



**GREAT PLAINS
INSTITUTE**

Better Energy.
Better World.

Aligning Autonomous Vehicles with Sustainability Goals: Local Government Playbook



Table of contents

DISCLAIMER	5
IMPORTANCE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	6
CONSIDERATIONS	9
STATE POLICY ENVIRONMENT	9
IMPACT ON TRANSIT AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION	9
ALIGNMENT WITH COMMUNITY GOALS AND VISION	10
LOCAL BURDENS	11
IS YOUR COMMUNITY LIKELY TO SEE AVs SOONER RATHER THAN LATER?	12
LEVERS FOR LOCAL ACTION	14
LEVER 1: ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY AND INCLUDE AVs IN COMMUNITY PLANS AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES	14
PARTNERS	15
COMMUNITY EXAMPLES	16
RESOURCES	18
LEVER 2: UPDATE LAND USE, ZONING, CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT, AND PARKING POLICY TO PREPARE FOR AVs	19
PARTNERS	21
COMMUNITY EXAMPLES	22
RESOURCES	23
LEVER 3: SERVICE AGREEMENTS WITH AV RIDESHARE PROVIDERS	25
PARTNERS	26
COMMUNITY EXAMPLES	27
RESOURCES	30
LEVER 4: PARTNERING ON OR LEADING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	31

PARTNERS	31
COMMUNITY EXAMPLES	32
RESOURCES	33
TEMPLATE: PILOT PROJECT CHECKLIST	34
EARLY GUIDING QUESTIONS	34
PROBLEM FIT	34
ENGAGEMENT	34
LEGAL AND POLICY	35
SAFETY AND OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	35
ACCESS AND CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE CONSIDERATIONS	35
PARTNERS AND GOVERNANCE	36
DATA AND EVALUATION	36
ENDNOTES	38

Introduction

This playbook provides guidance to local governments on how autonomous vehicles (AVs) may impact sustainability and community goals, and the potential tools available to guide future deployment so that it aligns with local needs and opportunities.

The concept of self-driving vehicles is not new, but over the past several decades, research and deployment have accelerated the technology's feasibility. Competitions and demonstrations held by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in the early and mid-2000s, in which teams were tasked with designing vehicles capable of navigating complex courses autonomously,¹ helped move autonomous driving into a major area of university, industry, and government investment.

As the AV industry has matured, standards such as the Levels of Driving Automation from the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) have become widely accepted to differentiate between different levels of autonomy.

Within this six-level framework, there is an important distinction between Levels 0 through 2, which consist of driver-supported features that still require active human interaction, and Levels 3 through 5, which include more automated features that require little to no intervention.² In practice, current deployments are typically in designated service areas and are almost entirely constrained to Level 4 systems or lower, rather than true Level 5 automation.³

Autonomous vehicles key terms

Autonomous vehicle (AV): The broad term used in this playbook for vehicles operating at the higher end of the SAE automation spectrum.

Connected, autonomous, shared, and electric (CASE): AVs that are shared (not personally owned) and electrified.

Transportation network company (TNC): App-based ride-hail service providers like Uber and Lyft.

Figure 1. SAE's Levels of Driving Automation

SAE J3016™ LEVELS OF DRIVING AUTOMATION

SAE LEVEL 0	SAE LEVEL 1	SAE LEVEL 2	SAE LEVEL 3	SAE LEVEL 4	SAE LEVEL 5
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

What does the human in the driver's seat have to do?

You are driving whenever these driver support features are engaged - even if your feet are off the pedals and you are not steering			You are not driving when these automated driving features are engaged - even if you are seated in "the driver's seat"		
You must constantly supervise these support features; you must steer, brake or accelerate as needed to maintain safety			When the feature requests you must drive	These automated driving features will not require you to take over driving	

THESE ARE DRIVER SUPPORT FEATURES

THESE ARE AUTOMATED DRIVING FEATURES

What do these features do?

These features are limited to providing warnings and momentary assistance	These features provide steering OR brake/ acceleration support to the driver	These features provide steering AND brake/ acceleration support to the driver	These features can drive the vehicle under limited conditions and will not operate unless all required conditions are met	This feature can drive the vehicle under all conditions
---	--	---	---	---

Example Features

- Automatic emergency breaking - Blind spot warning - Lane departure warning	- Lane centering OR - Adaptive cruise control	- Lane centering AND - Adaptive cruise control at the same time	Traffic jam chauffeur	- Local driverless taxi - Pedals/steering wheel may or may not be installed	Same as level 4, but feature can drive everywhere in all conditions.
--	---	---	---	---	--

Source: "[SAE Levels of Driving Automation6 Refined for Clarity and International Audience](#)," SAE International, May 2, 2021.

The focus of this playbook is on Level 4 and Level 5 AVs, the levels of automation at which this technology has the greatest potential to disrupt how passenger transportation services are delivered and how communities plan for them.

The following sections explore the sustainability implications of AVs, the factors that may influence when and how AVs arrive in communities, and the levers that local governments may be able to use to shape how this technology arrives.

DISCLAIMER

The guidance in this playbook is intended for communities that are new to this topic and is based on the best available information at the time of writing. Best practices, case studies, and other information surrounding AVs are constantly changing and dependent on a community's state and local policy environment. Local government staff are encouraged to reach out to the Great Plains Institute directly for context-specific technical assistance.

IMPORTANCE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The transportation sector is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, which means local climate and sustainability efforts are tied to how people travel and how communities manage streets, curbs, and the public right-of-way.⁴ Due to this outsized impact, connected, automated, and autonomous vehicle technologies have the potential to completely revolutionize the sector and its climate impacts. Many automated features are increasingly common in modern cars,⁵ and Level 4 driverless services are rapidly expanding in select cities.⁶ For local governments, the question is not necessarily *if* this technology will arrive, but rather *when* and *how*, and whether the community will be ready when it does.

Because AVs will affect travel demand, curb use, road safety, access, emissions, and future development patterns, local governments should begin planning for this new technology's impact on climate efforts today, rather than waiting until deployment is underway.

From a sustainability perspective, AVs represent both a challenge and an opportunity. The ultimate impact of this technology is still unknown, but it will likely depend largely on how these vehicles show up in communities, the types of trips AVs replace, and the policies that shape their deployment. One critical question is whether AVs will be primarily owned by individuals and serve single-occupant trips or deployed in shared mobility systems in which these vehicles provide rides and related AV services to a range of customers.

Research and scenario modeling indicate that a future dominated by privately owned AVs would likely increase total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by making driving easier, increasing deadhead miles (miles driven with no passenger present), and drawing community members away from modes like walking, biking, and transit.⁷ However, in scenarios that assume that AVs are shared amongst many users, total VMT and emissions are predicted to be significantly lower than a scenario with privately owned AVs.⁸ Some models even predict that widespread adoption of AVs could yield a net positive climate impact by reducing emissions relative to current levels, so long as AVs are powered by electricity, shared,⁹ and well-integrated into a broader transportation ecosystem that supports transit, walking, biking, and compact land use.

For this reason, this playbook is developed on the premise that local governments should encourage AV deployments using connected, autonomous, shared, and electric (CASE) vehicles.

The recent deployment of new technologies at scale, such as the rapid growth of data center development across parts of the US, has demonstrated that the best time to plan for emerging trends and technologies is before they are at your community's front door.

While it is often difficult to predict which emerging trends will ultimately prove disruptive, the recent rapid growth of the AV industry, the amount of capital being spent on improving and deploying the technology, and the current federal administration's pro-AV-innovation stance¹⁰ all indicate that AVs could become a much larger component of transportation systems in the near future.

Communities do not need to know exactly when AVs will arrive at scale to know that they could have major implications for travel behavior, emissions, public space, and long-term development patterns. If local governments wait until deployment is already underway, many of the most important decisions may become harder to shape.

The rest of this playbook is intended to help local governments understand key considerations when planning for AVs, as well as practical levers to ensure that this technology ultimately supports community and climate goals.

Table 1. Examples of how autonomous vehicle deployment can be addressed in planning activities

Community	Levers	Topics addressed	Playbook page
St. Paul, Minnesota	Community plans and planning activities	Community engagement to develop goals and recommendations for demonstration projects related to autonomous transportation.	P. 16
Seattle, Washington	Community plans and planning activities	Proactive vision development in the Seattle New Mobility Plan, followed by a responsive community engagement cohort.	P. 17
Grand Rapids, Minnesota	Demonstration projects	Creation of an AV pilot through partnerships of state, local, and community actors that grounded its design in community needs. The program has been extended into an ongoing microtransit service.	P. 17
Chandler, Arizona	Zoning, curbside management, and parking policy	A zoning amendment allows reductions in parking requirements once a study demonstrates that AVs and TNCs have reduced parking demand.	P. 22
Alexandria, Virginia	Zoning, curbside management, and parking policy	Establishment of curbside loading zones, a process to request additional zones, and use of real-time curb-monitoring technologies.	P. 22
Boston, Massachusetts	Zoning, curbside management, and parking policy	Creation of a pick-up and drop-off pilot that designates curbside ride-hail zones.	P. 22

Somerville, Massachusetts	Zoning, curbside management, and parking policy	The city encourages infill development, including the redevelopment of gray fields such as oversized parking lots.	P. 23
Fairfax County, Virginia	Zoning, curbside management, and parking policy	Inclusion of transportation demand management (TDM) measures in the development approval process.	P. 23
San Francisco, California	Service agreements	Pilot of AVs at San Francisco Airport that includes reporting requirements and geofenced pick-up and drop-off locations.	P. 27
Chandler, Arizona	Service agreements	The city contracted with Waymo to provide autonomous rides to city employees.	P. 27
Detroit, Michigan	Service agreements	Creation of a service agreement with May Mobility to provide free autonomous shuttle service for older adults and residents with disabilities.	P.28
Vail, Colorado	Service agreements	Creation of a Passenger Transportation Ordinance that regulates many modes of transportation, including through requirements for insurance, pick-up and drop-off rules, and limits on cruising, double parking, and idling.	P. 28
Eugene and Springfield, Oregon	Service agreements	Development of a transportation management framework that incorporates TNCs into the passenger transportation system and requires licensure, record keeping, and data sharing, and institutes fees.	P. 29
Arlington, Texas	Demonstration projects	Creation of the city's Rideshare, Automation, and Payment Integration Demonstration (RAPID), which was the first in the country to integrate AVs into an existing public transportation system. The city now plans to move forward with phased deployments.	P. 32
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Demonstration projects	Development of an AV pilot that placed significant emphasis on assessment, with the goal of aligning future deployments with community needs.	P. 33
Atlanta, Georgia	Demonstration projects	The ATL Spoke pilot offers free autonomous shuttle service between a major rail transit station and the Atlanta Beltline trail in Southwest Atlanta. Launched in June 2026, the 12-month pilot helps fill a first- and last-mile transit gap in a corridor where about one in four residents lack access to a personal vehicle.	Not addressed

CONSIDERATIONS

STATE POLICY ENVIRONMENT

Currently, there is no comprehensive federal regulatory framework governing AV deployment. In the absence of federal legislation, states have emerged as the primary regulators of AVs, with a slight majority having adopted AV-specific statutes focused on testing and deployment. Many of these laws include provisions that preempt local governments' ability to regulate certain elements of AV technology. State legislation on AV technology typically falls into three categories:

- **Testing-focused statutes:** These laws authorize the piloting and testing of AV technologies, often requiring permits, safety drivers, or reporting requirements to state legislatures. In this case, local governments usually have limited involvement in terms of permitting.¹¹
- **Deployment-enabling statutes:** These laws enable full deployment of AVs once certain safety or performance thresholds are met, even when those thresholds are not fully defined. In this case, state laws may explicitly restrict local governments from banning or restricting AV operations.¹²
- **States without comprehensive AV statutes:** Local governments may have greater flexibility in states lacking formal AV legislation. However, this makes the regulatory authority for AVs more ambiguous.¹³

Because of the possibility of preemption, understanding the existing [regulations in your specific state](#) is a crucial first step in determining what actions local governments can legally take to regulate AVs. Additionally, it is critical that local governments stay up to date on regulatory changes at the state and federal levels, as the regulatory landscape surrounding AVs is likely to change in the near future.

IMPACT ON TRANSIT AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

While cleaner, less polluting vehicles are a key component of reducing transportation emissions, communities are increasingly recognizing that the total number of single-occupant vehicle trips and VMT will likely need to decrease meaningfully to meet climate goals. This means that even if AVs are more sustainable than cars on the road today, other modes like transit, walking, biking, and rolling will remain necessary components of sustainable transportation ecosystems. Local governments

planning for AVs should consider how these vehicles may affect other modes and take steps to ensure they work harmoniously together.

AVs have the potential to either support or weaken public transit, depending on how they are deployed.¹⁴ Depending on pricing and availability, AVs could draw riders away from transit, reducing fare revenue and making it harder for transit agencies to maintain frequent service.¹⁵

On the other hand, AV technology could also prove to be a major asset for transit agencies, potentially providing flexible solutions for some of public transportation's trickiest challenges. To ensure that residents have access to a range of mobility options, communities should work with their transit agency to plan AVs as a supplement to transit, not a replacement for it.

Potential ways AVs could support transit include first- and last-mile connections to stops, flexible service in lower-density areas, late-night or gap options when standard services are unavailable, and paratransit or senior mobility programs. The right approach will ultimately depend on local needs, transit service levels, funding, state law, and the community's broader goals for access, affordability, and emissions reduction.

AVs may also affect other ways of getting around, such as walking, biking, and rolling. Because AVs have the potential to make short vehicle trips easier and more convenient, communities should ensure that these other modes are safe, comfortable, practical, and attractive so that this new technology does not undermine sustainable transportation goals. These efforts could include providing safe and well-maintained sidewalks, protected bike lanes, safe crossings, traffic calming, compact land use that supports trips on foot, and curb policies that preserve space for all users.¹⁶

The deployment of AVs could also create conflict between modes by blocking bike lanes, transit stops, curb ramps, or accessible loading areas.¹⁷ Local governments should consider these potential conflicts early and implement appropriate solutions, such as designated AV pick-up and drop-off zones, measures to prevent AVs from blocking bike lanes, and street designs that prioritize walking, biking, rolling, and transit.

ALIGNMENT WITH COMMUNITY GOALS AND VISION

AVs may create benefits for a community, particularly under the CASE approach. These benefits include creating new opportunities for independence for those currently experiencing limited mobility, offering ways to serve areas and time frames not covered by traditional transit, and

potentially shifting transportation behaviors to the extent that space in downtowns could be reimagined to focus on pedestrian needs.

However, AVs also have the potential to increase VMT and compete with transit. Local governments should carefully evaluate if and/or how AVs can align with their community's priorities. Local governments may consider pilot projects with clear boundaries to inform that process.

LOCAL BURDENS

Disruptive transportation technologies are often shaped by early adopters, who tend to be affluent, part of the majority demographic, and located in dense, urban areas. This was true of motor vehicles in the 1900s, bikeshare in the early 2000s, TNCs like Uber and Lyft in the 2010s, and others in between. These systems often evolve to serve other groups in the long run, but the needs of those groups are often treated as secondary.

Each component of the CASE approach, as laid out in this playbook, has the potential to contribute to broader community engagement and allow local governments to ensure that the needs of everyone in their community are met:

Connected: AVs can potentially communicate with one another and with other infrastructure. One use of this technology is platooning,¹⁸ where vehicles travel in groups with small, controlled gaps between them. This can, hypothetically, reduce congestion and travel time, as well as lower emissions and improve air quality. Faster and more reliable trips may also help reduce time poverty,¹⁹ where people spend an inordinate amount of their time meeting basic daily needs, leaving little time for work, rest, or community.

Automated: Truly autonomous vehicles could provide independent mobility options to those with physical limitations or low to no vision,²⁰ the elderly,²¹ and children.

Shared: Shared AVs could reduce reliance on personal vehicle ownership, which currently costs Americans an average of \$12,296 per vehicle per year.²²

Electric: In large-scale deployments, AVs have typically been electrified rather than powered by internal combustion engines. This means that the widespread adoption of AV technology could have the added benefit of accelerating transportation electrification and contributing to the sector's decarbonization.²³

IS YOUR COMMUNITY LIKELY TO SEE AVS SOONER RATHER THAN LATER?

Real-world deployment of fully autonomous vehicles in the United States is currently being led by private fleet operators rather than through consumer-owned vehicles. The autonomous rideshare company Waymo's February 2026 expansion brought its public service to 10 commercial metro areas,²⁴ which shows both that deployment is real and that it is still concentrated in a small number of markets.

This progressive rollout makes sense given the economics of the business model. By some estimates, deploying a commercial robotaxi service in a new US city can require up to two years of time and \$15 to \$30 million in upfront investment.²⁵ In the near term, this means AV services are most likely to show up first where a private operator believes they can technically work and eventually result in profits.

In terms of current technical limitations, poor weather and bad road conditions can negatively affect AV performance,²⁶ and early commercial deployment of autonomous rideshare services has largely occurred in cities with temperate climates and mild winters to reduce these complexities.

Currently, autonomous vehicle technology is also best suited to simple, predictable operating environments such as highways and communities with a standard street grid and well-signalized intersections.²⁷ In practical terms, this means that communities with favorable weather, simpler operating environments, and strong trip demand are more likely to be early deployment targets for private-sector AV rideshare companies.

It is possible that shared AV fleets will follow patterns similar to traditional ride-hail services, which have tended to concentrate in the most lucrative, high-demand markets. In California, nearly two-thirds of all TNC trips occurred in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego counties, even though those three counties contain only 5 percent of the state's land area.²⁸

This does not mean AV deployment will unfold in the same way, but it is a signal that some communities may experience commercial AV services relatively soon, while others may only see large-scale deployment after the technology and business model have matured.

It is also possible that private, for-profit AV services may never achieve significant market penetration in certain locations or for specific use cases due to underlying economic constraints. Even so, communities that do not expect to be early deployment targets still have strong reasons to plan ahead. Learning from early adopters and having initial conversations about how AVs will impact

roads, the curb, land use, public expectations, and community goals can help local governments maximize benefits and minimize potential drawbacks when this technology arrives.

It is important to note that just because your community may not be a good fit for early AV deployment due to economics and/or technology limitations, this does not mean AVs will not arrive in your community at some point. This technology is progressing rapidly, and it is possible that today's limitations will be addressed in the near future, resulting in new communities where AVs suddenly become feasible in a relatively short period of time.

Similarly, as the industry and technology mature, it is also possible that the cost to provide AV ride services decreases to the point that new markets that were not economically viable for deployment prior become attractive locations from a business perspective.

LEVERS FOR LOCAL ACTION

LEVER 1: ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY AND INCLUDE AVS IN COMMUNITY PLANS AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Cities should begin planning for AVs before these vehicles appear on their streets and become part of local transportation systems. Without a proactive approach, many cities may find themselves unprepared to react as AVs are deployed on their streets.²⁹ However, by engaging the community on the subject early and including AVs in planning activities well before they reach scale, local governments can advocate for and enact policies that ensure AV development supports community goals and needs.

Including AVs in ongoing planning processes can help local governments better prepare for how this emerging technology could impact ongoing and future initiatives. This may include incorporating AVs and their potential impacts into comprehensive plans, transportation plans, climate action plans, transit plans, capital improvement plans, curb management, and/or other city plans and policies related to land use, parking, and street design. This work can help identify opportunities, anticipate challenges, and signal to AV service providers the types of outcomes the community desires and will support.

This planning process should include an analysis of how AVs might support or detract from local sustainability goals. In particular, long-range planning processes ought to consider how different AV deployment pathways would impact VMT, active transportation, and public transit use. Flexible planning tools, such as scenario planning, can help account for the uncertainty of the evolving field.³⁰ The type of AV deployment (personal vehicles vs.

Prioritize the community

- Identify and intentionally engage groups within your community that will be most impacted by AVs, with emphasis on those who have historically been underrepresented in community planning.
- Provide multi-lingual resources, participant stipends, and multiple ways to engage, such as meetings outside of regular work hours and virtual options. Host engagement where community members gather.
- Within community plans, address how AVs can be used to correct inaccessibility within the transit system and expand access to sustainable transportation options.

CASE), integration with transit systems, and land use planning may all impact the sustainability outcomes of AV adoption.³¹

Planning for AVs must also be grounded in community members' input. Effective engagement includes both education and dialogue about the state of AVs and CASE vehicles, the potential problems the technology may address, and the risks the community may wish to avoid. Cities with experience planning for this technology agree that this process should focus on how AVs fit into the community's priorities, rather than how the city can adapt to their presence.³²

PARTNERS

Internal departments to engage

Planning department. Leads planning and engagement processes and provides data on land uses and scenario planning.

Transportation department. Connects AV planning to existing transportation plans and systems.

First responders. Provides insight into the needs related to AVs in the case of emergencies.

Sustainability staff. Ensures AV planning is aligned with sustainability goals.

Information or data services. Determines what data your city will need to request from AV companies, and how to navigate data privacy concerns.

City attorney/legal department. Will be essential in understanding what the city can do and what legal concerns may arise.

External partners to engage

Transit agency. Can make sure that AV planning integrates with and supports existing and planned transit systems.

State transportation policy staff. Can share state efforts and incorporate local government insights into larger planning and policy projects.

Schools and neighborhood groups. Can help identify local priorities and ways AVs may show up in their areas of influence.

Disability rights advocates. Can surface concerns and possibilities to plan for accessibility in AV deployment.

Labor organizations. Can provide perspectives on workforce impacts, such as the impact of AVs on rideshare drivers.

Other community organizations and advocates. Can share insights on the needs of vulnerable groups within the community and how AV deployment might impact them. These might include advocates for the unhoused, marginalized communities, those facing language barriers, or other priority groups.

Large employers. Your city might consider including large employers in planning or pilot development to explore the transportation needs of their workforce.

COMMUNITY EXAMPLES

St. Paul, Minnesota. In 2023, the Minnesota Department of Transportation conducted an in-depth community engagement project with residents of St. Paul’s Creative Enterprise Zone to learn about their interest in potential automated vehicle projects. The project involved multiple community listening sessions, a workshop, and a zine shared broadly at community events. Rather than focusing on the technology itself, the workshop centered on community goals and visions, allowing project proposals to emerge from identified needs. Facilitators found that relationship-building with local organizations was an essential part of the process and recommended that future AV demonstration projects continue to center their work around these deep relationships.³³

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 311,527
- Median household income: \$73,394
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, “[QuickFacts](#),” accessed July 6, 2026.

This engagement effort resulted in a set of community goals for future transportation development, recommendations for demonstration concepts, and considerations to be incorporated into these demonstrations.³⁴

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 737,015
- Median household income: \$123,860
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Seattle, Washington. When the AV company Zoox began testing vehicles on Seattle's roads, the city lacked any policies specifically regulating AVs. Seattle's Department of Transportation noted concerns about the rollout, including "lack of public awareness or involvement," no data transparency, and "troubling" reports from other cities facing AV deployment.³⁵

Seattle was able to respond relatively quickly to AV deployment because it had already begun preparing for this eventuality. In 2017, four years before Zoox brought its vehicles to the city, Seattle published a new mobility plan to proactively guide the city's approach to emerging transportation technologies.³⁶ Instead of focusing on specific technologies, this plan is grounded in the core values and vision of the city. It outlines priorities and generalized strategies to ensure emerging mobility technologies move Seattle toward this vision.

The development of Seattle's new mobility plan was led by the Seattle Department of Transportation and an interdepartmental and interagency team. While it was based on city-wide goals, it did not involve extensive community engagement. Thus, in 2024, Seattle held an Autonomous Vehicle Inclusive Planning Cohort to engage diverse community voices in conversations about autonomous vehicle priorities.³⁷ Insights from the cohort will help guide future autonomous vehicle policies and strategies.³⁸

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 11,126
- Median household income: \$61,029
- Urban-rural classification: Rural

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Grand Rapids, Minnesota. GoMARTI (Minnesota's Advanced Rural Transportation Innovations), a pilot program providing on-demand autonomous microtransit to the community of Grand Rapids, Minnesota, arose from a real-world community need.

As a rural hub, Grand Rapids faced distinct transportation challenges, such as the need for transportation across many spread-out towns. At the same time, a higher-than-average proportion of residents were unable to drive personal vehicles due to age, disability, or cost barriers. Community advocacy,

the efforts of the city government, and state investment aligned to plan a program that could meet the community's needs.³⁹

GoMARTI was launched in 2022 as a partnership between the Minnesota Department of Transportation, the City of Grand Rapids, the PLUM Catalyst (a social innovation incubator), and May Mobility (an autonomous vehicle company). The initial pilot focused on reaching people without access to transportation, especially those unable to drive. After robust uptake and positive community feedback, the project was extended into an ongoing service that continues into 2026.⁴⁰

This example shows how a focus on community needs can guide AV projects to improve transportation access, especially in communities that may not be well served by existing transportation infrastructure.

RESOURCES

[*Equity in Public Engagement: A Guide for Practitioners*](#): A guide, developed by Simon Fraser University's Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, to effective public engagement, including case studies.

[*The Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership tool*](#): A tool developed by Facilitating Power to support meaningful and inclusive engagement design.

[*From Community Engagement to Ownership: Tools for the Field with Case Studies of Four Municipal Community-Driven Environmental & Racial Equity Committees*](#): An Urban Sustainability Directors Network Innovation Fund analysis of four community engagement case studies using the Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership. Provides detailed insight for practitioners.

[*Robotaxis Aren't Coming, They're Here: A Practical Guide for Cities Getting Started*](#): A guide to prepare for autonomous shared mobility, or "robotaxis," developed by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) with insights from cities experiencing the frontline of AV rollout.

[*Preparing Communities for Autonomous Vehicles*](#): A summary of a 2018 American Planning Association symposium on AVs, featuring guidance and resources on planning for AVs.

[*Autonomous Vehicles: A Policy Preparation Guide*](#): A 2017 guide, developed by the American Planning Association, outlining major considerations around AV planning.

LEVER 2: UPDATE LAND USE, ZONING, CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT, AND PARKING POLICY TO PREPARE FOR AVS

The most easily accessible tool a local government can use to influence AV deployment is land use regulations for the spaces where the vehicles will be used.⁴¹ Land use, zoning, parking, and curbside management will play a major role in shaping how AVs are deployed and whether this technology supports or undermines sustainability goals. These tools can help local governments ensure that AVs do not reinforce sprawling development and auto-dependence, but are instead integrated into a more compact, multimodal, and lower-emission transportation system.⁴²

One concern is that AVs could reinforce auto-centric development and design patterns, leading to more low-density sprawling development, driven by convenience and the reduced total cost of travel.⁴³ Local governments should consider zoning policies that encourage infill and transit-oriented development, as well as the adaptive reuse of parking infrastructure.⁴⁴ These actions should be taken to support sustainable transportation options, like walking, biking, and transit, so that these modes remain viable and attractive compared to AVs.

To avoid low-density sprawl, local governments should also consider updating impact and infrastructure fees for new construction so that infill development in walkable and transit-served areas becomes more viable and cost-effective while greenfield development⁴⁵ becomes more expensive and less attractive. If AVs follow a CASE model, communities should carefully consider where AV fleet charging, storage, and maintenance depots should be allowed and under what conditions, then update their zoning codes accordingly.

Parking policy and curbside management will also be critical for local governments to prepare for AVs.⁴⁶ Because shared vehicles will rarely need to park (other than for charging and maintenance

Prioritize the community

- Use zoning and parking reform to incentivize affordable housing in locations that already support multi-modal transportation.
- Ensure AV fleet charging, storage, and maintenance depots are not concentrated in already overburdened areas.
- Pair parking reform with better walking, biking, transit, and accessibility improvements so people have a range of practical travel options.
- Make sure loading zones work for pedestrians, cyclists, and people using mobility devices.

needs), parking minimums can be reduced, removed, or replaced with parking maximums as AV ride services become more common. This may make it possible to develop policies or incentives that encourage the reuse or redevelopment of parking infrastructure.

AVs will also increase the number of users competing for limited curb space and loading and unloading zones, which means updating curbside management policy, expanding drop-off and pick-up locations, and ensuring the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users should be addressed well in advance of AVs arriving.⁴⁷

Communities should be especially careful about AVs blocking bike lanes and curb access points and devise policies to prevent this.

Used effectively, this lever can help communities shape the physical infrastructure within which future AVs will operate. It can also create opportunities to guide where AV fleet charging, storage, and maintenance uses are located, align development with local sustainable transportation goals, and ensure that street and site design continue to support a broader range of travel options. Proactive action of this type can safeguard local priorities around safety, access, sustainability, and public space.

PARTNERS

Internal departments to engage

Planning and zoning department. Leads zoning code updates for AV-related land uses, like fleet charging and storage, parking, curbside management, as well as updates to encourage infill development.

Transportation/public works department. Can help manage AV-related policy and programs like loading zones, street design, and pick-up/drop-off zones.

Sustainability department. Connects AV-related land use and curb use changes to emissions, mode shift, and climate goals.

Economic development department. Evaluates how AVs may impact redevelopment plans, business districts, and growth goals.

City attorney. Reviews AV-related zoning and policy changes, fee structures, and any other exercise of local authority to ensure that any action taken by the local government is legal.

External partners to engage

Developers and property owners. Can implement site design, parking, and TDM that can shape how AVs operate.

Transit agency. Can help make sure that any AV-related zoning, parking, and curb management changes support transit access.

Utilities. Will be involved in planning for power and infrastructure needs for AV fleet charging and maintenance depots.

Community-based organizations and neighborhood groups. Can help identify local priorities and provide insights on how AV-related land use changes might affect residents.

Disability advocacy organizations. Can help ensure that curb, loading, and site access standards work for community members with disabilities.

COMMUNITY EXAMPLES

Chandler, Arizona. Chandler amended its zoning code in 2018 to allow a reduction in the total parking required for new development once it was demonstrated that AVs and TNCs have significantly reduced parking demand. The ordinance allows the zoning administrator to reduce the required parking amount by up to 40 percent once parking demand has decreased.

This approach demonstrates how communities can create a framework for future policy change that only takes effect when AVs begin to measurably change travel patterns.⁴⁸

Alexandria, Virginia. In 2022, Alexandria made several temporary COVID-19-era curbside loading zones permanent in response to growing demand from rideshare, delivery, and other short-term curb uses.⁴⁹ There are now over 25 permanent loading zones throughout Alexandria, and an application process has been established for local businesses that wish to add new curbside loading zones at eligible locations.

Alexandria is also pairing this work with a Smart Curb Solutions initiative that digitally maps curb space and uses real-time curb-monitoring technologies to support orderly and efficient use of this space. These upgrades would directly help prepare the city for AVs.

Boston, Massachusetts. Boston's Fenway pick-up and drop-off pilot created designated curbside ride-hail zones to respond to growing demand for curb space. The city worked with Uber and Lyft to geofence these locations within the apps, which helped shift activity out of travel lanes and improved safety and curb operations.⁵⁰ This approach can serve as a proxy for AV planning, demonstrating how cities

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 275,987
- Median household income: \$108,095
- Urban-rural classification: Suburban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 159,467
- Median household income: \$119,681
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 675,647
- Median household income: \$97,344
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

may manage pick-up and drop-off space as more on-demand vehicle trips compete for limited curb access.

Somerville, Massachusetts. Somerville encourages infill development and the redevelopment of gray fields, including oversized parking lots, to create a more walkable environment.⁵¹ This approach can be informative for planning for AVs, demonstrating how local governments can respond to decreased parking demand with policies that create a more compact environment that supports multiple transportation modes, rather than allowing AVs to reinforce auto-oriented growth.

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 81,045
- Median household income: \$132,000
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Fairfax County, Virginia. Fairfax County requires developers to include TDM measures in the development process, with specific requirements shaped by factors like access to transit and development type.⁵²

Potential TDM measures that developers may provide include bike storage, transit incentives, a ridesharing program, and vanpool accessible parking/drop-off. Programs like this can help ensure that other, non-car-based modes of transportation are supported and encouraged, even when AVs become more widely available.

Community snapshot

- Community type: County
- 2020 census population: 1.15 million
- Median household income: \$153,000
- Urban-rural classification: Suburban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

RESOURCES

[Getting Ready for Driverless Cars](#): An American Planning Association resource that can be a great starting point for local governments on how AVs may affect zoning, parking, curb use, and land use.

[Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism](#): Local government-focused guidance from NACTO on shaping AV policy around transit, parking, curb management, and street design.

[*Toolbox for Navigating the Land-Use Impacts of the Automated Vehicle Ecosystem*](#): Planning-focused resource by the Urban Institute for local governments to assist with thinking through how AVs may affect land use, equity, and sustainability. The resource walks users through six planning steps, including identifying local conditions, exploring private-versus-shared AV scenarios, reviewing policy options such as zoning reform, pricing, transit integration, and parking management, and choosing metrics to track progress.

[*Curbside Management Practitioners Guide*](#): An ITE resource on curb allocation, policy development, treatments, and evaluation metrics that can help cities prepare for more pick-up, drop-off, and loading demand.

[*Value Capture: Development Impact Fees and Other Fee-Based Development Charges*](#): A primer for communities exploring how fee structures can help align new development with transportation and infrastructure costs, developed by the US Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration.

LEVER 3: SERVICE AGREEMENTS WITH AV RIDESHARE PROVIDERS

Because real-world driverless passenger services in the United States are currently led by private fleet operators, one of the most direct ways local governments can influence how AVs appear may be through agreements with the operators deploying them. Permits, licenses, pilot programs, airport access agreements, curb access rules, reporting requirements, and taxes or fees are potential ways for local governments to help shape how AVs are deployed and how this mode integrates with the existing transportation network. However, the extent to which local governments can influence private companies providing AV services may be affected by preempting state-level statutes.⁵³

Used effectively, this lever can help communities shape AV services so they better support climate and community goals. While real-world examples of AV-specific local agreements are still limited, current regulations on TNCs like Uber and Lyft can be adapted to this new technology.

Depending on the local authority, local governments may be able to influence how these services arrive through permits, operating conditions requirements, reporting requirements, pricing policies, airport or curb access rules, and standards related to accessibility or service coverage.

These kinds of tools have already been used to address issues related to ride-hailing services, such as congestion, emissions, access to service, data transparency, and the use of public curb space. As AV ride services expand, this same approach may be one of the clearest and most practical ways to influence how these services emerge.

Prioritize the community

- Include accessibility requirements such as wheelchair access, multi-lingual customer support, and booking options that don't require a smartphone.
- Incorporate service coverage requirements to make sure services are not concentrated in the most profitable areas.
- Require discount-pass or reduced fare options for low-income community members.
- Direct revenue from application and permit fees toward transit, safer streets, accessibility upgrades, and/or curb management.
- Include data sharing and strong privacy protection requirements.

PARTNERS

Internal departments to engage

Transportation department. Can help shape service requirements related to curb access, pick-up and drop-off activities, circulation, safety, and integration with the existing transportation network.

Planning and zoning department. Ensures that service agreements align with broader land use, curb management, parking, and multimodal planning goals.

Sustainability department. Connects AV service requirements to emissions reduction, electrification, mode shift, and other climate goals.

City attorney. Reviews service agreements, permit conditions, data sharing, and price requirements to make sure the local government is acting legally.

Finance/revenue department. Can help structure fees or revenue mechanisms linked to AVs and determine how revenue should be used.

Information technology department. Evaluates data-sharing requirements, privacy protections, data standards, and any technical systems necessary to receive and analyze operator data.

External partners to engage

AV operators/TNCs. As direct service providers, these partners are central to negotiating operating conditions, data-sharing requirements, fleet standards, and service expectations.

Transit agency. Can help ensure AV ride services complement transit rather than compete with it.

Disability advocacy groups. Can help ensure that service agreements adequately address accessibility so that the benefits of AV services can be experienced by the entire community.

Labor groups. Employment sectors that may be directly or indirectly impacted by the growth of AV ride-hailing services should be engaged early and often.

COMMUNITY EXAMPLES

Waymo Passenger Services pilot at San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

In September 2025, Waymo received a testing and operations pilot permit from the City of San Francisco, allowing the company to provide autonomous vehicle services at SFO.⁵⁴ The airport used a phased pilot process that moved from initial testing to limited employee service, and then to paid public service.

The permit included meaningful data-sharing and safety requirements, and Waymo was required to provide geofenced operating data and regular reports on performance, including information on pickups and drop-offs, wait time, VMT on airport property, wheelchair-

accessible rides, disengagements, immobilizations, and collisions.⁵⁵ Waymo was also required to meet incident-response and staff training requirements, in addition to using AV pick-up and drop-off locations.

This example shows how permits or operating agreements can be used to manage safety, data, and curb operations as AV services expand, and how well-designed pilot projects can take a slow, iterative approach to rolling out this technology.

Chandler, Arizona. Chandler's relationship with Waymo shows how a local government can build toward AV service agreements over time. In 2019, Chandler launched a partnership that allowed certain city employees to use Waymo vehicles for official work trips, with rides charged to the city and rider surveys required after each trip.⁵⁶ More recently, Chandler began integrating Waymo rides into Chandler Flex, the city's on-demand microtransit service. Under this model, riders may be offered a Waymo trip when regular Flex vehicles are at capacity.⁵⁷

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 826,079
- Median household income: \$140,970
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 275,987
- Median household income: \$108,095
- Urban-rural classification: Suburban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

This example shows how a city can use an existing transit technology contract and service framework to test AV integration, monitor performance, and keep AV services aligned with local mobility goals.

Detroit, Michigan. Detroit's Accessibili-D program demonstrates how a city can use formal procurement to shape AV service around a specific community need. In 2023, the Detroit City Council approved a contract with May Mobility to provide free autonomous shuttle service for older adults and residents with disabilities.⁵⁸ The service was developed through the city's Office of Mobility Innovation, May Mobility, and the Michigan Mobility Collaborative, with community input helping identify destinations and service needs. The pilot included wheelchair-accessible vehicles, phone-based booking options, trained safety operators, and service to healthcare, shopping, work, and social destinations.⁵⁹

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 639,111
- Median household income: \$140,970
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

By using a public contract rather than relying on a private operator's existing service model, Detroit was able to directly influence service design and evaluation while maintaining public accountability and collecting relevant information to inform future decisions.

Vail, Colorado. The town of Vail, Colorado, demonstrates how a smaller community may go about regulating passenger transportation in a small, high-demand environment where curb space is limited and traffic circulation is critically important. The town's Passenger Transportation Ordinance creates a permit system for shuttles, courtesy cars, limousines, taxis, buses, and TNCs in the town center, aimed at addressing staging, congestion, and operations concerns within the community.⁶⁰

Community snapshot

- Community type: Town
- 2020 census population: 4,835
- Median household income: \$98,893
- Urban-rural classification: Rural

Source: US Census Bureau, "[Total Population in Vail town, Colorado is 4,835](#)," accessed July 7, 2026.

Vail also requires application and per-vehicle permit fees in addition to insurance documentation, bars cruising while waiting for passengers and double parking, limits idle time, and requires drivers to follow pick-up, drop-off, and staging rules, including restrictions on where TNCs can wait for passengers.

Eugene and Springfield, Oregon. The City of Eugene, Oregon, has implemented a transportation management framework that treats Uber and Lyft as part of the existing passenger transportation system. Eugene requires these service providers to have a public passenger vehicle company license and a driver for each vehicle, maintain driver records, and make data available for audit. Eugene also requires airport authorization for rideshare companies operating at the Eugene Airport and, as of 2025, began collecting a 50-cent trip fee on rides starting within city limits.⁶¹ While Eugene's regulations do not reference autonomous vehicles specifically, this approach to regulating TNCs demonstrates how even smaller cities can effectively guide the deployment of shared AVs.

Community snapshot (Eugene)

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 176,654
- Median household income: \$66,562
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Community snapshot (Springfield)

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 61,851
- Median household income: \$68,761
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

The city of Springfield borders Eugene, and rather than developing its own, from-scratch regulations for TNCs, Springfield opted to piggyback on the framework developed by Eugene. Currently, Springfield states that public passenger vehicle services are to follow the same application process and provisions set forth by Eugene,⁶² and in 2024, Springfield updated its code to mirror Eugene's provisions for TNCs.⁶³ This approach to regulating TNCs demonstrates how local governments can work together to ensure that a consistent regulatory framework exists in the region.

RESOURCES

[Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism](#): Local government-focused guidance from NACTO on shaping AV deployment around transit, pricing, data, and curb management.

“[AV Passenger Service Quarterly Reporting](#)”: California Public Utilities Commission’s reporting requirements for AV services in the state, which can provide a model for the types of data governments may want from AV ride operators, including occupancy, EV use, dwell time, and wheelchair-accessible trip requests.

“[The TNC Regulatory Landscape](#)”: San Francisco County Transportation Authority’s report, *The TNC Regulatory Landscape*, can help local governments understand which elements of ride-hail policy are usually local, regional, or state-controlled, and where preemption may limit city action.

[Guidelines for managing mobility data](#): This resource from NACTO and the International Municipal Lawyers Association includes practical guidance on asking for mobility data in ways that support planning and enforcement while protecting privacy.

[Regulation of Transportation Network Companies: Policy Guide](#): This guide is a helpful scan of licensing, insurance, operations, data reporting, and enforcement tools used in TNC regulation.

LEVER 4: PARTNERING ON OR LEADING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Demonstration projects provide a pathway to directly test AV technology against real community needs and challenges. One of the most significant opportunities associated with AV demonstration projects is their potential to support mobility for underserved communities, particularly the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and communities underserved by fixed-route transit systems.

Demonstration projects also present opportunities to test AVs as a component of transit, microtransit, and on-demand mobility systems.

Local governments can play various key roles in the development and implementation of AV demonstration projects. Cities can convene private technology firms, transit agencies, academic institutions, and community-based organizations to design and implement pilot projects.⁶⁴ Additionally, local governments can take a leadership role by managing pilot programs or securing funding to support their development.⁶⁵ Lastly, local governments can transform the regulatory framework by streamlining the permitting process and providing access to the public right-of-way for an AV pilot project.

Prioritize the community

- Prioritize underserved communities in the pilot design, ensuring that service areas include communities with limited transportation options.
- Include provisions for wheelchair accessibility and other affordability and accessibility requirements.
- Engage communities and residents early to gather feedback and build trust throughout the pilot project.

PARTNERS

Internal departments to engage

Transportation/public works department. This department manages roadway design and traffic operations.

Planning and community development department. Planning staff can help ensure AV pilots align with long-term land use, climate, and comprehensive plans.

External partners to engage

Community-based organizations. Partnering with community-based organizations can ensure that AV pilot project designs align with the needs of underserved communities.

Transit agencies. Transit agencies can support the implementation of AV pilots within existing transportation systems.

Private-sector mobility companies. These partners can provide the vehicles and operational expertise required to develop a pilot.

Disability advocacy groups. Can help ensure that service agreements adequately address accessibility so that the benefits of AV services can be experienced by the entire community.

COMMUNITY EXAMPLES

Arlington, Texas. The City of Arlington funded a pilot of low-speed AV shuttles to improve mobility within the city's entertainment district. The pilot, led primarily by the city's Transportation Department and Office of Innovation, with collaboration from The University of Texas at Arlington, was designed to better understand AV technology, increase public familiarity and acceptance with AVs, and position Arlington as a national leader in AVs.⁶⁶

The City of Arlington's Rideshare, Automation, and Payment Integration Demonstration (RAPID) project launched in 2021 as the first US program to integrate AVs into an existing public transit service.⁶⁷ Funding for the pilot program came from external grants, with significant contributions from the Federal Transit Administration and the North Central Texas Council of Governments.⁶⁸

Building on the success of the first stages of the pilot program, Arlington has moved forward with its phased approach and plans to deploy on-street AVs and integrate app-based rideshare systems to

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 394,266
- Median household income: \$75,171
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

address local transportation needs.⁶⁹ This case highlights how local governments can lead demonstration projects and advance broader transportation goals, particularly in areas lacking conventional public transport.

Community snapshot

- Community type: City
- 2020 census population: 302,971
- Median household income: \$65,742
- Urban-rural classification: Urban

Source: US Census Bureau, "[QuickFacts](#)," accessed July 6, 2026.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The City of Pittsburgh partnered with Uber and Carnegie Mellon to test AVs on public streets, prioritizing speed of deployment, adaptability, and opportunities for innovation during the beginning stages of deployment.⁷⁰ The pilot's initial stages were led primarily by the city's Department of Mobility and Infrastructure, the Mayor's Office, and transportation policy staff. The pilot was heavily funded by private-sector investment, with Uber funding vehicle operations, AV technology, and testing activities. City staff primarily focused on coordination, support, and transportation planning.⁷¹

Over time, residents became more familiar with AVs and had positive perceptions of the technology, particularly cyclists and pedestrians. As the pilot project moved forward, the city continued to assess it and used the technology to inform future policy development and align AV deployment with broader goals such as equitable access and safety.⁷² This example demonstrates how cities can use demonstration projects to assess the technology and deploy it to serve community needs.

RESOURCES

[Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#): A guide developed by the National League of Cities to local governments, providing case studies and best practices from cities that have already deployed AV pilot programs.

[Autonomous Vehicles Legislation Database](#): This National Conference of State Legislatures' database tracks state-level AV policies across the US, helping local governments understand regulatory frameworks and opportunities.

[*Regulations to Respond to the Potential Benefits and Perils of Self-Driving Cars: Analysis and Recommendations for Advancing Equity and Environmental Sustainability*](#): An Urban Institute report providing a comprehensive overview of the benefits and risks of AVs.

TEMPLATE: PILOT PROJECT CHECKLIST

Local government staff and officials can use this sample list of questions to assist in planning, designing, and implementing an AV pilot program. Because pilot projects may vary greatly in their challenges, goals, limitations, and opportunities, there will be questions within this checklist that are not applicable/relevant in all situations.

EARLY GUIDING QUESTIONS

- ☐ What would be the best-case scenario for how AVs interact with the rest of our transportation system?
- ☐ What AV use cases make sense in our community? How do we want AVs to show up (if at all)?
- ☐ What is the current technical understanding of AV technology within the community?
- ☐ Are there any local issues that AVs may exacerbate? If so, how can this be prevented?
- ☐ How can we engage a wide range of community groups, especially those who are underserved by the current transportation ecosystem, in planning for a demonstration or pilot program?

PROBLEM FIT

- ☐ We have identified a community or transportation challenge that an AV pilot may help address.
- ☐ We have compared AVs to alternative options and determined that AVs are an appropriate and desirable solution.
- ☐ The pilot has a clearly defined purpose.
- ☐ The use case is narrow enough to test.

ENGAGEMENT

- ☐ The group or groups that will be impacted by the pilot project have been involved in the planning and development of the pilot project.
- ☐ The project is in alignment with existing community visions and plans.
- ☐ The project does not conflict with existing transportation services, such as public or active transportation.

- ☐ We have developed a plan for community engagement and feedback throughout the project, focusing on target groups.

LEGAL AND POLICY

- ☐ We have reviewed state AV laws, testing rules, insurance requirements, and operator requirements to ensure the pilot is legal and compliant.
- ☐ We have identified the agencies that approve the use of public roads.
- ☐ We have involved legal counsel.
- ☐ The division of roles is clearly laid out and understood by all parties within the pilot or demonstration.

SAFETY AND OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

- ☐ We have defined the operational design domain (ODD). The ODD are the exact conditions under which AVs can operate, such as route, speed, weather, lighting, road type, and traffic conditions.
- ☐ We have completed a review of intersections, crossings, bike lanes, curb zones, snow routes, grades, rail crossings, school zones, and emergency access points within the pilot area.
- ☐ We have a safety operator plan (situations when an operator must be onboard or monitoring remotely).
- ☐ We have an emergency response plan with police, fire, emergency medical services, public works, and dispatch.
- ☐ We have an incident reporting process.
- ☐ We have a stop/pause protocol for any issues that arise.

ACCESS AND CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ The service is designed to address the needs of an identified target audience.
- ☐ The pilot considers options for users without a smartphone or a credit card.
- ☐ Options for those using wheelchairs or other assistive mobility devices are considered.
- ☐ Pick-up and drop-off locations are accessible in all weather.
- ☐ The project includes information and instructions in plain language.

- ☐ The project provides information and instructions in multiple languages, based on the needs of the target community.
- ☐ The pilot includes rider support by phone, in person, or through community partners.

PARTNERS AND GOVERNANCE

- ☐ A lead agency has been identified and assigned.
- ☐ A project manager has been identified and assigned.
- ☐ Roles are clear for the involved parties (vendor, transit agency, city, county, state department of transportation, metropolitan planning organization, emergency responders, community partners, researchers, and any other pilot partners).
- ☐ The project has a steering group or advisory committee.
- ☐ The project has an established decision-making process for programmatic changes.

DATA AND EVALUATION

- ☐ We have defined what success means for the pilot prior to launch.
- ☐ We have a baseline for the problem we are trying to solve.
- ☐ We have data collection plans and procedures in place.
- ☐ We know which data will be public, internal, aggregated, anonymized, or protected.
- ☐ We are not collecting personally identifiable information.
- ☐ The evaluation will include operations data, safety data, customer feedback, benefit distribution, and costs.
- ☐ We have a plan to collect qualitative data from pilot users and the target audience in an accessible and inclusive way.
- ☐ We have a plan to share results with the target audience and other interested parties, and we have communicated that plan clearly.

Endnotes

- ¹ “[Grand Challenge](#),” Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, accessed May 10, 2026; “[DARPA Urban Challenge](#),” Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, accessed May 10, 2026.
- ² “[J3016 202104 - Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles](#),” Society of Automotive Engineers, April 29, 2021.
- ³ “[Automated Vehicles for Safety](#),” National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, accessed April 24, 2026.
- ⁴ “[Transportation Sector Emissions](#),” United States Environmental Protection Agency, January 9, 2025.
- ⁵ “[PARTS: Market Penetration of Advanced Driver Assistance Systems \(ADAS\)](#),” MITRE, accessed April 29, 2026.
- ⁶ “[Delivering More for Our Riders in a Year of Incredible Growth](#),” Waymo, December 10, 2025; “[Ready to Ride: Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and Orlando](#),” Waymo, February 24, 2026.
- ⁷ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, “[Chapter 9: Autonomous Vehicles](#)” in *Assessment of Technologies for Improving Light-Duty Vehicle Fuel Economy—2025-2035* (National Academies, 2021), 269–271.
- ⁸ “[Assessment of Technologies for Improving Light-Duty Vehicle Fuel Economy](#),” National Academies, accessed May 20, 2026.
- ⁹ Lew Fulton, et al., *Three Revolutions in Urban Transportation* (UC Davis Sustainable Transportation Energy Pathways, 2017), 25–28.
- ¹⁰ Ethan Klein, “[Driving Safety & Innovation on American Roadways: An Updated Federal Policy on Auto Driving Systems](#),” The White House, September 12, 2017.
- ¹¹ Yonah Freemark, et al., *Regulations to Respond to the Potential Benefits and Perils of Self-Driving Cars* (Urban Institute, 2022), 20–28.
- ¹² “[Autonomous Vehicle Statutes and Regulations Across the 50 States](#),” Baker Donelson, September 20, 2024.
- ¹³ National Conference of State Legislatures [Autonomous Vehicles Legislation Database](#) (updated June 16, 2026).

- ¹⁴ NACTO, [Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism: Second Edition](#) (NACTO, accessed May 20, 2026), 46–54.
- ¹⁵ Ran Sun, et al., “[Impacts of Connected and Automated Vehicles on Travel Demand and Emissions in California](#),” *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2678, no. 4 (2023): 881–900.
- ¹⁶ NACTO, [Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism](#), 91–120.
- ¹⁷ Meghan F. Mitman, et al., [Curbside Management Practitioners Guide](#) (Institute of Transportation Engineers Complete Streets Council, accessed 6/12, 2026), 6–8.
- ¹⁸ “[How an Automated Car Platoon Works](#),” US Department of Transportation Volpe Center, July 11, 2017.
- ¹⁹ Yana Van Der Meulen Rodgers, “[Time Poverty: Conceptualization, Gender Differences, and Policy Solutions](#),” *Social Philosophy and Policy* 40, no. 1 (2023): 79–102.
- ²⁰ Henry Claypool, et al., [Self-Driving Cars: The Impact on People with Disabilities](#) (Ruderman Family Foundation, 2017), 7–22.
- ²¹ Fraade-Blanar, et al., [Older Adults, New Mobility, and Automated Vehicles](#) (AARP Public Policy Institute, February 2021), 9–10.
- ²² “[Average Cost of Owning and Operating an Automobile](#),” US Department of Transportation Bureau of Transportation Statistics, accessed May 20, 2026.
- ²³ Anh Bui, “[Why Electric Vehicles Are Already Much Greener than Combustion Engine Vehicles](#),” International Council on Clean Transportation, July 24, 2025.
- ²⁴ “[Ready to Ride: Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and Orlando](#),” Waymo.
- ²⁵ Markus Hagenmaier, Sebastian Pfaffinger, Julien Bert, Augustin K. Wegscheider, Dong Cui, Nikolaus Lang, Luis Schaber, and Raphael Brunner, “[Here at Last: The Evolution of the Robotaxi](#),” BCG, January 6, 2026.
- ²⁶ “[Automated Vehicles for Safety](#),” National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- ²⁷ Kristie Chin, et al., [Automated Vehicle Recommendations for Texas: A Study of Highway and Urban Operational Design Domains](#), (University of Texas at Austin Center for Transportation Research, 2023), 9.
- ²⁸ San Francisco County Transportation Authority, “[General Characteristics](#),” in *TNCS 2020: A Profile of Ride-Hailing in California* (San Francisco County Transportation Authority, accessed 06/22/2026).

²⁹ NACTO, [Robotaxis Aren't Coming, They're Here: A Practical Guide for Cities to Get Started](#) (NACTO, 2026), 1–6.

³⁰ Jennifer Henaghan, [Preparing Communities for Autonomous Vehicles](#) (American Planning Association, 2018), 16.

³¹ “[Autonomous Vehicles and Cities](#),” JTL Urban Mobility Lab at MIT, accessed Jun 1, 2026.

³² NACTO, [Robotaxis Aren't Coming, They're Here](#), 10.

³³ Minnesota Department of Transportation, [Community Driven CAV](#) (Minnesota Department of Transportation, accessed May 22, 2026).

³⁴ Minnesota Department of Transportation, [Community Driven CAV](#).

³⁵ Armand Shahbazian, [Seattle Department of Transportation Autonomous Vehicles Update](#) (Seattle Department of Transportation, accessed May 22, 2026), 4.

³⁶ Seattle Department of Transportation, [New Mobility Playbook](#) (Seattle Department of Transportation, 2017), 1–46.

³⁷ “[Seattle's Autonomous Vehicle Approach](#),” Seattle Department of Transportation, accessed May 20, 2026.

³⁸ “[Autonomous Vehicle Inclusive Planning Cohort \(AVIPC\)](#),” Seattle Department of Transportation, accessed May 20, 2026.

³⁹ Minnesota Department of Transportation, [goMARTI: MnDOT Final Report](#) (Minnesota Department of Transportation, 2025), 8–10

⁴⁰ “[Minnesota's Advanced Rural Transit Innovations](#),” goMARTI, accessed May 22, 2026.

⁴¹ Donald L. Elliott, “[Getting Ready for Driverless Cars](#),” *APA Zoning Practice* 34, no. 12 (2017), 2–7.

⁴² NACTO, [Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism](#), 10–15.

⁴³ Yonah Freemark, et al., [Toolbox for Navigating the Land-Use Impacts of the Autonomous Vehicle Ecosystem](#), (Transportation Research Board of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2024), 78–81.

⁴⁴ Yonah Freemark et al., [Toolbox for Navigating the Land-Use Impacts of the Autonomous Vehicle Ecosystem](#), 4–5.

⁴⁵ Gregory S. Burge and Trey L. Dronyk-Trosper, “[Can Development Impact Fees Reduce Urban Sprawl](#),” Scholars Strategy Network, September 9, 2013, Accessed May 20, 2026.

⁴⁶ NACTO, [Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism](#), 91–120.

⁴⁷ Yonah Freemark et al., [Toolbox for Navigating the Land-Use Impacts of the Autonomous Vehicle Ecosystem](#), 71–77.

⁴⁸ “[Chandler First in the Nation to Include Autonomous Vehicles and Ride Sharing in Zoning Code](#),” City of Chandler, Arizona, April 27, 2018.

⁴⁹ “[Curbside Loading/Pickup Zones](#),” City of Alexandria, Virginia, last updated April 8, 2026.

⁵⁰ City of Boston, Massachusetts, [Pick-Up/Drop-Off Pilot: Initial Assessment and Early Findings](#) (City of Boston, Massachusetts, accessed May 28, 2026), 8.

⁵¹ City of Somerville, Massachusetts, [Union Square Neighborhood Plan](#) (City of Somerville, Massachusetts, accessed May 18, 2026), 42, 114–125.

⁵² “[Transportation Demand Management \(TDM\) in Fairfax County](#),” Fairfax County, Virginia, accessed April 25, 2026.

⁵³ National Conference of State Legislatures [Autonomous Vehicles Legislation Database](#).

⁵⁴ City and County of San Francisco, [Autonomous Vehicle Company Commercial Ground Transportation Non-Exclusive Testing and Operating Pilot Permit](#) (City and County of San Francisco, 2025), 1–40.

⁵⁵ City and County of San Francisco, [Autonomous Vehicle Company Commercial Ground Transportation Non-Exclusive Testing and Operating Pilot Permit](#), 13–14.

⁵⁶ “[Chandler Is the First City Nationwide to Partner with Waymo for Autonomous Vehicle Ride-Hailing Program](#),” City of Chandler, Arizona, June 24, 2019.

⁵⁷ “[Chandler Flex](#),” City of Chandler, Arizona, accessed May 22, 2026.

⁵⁸ “[Office of Mobility Innovation to Launch Self-Driving Shuttle Pilot to Improve Quality of Life for Older Adults and People with Disabilities](#),” City of Detroit, July 26, 2023.

⁵⁹ Karsten Kutterer, “[May Mobility Launches Detroit Autonomous Vehicle Pilot Program with Detroit Office of Mobility Innovation](#),” May Mobility, June 12, 2024.

⁶⁰ “Vail Passenger Transportation Ordinance,” City of Vail, Colorado, accessed May 22, 2026.

⁶¹ “[Public Passenger Vehicles \(PPV\)](#),” City of Eugene, Oregon, accessed April 24, 2026.

⁶² “[Business Licensing](#),” City of Springfield, Oregon, 2024, accessed April 24, 2026.

⁶³ City of Springfield, Oregon, [City Council Agenda](#) (City of Springfield, Oregon, April 1, 2024), 5.

⁶⁴ Lucy Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#) (National League of Cities, 2018), 35.

⁶⁵ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 35.

⁶⁶ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 20–21.

⁶⁷ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 20–21.

⁶⁸ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 20–21.

⁶⁹ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 20–21.

⁷⁰ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 26–27.

⁷¹ Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 26–27.

⁷² Perkins, et al., [Autonomous Vehicle Pilots Across America](#), 26–27.