

For previous waiver

1) Who are the specific interested parties that were solicited under the previous waiver? and a statement as to why the department believes the parties to be interested parties?

- **Lyft** – During the previous period, the partners on the India Basin project (including Partnership Staff and the India Basin Equitable Development Plan Manager) received a private grant enabling staff to work with Lyft to implement an equitable transportation element of the Initiative as directed by the community-developed [Equitable Development Plan](#) (EDP). This transportation program is designed to improve access to the park from the surrounding neighborhood. The program involves installing a bike rideshare station near the park – as specifically called out in the EDP – and creating a mechanism to offer subsidized car rides to the park. Lyft is an interested party to the Department because the company holds a five-year permit to operate a bikeshare program in San Francisco Parks under the Department’s jurisdiction.

India Basin partners and Rec Park Partnerships staff, and the EDP manager worked with Lyft because they are the sole provider of bike share in San Francisco, per agreements with the Metropolitan Transportation Council.

The project, which is in formation, will also involve developing a pilot project with Lyft to create a geofenced area within the 94124 zip code and provide free car rides to qualifying community members, supported with private funding. This work is primarily a business deal, but to stretch the funding, Rec Park staff requested that Lyft make an in-kind contribution of subsidizing or offering additional free rides.

Lyft responded with an offer of a 5% rebate on all funds spent on the initiative, which is most likely a standard reduction in cost as part of a negotiation, but out of an abundance of caution and transparency staff recorded this as a contribution and noted it on the initiative Website.

2) If interested parties were solicited under the previous waiver, can you explain why your office believes this waiver does not create an appearance of impropriety?

- This relationship does not create an appearance of impropriety because the Recreation and Park Commission approved the permit in July, and the financial terms of this relationship are set.

- 3) **Can you detail any payments in progress or pledged by donors that were solicited through the use of this waiver?**
- See item 2.
 - Further I did want to note that the Department takes ethics and transparency extremely seriously. Partnership staff are meticulously tracking every contribution to the Initiative, which has raised more than \$76 million in private funding as part of the \$225 million overall budget. This private funding has come from 70 gifts from individuals or institutions, and per the Sunshine Ordinance, every donor contributing more than \$100 is listed on a [dedicated page](#) the initiative website with a notation if the donor has any financial relationship with the city. None except Lyft, triggers a prong of the Behested Payments Waiver.
- 4) **Do note that RPD previous agreed to report to the board regarding the use of the previous waiver by no later than 12/14/25**
- Thank you for the note. This report is in progress

For current waiver

- 5) **Who are the specific interested parties, who would potentially be solicited under this waiver? Please provide a statement as to why the department believes the parties to be interested parties, under this new waiver?**
- **Lyft** – Since the waiver lapsed in October, the department has not made any further solicitations of Lyft, but as RPD staff or partners continue to negotiate a business relationship with the company, we would like to be able to renew a request for increased subsidies to stretch the philanthropic dollars available to fund this important program.
- 6) **If donations are being solicited or coordinated from interested parties through the grant of this waiver, can you please explain why your office believes this waiver does not create an appearance of impropriety?**
- We believe this relationship does not create an appearance of impropriety because the Recreation and Park Commission approved the permit in July, and the financial terms of this relationship are set.
- 7) **Will you commit to the reporting requirements and to fulfilling them prior to requesting an extension of this waiver?**
- Yes

General questions

- 8) **Explain why the goals of the BPW couldn't be accomplished by soliciting behested payments from anyone who is not an interested party for RPD, or through a public appeal.**
- The goal of this Behested Payments Waiver is to give staff some comfort and flexibility to bring resources into this important community project without fear of violating city rules. We are constantly mindful of not creating an appearance of impropriety
- 9) **What specific programs and initiatives are being funded by donations raised through this BPW in the prior 6 months?**
- A transportation element of India Basin's Equitable Development Plan
- 10) **What specific programs and initiatives will be funded by donations raised through this BPW if granted.**
- There are no specific plans for this.