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**Abstract**

Objectives: To identify, describe, and critique state and local policies related to child passenger safety in for-hire motor vehicles including ridesharing and taxis.

Methods: We used standard legal research methods to collect policies governing the use of child restraint systems (CRS) in rideshare and taxi vehicles for all 50 states and the 50 largest cities in the U.S. We abstracted the collected policies to determine whether the policy applies to specific vehicles, requires specific safety restraints in those vehicles, lists specific requirements for use of those safety restraints, seeks to enhance compliance, and punishes noncompliance.

Results: All 50 states have policies that require the use of CRS for children under a certain age, weight, or height. Seven states exempt rideshare vehicles and 29 states exempt taxis from their CRS requirements. Twelve cities have relevant policies with eight requiring CRS in rideshare vehicles, but not taxis, and two cities requiring CRS use in both rideshare vehicles and taxis.

Conclusion: Most states require CRS use in rideshare vehicles, but not as many require CRS use in taxis. Though states describe penalties for drivers who fail to comply with CRS requirements, these penalties do not actually facilitate the use of CRS in rideshare or taxis. Furthermore, there is ambiguity in the laws about who is responsible for the provision and installation of the restraints. To prevent serious or fatal injuries in children, policy makers should adopt policies that require, incentivize, and facilitate the use of CRS in rideshare vehicles and taxis.
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Child restraint systems (CRS) are highly effective in reducing the risk of fatal injury for children in a crash;[[1]](#endnote-1),[[2]](#endnote-2) since 1975, CRS have saved an estimated 11,606 lives.2 While considerable advances have been made in child restraint use in personal vehicles,[[3]](#endnote-3) motor vehicle crashes remain the leading cause of death for young children[[4]](#endnote-4) and the lack of restraint use has been identified as a key risk factor in fatal crashes involving children.[[5]](#endnote-5)

Over the past decade, ridesharing services have emerged as a key mobility option in urban markets. The proportion of adults in the United States who have used ridesharing services such as Uber® and Lyft® has more than doubled from 15% in 2015 to 36% in 2018.[[6]](#endnote-6) While the initial effect of the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a significant reduction in the use of ridesharing in major metropolitan areas,[[7]](#endnote-7) ridership was approaching pre-pandemic levels by mid 2021.[[8]](#endnote-8) Rideshare trips are arranged through a mobile application that connects riders with drivers. Rideshare drivers are typically private individuals who are not licensed as drivers beyond normal state driver licensing processes.[[9]](#endnote-9) Ridesharing companies provide a dispatch service but do not own the vehicles used for ridesharing and typically employ drivers as contractors instead of full-time employees, raising questions about how to regulate these services.[[10]](#endnote-10)

Though rideshare vehicles and taxis are somewhat similar, there are some important differences. Though some rideshare companies allow drivers to rent a car from the company,[[11]](#endnote-11) the typical rideshare driver uses their own personal vehicle.6,7 These drivers must pay a share of each trip fare to the rideshare company for arranging the ride.[[12]](#endnote-12) Taxi drivers may own their vehicle, but more commonly lease or use a vehicle provided by the taxicab company. Some cities use a medallion or licensing system to limit the number of taxis that can operate within the city, but rideshare companies are often regulated differently and are rarely subject to these limits.[[13]](#endnote-13),[[14]](#endnote-14) In some cities, taxi drivers are supported by powerful labor unions[[15]](#endnote-15) that advocate for policies that protect drivers, but rideshare drivers have faced adversity in joining or forming their own unions.[[16]](#endnote-16) Regulatory differences have led to tensions between taxi drivers and rideshare companies.[[17]](#endnote-17),[[18]](#endnote-18),[[19]](#endnote-19)

An emerging literature indicates that use of appropriate CRS in taxis[[20]](#endnote-20),[[21]](#endnote-21) and ridesharing vehicles,[[22]](#endnote-22) broadly categorized as for-hire vehicles, is considerably lower than in personal motor vehicles.3 A recent study found that 82% of rideshare users with children younger than 10 report that their children occasionally travel with them in rideshare vehicles.[[23]](#endnote-23) Other research has found that 30% of parents using rideshare services thought ridesharing was safe for transporting children.[[24]](#endnote-24) Proper restraint use for young children is high (about 90.4-92.8%) in privately owned motor vehicles,[[25]](#endnote-25) but recent research suggests proper use is lower for children in taxis (51.2% compared to 86.7% in other passenger vehicles)[[26]](#endnote-26) and ridesharing services (about 59%).[[27]](#endnote-27)

Several factors could be contributing to significantly lower CRS use in rideshare vehicles and taxis. Some state and local laws/ordinances may exempt taxis and rideshare vehicles from CRS requirements. This is supported by qualitative research with rideshare drivers and parents, who demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the responsibility and liability of drivers and caregivers for child passenger safety in general.25 This is exacerbated by rideshare companies’ fragmented approach to CRS use. Both Uber® and Lyft® give riders the ability to request a CRS-equipped vehicle in limited markets. These vehicles are operated by drivers who are specially trained to install and uninstall a CRS and appropriately secure child passengers. Uber, for example, partners with Safe Kids Worldwide to ensure that Uber drivers in New York City know how to properly install and use a CRS and gives parents the option to request a CRS-equipped vehicle for an additional fee.[[28]](#endnote-28) These services, however, are only available in New York City at the time of this writing. Also, the car seat options provided by Uber® and Lyft® only include the use of one forward facing CRS per vehicle that is suitable for children at least 2 years old. It is not clear if rear facing seats, booster seats, multiple CRS per vehicle, or any other special CRS equipment are available as options.[[29]](#endnote-29),[[30]](#endnote-30)

Some parents have noted that ridesharing is not a practical option when traveling with children due to safety concerns or the impracticality of installing/uninstalling their own CRS.25 Parents experience logistical problems carrying and handling a CRS between vehicles and installing them in unfamiliar vehicles. The problems appear to be magnified when traveling with two or more children. In a caregiver survey, of those using rideshare with their children (n = 871), 59% reported transporting children differently in rideshare vehicles compared to personal vehicles, including holding a child on their lap, letting a child ride without a proper car seat, and riding with more children than available restraints.25 Rideshare drivers appear to prefer not to tell parents how to secure their children and permit CRS nonuse, misuse, and other unsafe restraint methods (i.e., holding a child on an adult’s lap).25

States and localities have attempted to ensure or encourage higher CRS use by enacting specific CRS policies (e.g., seating position, age, weight, and height, among others). Such requirements have proven effective in encouraging parents and guardians to take necessary precautions, but states and localities may exempt for-hire vehicles from certain policies. A jurisdiction’s policy may have significant implications for the use of CRS in rideshare and taxi vehicles. This paper sought to identify, describe, and critique current state and local policies related to child passenger safety in for-hire motor vehicles including ridesharing and taxis.

**Methods**

State policies governing the use of CRS in for-hire motor vehicles, including rideshare vehicles and taxis, were collected for all 50 states and the 50 largest cities in the US (determined using U.S. Census intercensal estimates from 2019). To review state legislation, we used the Thomson Reuters Westlaw database, a resource for online legal research. We examined each state’s statues and regulations, using an advanced search which allowed for multiple keywords at once.[[31]](#footnote-1) We also included alternate versions of some of these keywords in our advanced search to avoid missing any relevant laws. For example, we searched for both “seat belt” and “seatbelt” to cover two common spellings of the same term.

Once the search results were retrieved, research assistants reviewed each of the first 100 results to determine their pertinence to our research question. We abstracted the collected policies to determine whether the policy applies to specific vehicles (i.e., specific standards for rideshare or taxi vehicles), whether the policy requires specific safety restraints in those vehicles, the specific requirements for use of those safety restraints, how compliance was enhanced, how noncompliance was penalized, and whether there were any exceptions.

We used a similar method for the city review, but because Westlaw does not include many relevant local policies, we used city-specific databases. For each city, we located the official city charter or code. Many large cities use similar services to host their municipal code, namely Municode and American Legal Publishing Corporation. These services allow for city-specific code searches. Where these databases were available, we used the same search terms to identify relevant code sections. When city code databases were not hosted by one of these services, we tried searching the city code using search tools provided by the city’s website. Where city code databases where not searchable, we identified the relevant subsections pertaining to transportation and public safety and searched these manually. As a check on these searches, we also conducted basic internet searches using city names and selected search terms. Once the city search results were retrieved, research assistants reviewed each of the results to determine their relevance to the study. We abstracted the city policies using the same method we used for abstraction of the state polices.

This search and coding strategies were tested on five states and five cities to determine their feasibility and adequacy. Once these strategies were finalized, one team member performed all searches and all coding for the states and cities to ensure consistency. To validate these results, a second team member independently reviewed a random 20% sample of the states and the cities (10 states and 10 cities). For this random sample, both sets of results were compared. Any discrepancies were reviewed and resolved through discussion with the entire study team. Where possible, we compared our findings to existing collections of state CRS, seatbelt, and rideshare policies.[[32]](#endnote-31),[[33]](#endnote-32)

**Results**

All 50 states have policies that require the use of CRS for children under a certain age, weight, or height (Table 1). Seven states (14%) define “commercial” or “for-hire” vehicles to include both rideshare vehicles and taxis and exempt these vehicles from the CRS requirement (HI, ID, IN, MD, NH, TX, WA). In the remaining 43 states, child passengers in rideshare vehicles are required to be secured in an appropriate CRS. Twenty-eight states (56%) exempt taxis from the CRS requirement. Among the 43 states requiring child passengers in rideshare vehicles to be secured in an appropriate CRS, 21 states (49%) exempt taxis and 22 states (51%) do not exempt taxis. Links to the laws themselves have been posted to the website of the Johns Hopkins Center for Law and the Public’s Health. Additional detail regarding the laws is provided in the footnotes to the table.

Every state policy describes penalties for failure to comply with CRS requirements. These penalties generally include monetary fines or points added to the violator’s driver’s license. The fines vary depending on the state, type of CRS, and other circumstances, with a minimum fine of $10 and a maximum of $1,000. In personal vehicles, the driver is generally responsible for traffic and safety violations, but when children are riding in rideshare or taxi vehicles, the responsibility may shift. Of the 43 states that require CRS in rideshare or taxis, 36 (84%) place responsibility on the driver. Four states (9%) (CA, CO, IA, FL) hold the parent or guardian responsible, though California and Colorado note that this is only true if the parent or guardian is in the vehicle with the child. In three states (7%) (MT, ND, OR), the legal responsibility for CRS violations in this context is somewhat ambiguous or unclear. In these cases, it is likely that the driver is responsible.

Of the 50 cities included in this study, just 12 cities had relevant laws or ordinances (Table 2). The fact that relevant policies were not found for the remaining 38 cities does not mean that CRS use is not required or that rideshare vehicles or taxis are unregulated in these cities. Rather, these localities either have not legislated on top of state requirements or cannot do so. Of the 12 cities with relevant policies, 8 (67%) require CRS in rideshare vehicles, but not taxis; two cities (17%) (Raleigh, NC and Seattle, WA) require CRS use in both rideshare vehicles and taxis. In one city (Louisville, KY), there is an explicit requirement for taxis, but no specific language for rideshare vehicles. In one last city (Chicago, IL), the law does not indicate any specific requirements or exceptions for rideshare or taxis. Importantly, these laws generally reiterate state law—only one city (Seattle) has an ordinance that differs from the state (Washington) law. While Seattle and Washington state both have a CRS requirement that exempts “for-hire” vehicles, Washington state includes taxis and rideshare vehicles (though Washington uses “Transportation Network Company” to refer to the entities we call rideshare companies) in its definition of “for-hire,”[[34]](#endnote-33) while Seattle’s definition of “for-hire” excludes both rideshare vehicles and taxis.[[35]](#endnote-34)

**Discussion**

Most states require CRS use in rideshare and taxi vehicles. Where present, these requirements generally do not differ from a state’s overall CRS law. It is far more common for taxis to be exempt from a CRS requirement, which may be the result of successful lobbying on behalf of taxi operators when state CRS laws were formulated and enacted (between 1977 and 1985)[[36]](#endnote-35). Rideshare companies did not exist at this time, which may explain why most states do not exempt rideshare vehicles from their blanket CRS requirement.

Cities generally emulate state policies, either by enacting identical policies or by not enacting a local policy at all, thereby defaulting entirely to state policies. In Seattle, WA, which is a rare case of disagreement between state and local policy, the local policy is more stringent than the state policy—rideshare and taxi vehicles are not exempt from CRS requirements. The high number of cities without any CRS policy may reflect the fact that state policies generally do not exempt rideshare vehicles and exemptions for taxis may have initially been driven by taxi operators that serve major metro regions; therefore, many cities do not need to enact a rideshare CRS requirement because the state already has one, and state taxi exemptions may be hard to overcome at the local level.

Of the policies we collected, it was far more common for a requirement to place responsibility on the driver of a vehicle than on the parent or guardian. Most laws state that the driver will be penalized for failure to appropriately use a CRS. There is a certain logic to this—ultimately, drivers decide whether to operate a vehicle with a child passenger that is not secured as required by law. Importantly, however, liability for violating a state or local law is a form of responsibility that is discrete from responsibility for *providing* *or installing* an appropriate CRS. The ambiguity that results from a lack of explicit language about the provision or installation of CRS places both drivers and parents in a difficult position. In the case of a rideshare vehicle, a driver may be cited or otherwise penalized for driving with a child passenger not appropriately secured in a CRS, but—depending upon company policy—that driver is free to deny a ride to any party that lacks an appropriate CRS. Even in this case, however, denying a ride may have adverse effects on the driver’s income and their rating on the rideshare app. Parents may assume that providing a CRS is their responsibility but may not be able to install the seat correctly in a vehicle they are not familiar with.

While some rideshare companies offer certain child car seats in a small number of cities, the available car seats may be limited and most rideshare drivers in the city will not have a car seat at all. The majority of rideshare and taxi drivers nationwide will not carry or offer a car seat, placing parents and drivers in the difficult position of weighing the risks of riding without proper safety seats. Recent research suggests that parents or families with an urgent need for transportation and drivers unable to sacrifice a fare may both decide that it is worth the risk to transport a child without an appropriate CRS.[[37]](#endnote-36)

**Limitations**

This study has a few limitations. First, though our search strategy was thorough and systematic, it is possible that a state or locality has a relevant CRS law that we did not capture. As there is no comprehensive database of city laws and regulations, this may be more likely to have occurred for these jurisdictions. While some city laws and regulation are included in searchable databases such as Municode, others may list them exclusively on a city website. Furthermore, some city websites do not include a search function for keywords, requiring manual review of the website content. Hence, while our search and coding strategies were designed to maximize the possibility of capturing a relevant CRS law, and we took the additional step of cross-referencing our findings to existing secondary sources, there is still a possibility that certain laws or regulations were omitted due to the challenges described above. Second, we only identified the laws themselves, which may not reflect the realities of enforcement and implementation. Future studies should engage in qualitative research with drivers, parents, law enforcement, and legislators to determine how these laws are interpreted and enforced. Finally, this study did not evaluate rideshare or taxi company policies, which may exert a powerful effect on driver behavior. Future work should evaluate these policies.

**Conclusion**

Most states require CRS use in rideshare vehicles, but fewer require CRS use in taxis. Policies that require CRS use also describe penalties for drivers who fail to comply, but do not actually facilitate the use of CRS in rideshare. This is further complicated by ambiguity in the laws about who is responsible for the provision and installation of the restraints. Legislators should seek to require, encourage, and facilitate CRS use in all vehicles, including rideshare vehicles and taxis. Perhaps the most equitable way to ensure child safety in for-hire vehicles is to mandate drivers to provide appropriate CRS for child passengers and require companies to bear the associated costs. Though this review highlights several policy gaps related to the safe transportation of children in for-hire vehicles, the most significant gaps lie in the regulation of taxis, which are more often exempt from CRS requirements. CRS requirements should apply to both rideshare and taxis, but such a requirement must be coupled with significant and equitable investment in provision of and education about CRS use.
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**Table 1:** State Laws and Policies for Child Passenger Safety in For-Hire Motor Vehicles

Legend: Yes = 1, No = 0 (unless otherwise indicated).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State** | **CRS Required?** | | **Seating position**  **specified?** | **Ages (years), weights (lbs), and heights (in.) for which a CRS is required** | **Monetary penaltiesa** | **Means of enhancing compliance?** | **Is a seat belt required for children younger than 13 who are not in a CRS?** | **Exceptions for rideshare or taxis?**  (0 = none,  1 = for taxis only,  2 = rideshare only,  3 = for both taxis and rideshare) |
| **Ride-**  **share** | **Taxi** |
| **AL** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 6 yo | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **AK** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” AND < 65 lbs  OR 8-15 yo AND (< 57” or < 65 lbs) | $50 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **AZ** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 5 yo OR < 8 and < 58” | $10-50 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **AR** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 6 yo AND < 60 lbs | $25-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **CA** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $100-250 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **CO** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $81 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **CT** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 60 lbs | $50-190 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **DE** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND ≤ 65 lbs | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **FL** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 6 yo | $30-63 fine | 1 | 1 | 3b |
| **GA** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND ≤ 57” | $25-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **HI** | 0 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 58” | $45-500 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **ID** | 0 | 0 | 0 | < 7 yo | $10-84 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **IL** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 2 yo AND < 40” AND < 40 lbs OR  noncommercial passenger AND < 8 yo | $25-200 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **IN** | 0 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **IA** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 6 yo AND some children 6-17 yo | $135 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **KS** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND (< 80 lbs OR < 57”) | $60 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **KY** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 41” OR < 8 yo AND < 58” | $25-50 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **LA** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 9 yo AND children under the CRS height limit | $100-500 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **ME** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” AND < 80 lbs | $50-250 fine | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **MD** | 0 | 0 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $50 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MA** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 58” | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **MI** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 4 yo OR < 8 yo AND < 57” | $10-25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **MN** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $50-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **MS** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 7 AND < 57” OR < 65 lbs | $25 fine | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **MO** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 4 yo OR < 40 lbs OR < 8yo AND  < 57” AND < 80 lbs | $10-50 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **MT** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 6 yo AND < 60 lbs | $20-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **NE** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **NV** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 6 yo AND ≤ 60 lbs | $25-1000 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **NH** | 0 | 0 | 0 | < 7 yo AND < 57” | $50-100 fine | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| **NJ** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $20-75 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **NM** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 7 yo OR < 60 lbs | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **NY** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $25-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **NC** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 80 lbs | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **ND** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $25 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **OH** | 1 | 0 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” OR < 40 lbs | $25-75 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **OK** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND ≤ 57” | $20-50 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **OR** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” OR ≤ 40 lbs | $115 fine | 0 | 1 | 3c |
| **PA** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” AND ≤ 80 lbs | $10-75 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **RI** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” AND < 80 lbs | $40-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **SC** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $25-150 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **SD** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 5 yo AND < 40 lbs | $25 fine | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **TN** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 4 yo OR 4-8 yo AND < 57” | $50 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **TX** | 0 | 0 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $25-250 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **UT** | 1 | 1 | 0 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $45 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **VT** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo OR < 20 lbs | $25-100 fine | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **VA** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $20-500 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **WA** | 0 | 0 | 1 | < 4 yo OR < 57” | $139 fine | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **WV** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $10-25 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **WI** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND ≤ 57” AND ≤ 80 lbs | $10-200 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **WY** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 9 yo | $10-100 fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **Sum** | **43** | **22** | **34** | **-** | **-** | **44** | **50** | **-** |

a. For brevity, only monetary penalties are described here. For more information on penalties (including any driver’s license penalties or incarceration) and for specific information about each state’s law, see the Appendix and full version of state law table.

b. Florida exempts taxi and rideshare drivers and shifts responsibility to the parent/guardian of the child passenger

c. Oregon exempts taxi and rideshare drivers from responsibility for enforcing CRS use in their vehicles, but requires children to be restrained in a CRS when riding in a rideshare or taxi vehicle.

**Table 2: City Laws and Policies for Child Passenger Safety in For-Hire Motor Vehicles**

Legend: Yes = 1, No = 0 (unless otherwise indicated).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **City** | **CRS Required?** | | **Seating position**  **specified?** | **Ages (years), weights (lbs), and heights (in.) for which a CRS is required** | **Monetary penaltiesa** | **Means of enhancing compliance?** | **Is a seat belt required for children younger than 13 who are not in a CRS?** | **Exceptions for rideshare or taxis?**  (0 = none,  1 = for taxis only,  2 = rideshare only,  3 = for both taxis and rideshare) |
| **Ride-**  **share** | **Taxi** |
| **Chicago** | 0b | 0b | 0 | Not indicated | $25 fine | 1 | 1c | 0 |
| **Colorado Springs** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $81 fine (state law) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Denver** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $81 fine (state law) | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **District of Columbia** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo | $25-150 fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Kansas City** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 4 yo OR < 40 lbs OR < 8 yo AND < 57” AND < 80 lbs | $50 max fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Louisville** | 0d | 1 | 0 | Taxi passengers who are < 41” | None indicated. | 1 | 1d | 0 |
| **Memphis** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 4 yo OR < 9 yo AND < 60” | $50 max fine | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **New Orleans** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 5 yo | $50 fine | 0 | 1e | 1 |
| **Oklahoma City** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 6 yo | $500 max fine | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **Raleigh** | 1 | 1 | 1 | Taxi or rideshare passengers who are < 9 yo OR < 8 yo AND < 80 lbs | None indicated. | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| **Seattle** | 1 | 1 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 57” | $250 max fine | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **Tulsa** | 1 | 0 | 1 | < 8 yo AND < 58” | $20-50 fine | 1 | 1f | 1 |
| **Sum** | **10** | **3** | **10** | **-** | **-** | **8** | **12** | **-** |

a. For brevity, only monetary penalties are described here. For more information on penalties (including any driver’s license penalties or incarceration) and for specific information about each law, see the Appendix and full version of law table.

b. There was no CRS requirement specified by the city.

c. Chicago specifies that only children seated in the front seat are required to wear a seat belt.

d. Louisville specifies that any taxi passenger who is not in a CRS must wear a seat belt.

e. New Orleans only requires seat belts for children aged 3-5 who are not in a CRS.

f. Tulsa only requires seat belts for front seat passengers and children younger than 8 who are not in a CRS.
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