | Initial Count | Additions | Subtractions | Net Change |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|
| Involved* | | | | | |
| 24 VAC 20- | Statutory: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 82-20 | Discretionary: | 13 | 0 | 1 | -1 |
| | | | | Total Net | 0 |
| | | | | Change of | |
| | | | | Statutory | |
| | | | | Requirements: | |
| | | | | Total Net | -1 |
| | | | | Change of | discretionary |
| | | | | Discretionary | regulant |
| | | | | Requirements: | requirement |

Cost Reductions or Increases (if applicable)

| VAC Section(s) Involved* | Description of Regulatory Requirement | Initial Cost | New Cost | Overall Cost Savings/Increases |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Other Decreases or Increases in Regulatory Stringency (if applicable)

| VAC Section(s) | Description of Regulatory | Overview of How It Reduces | |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| Involved* | Change | or Increases Regulatory | |
| | | Burden | |
| 24 VAC 20-82-20 | Repeal removal of expired decal requirement | The repeal of the of the removal of expired decal requirement from 24 VAC 20-82-20 would lessen the regulatory burden on motor carrier companies by | |
| | | eliminating this requirement. Additionally, while DMV does not have specific data related to the time spent by motor carrier businesses removing expired decals from vehicles, it can infer that the removal of this | |

| | regulatory requirement will | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | save motor carrier businesses | |
| | money by eliminating any | |
| | payroll costs associated with | |
| | employees removing expired | |
| | decals from vehicles. | |
| | | |

Length of Guidance Documents (only applicable if guidance document is being revised)

| Title of Guidance | Original Length | New Length | Net Change in |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| Document | | | Length |
| | | | |
| | | | |

^{*}If the agency is modifying a guidance document that has regulatory requirements, it should report any change in requirements in the appropriate chart(s).