SoMa Community Planning Advisory Council

Draft Minutes

Tuesday, November 10, 2026
5:30 to 7:00pm

49 South Van Ness Avenue
14th Floor, Room 1411
San Francisco, CA 94103

Rob Jacques, Chair	Lex Montiel, Vice Chair	Leah Edwards, Seat 7
Paige Reeve, Seat 9	Gina Mariko Rosales, Seat 11	Adam Swig, Seat 10
Jane Weil, Seat 6	Richard Dillon, Alternate	Mark Johnson, Alternate
	Fernando Enciso-Marquez, Alternate	

Meeting inquiries can be made to **kris.romasanta@sfgov.org**

Meeting Calendar is **available on the Planning Department website.**

Order of Business

1. Call to Order and Roll Call (5:40 p.m.)

The Chair, Rob Jaques, called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda and announcements.

Members present: Rob Jaques (Chair); Mark Johnson (serving as alternate for Paige); Fernando Enciso-Marquez ; Leah Edwards; Rich Dillon; Gina Mariko Rosales; Adam Swig.

Announcements: Member Edwards noted the number of vacant seats on the body that remain to be filled. Member Johnson stated his interest in updating the body's by-laws.

2. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)

The body considered the minutes of the meetings held on 10/24/2023, 12/12/2023, 3/26/2024, 6/11/2024, 9/10/2024, 12/10/2024, 3/11/2025, 6/10/2025, and 12/15/2025.

Motion: Rich Dillon **Second:** Gina Mariko Rosales **Result:** Approved.

3. Overview of the SoMa CAC (Informational Item)

Presenter: Kris Romasanta, SF Planning Department staff

Staff provided an overview of the role and structure of the SoMa CAC.

Discussion topics included:

- A potential change to the Folsom Street streetscape designation.
- The body's advocacy role and its relationship with the Board of Supervisors, including whether the body may make recommendations to the Board.
- Member Edwards asked about the rationale for the Mayor's appointment seat and whether the Jane Weil seat could be changed to a preservation seat.
- Whether the body may recommend changes to the Eastern SoMa and Western SoMa plans. Staff indicated this depends on staff capacity, and that the Western SoMa Plan could be revised.
- Monitoring reports will now be provided as dashboards of progress reports, rather than as stand-alone reports.

4. Potential Fee Revenue and Expenditures (Informational Item)

Presenter: Mat Snyder, SF Planning Department staff

Staff presented on the SoMa Area Plan Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) and impact fees. A presentation was provided as a linked file.

Background and fee structure

- Staff reviewed the three neighborhood plans, beginning with the original Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, and noted the need to resolve issues related to PDR (production, distribution, and repair) uses and to establish better controls for residential and mixed-use development.
- Impact fees are calculated based on the square footage of a development. Staff described the Eastern Neighborhoods fees, the Central SoMa Infrastructure Fee, and the Central SoMa Community Facilities District (CFD), along with the funding categories each supports.
- Staff explained that impact fees cannot be collected until the end of construction under current local legislation, and that the value of fees diminishes while collection is delayed. Fees are now collected at the Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) stage, rather than at the first addendum. Staff noted that a portion (approximately 20%) of fees is collected up front. Large fees come from large projects, typically the top 10–20% by size.
- In response to a question from Member Gina, staff explained that an "in-kind" contribution means a developer builds a public benefit in lieu of paying the fee.

Revenue outlook

- No fee revenue has been received for three consecutive years, and none is expected in the next few years because payment follows construction. The development pipeline remains active and projects continue to be submitted, but revenue has not yet materialized.
- Three years ago, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended a 33% fee reduction, and it later established a permanent 67% reduction. An additional reduction took effect in July 2026.
- The projected $91 million is approximately one-third of the amount originally anticipated due to fee reductions, and very little is expected within the next three years.
- In response to a question from Member Johnson, staff stated that the 'Quincy' project was an isolated exception, as it paid at the start of construction.
- Because projections have proven unreliable, staff will focus on the projects currently in the pipeline.
- Staff described the Central SoMa CFD as an ongoing tax that can also be bonded against, providing cash up front with revenue received over time. CFD funds were largely directed to regional capacity (BART, Caltrain, etc.), with additional general-purpose categories including buses, streetscape, and complete streets.

Funded projects and priorities

- Folsom and Howard streetscape improvements (25% of funding from SoMa fees).
- 2nd Street improvements.
- Ringold Alley improvements, including plaques recognizing the LGBTQ (Leather) community, with a major contribution from Gene Friend.
- Eagle Plaza (in-kind contribution).
- Rachel Sullivan Park at 11th and Minna Streets, purchased with SoMa funds and a major priority for Recreation and Parks; the CFD includes categories outside of IPIC funding.
- Philanthropic funding, including a fund supported by Brian Chesky.
- Jackson Playground. A member asked about environmental risks at the park site; staff noted that SoMa remains an environmental area of concern.

Member questions

- Member Edwards asked about the Special Use District / SALI in Western SoMa and State Bill SB 79, particularly regarding well-resourced areas, and about efforts to reevaluate challenges to development in SoMa over the next six months.

5. Officer Nominations and By-Laws (Review)

The Chair introduced the topic of officer nominations and asked members for their input.

- Member Fernando proposed revisiting the by-laws and continuing to operate under the current by-laws in the interim.
- Members discussed Brown Act requirements, including that members may not meet outside of a noticed meeting in a quorum, and may not conduct business by email among a quorum.
- Members discussed forming an ad hoc Governance Committee of three or four members to review and update the by-laws. Forming the committee will require a posted agenda in compliance with the Brown Act.
- Members Leah Edwards and Mark Johnson volunteered to work with the Chair on the by-laws and will circulate a clean copy and a redlined version.

- **Action:** The body will consider the by-law revisions and the formation of a Governance Committee at the next meeting.

6. Other Updates and Comments (Discussion Item)

Flower Mart Development Agreement Amendment. Staff reported that the Planning Department is reviewing a proposed amendment to the Flower Mart Development Agreement for the approximately 6.5-acre site along Brannan Street between 5th and 6th Streets in Central SoMa. Kilroy Realty remains the project sponsor. The amendment would allow greater flexibility in a mix of residential, commercial, life science, and institutional uses, including up to approximately 3,500 new housing units, along with increased building heights, new publicly accessible open spaces, and pedestrian connections. The project is anticipated to come before the Planning Commission on January 21, 2027. Jessica Look, Senior Planner, is the project planner. Additional information: **https://www.sf.gov/flower-mart-development-agreement-amendment**

Future agenda items. Members asked whether they may propose agenda items. The following were identified:

- By-law updates (parking lot item).
- Western SoMa Plan: a member noted that most residential development is currently prohibited and that there is potential to add housing. Members discussed a possible recommendation and future agenda item.
- Design and programming of the POPOS (privately owned public open space) at 5th and Minna Streets, owned by Brookfield, for community use. Members noted there is no local point of contact, as the contact resides in Texas.

.

7. General Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to address the body on matters within its jurisdiction that did not appear on the agenda, for up to three minutes each.

No members of the public were present.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02pm.

Motion: Rob Jaques **Second:** Adam Swig