



CITY OF SAN PABLO
Office of the City Manager

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP):

**UPGRADING THE CITY COUNCIL PRIORITY WORKPLAN:
RANKED, PRIORITY-BASED BUDGETING AND BUILDING
CONSENSUS FOR COMMUNITY-DRIVEN POLICYMAKING**

SUBJECT DOCUMENT	FY 2025-27 City Council Priority Workplan (Reso. No. 2025-044, as amended through Amendment #3, Reso. No. 2026-063)
PREPARED FOR	San Pablo City Council; City Manager
PURPOSE	Executive proposal and framework for soliciting external consultant proposals (RFP basis)
DATE	June 11, 2026
STATUS	1). Budget, Fiscal and Legislative Standing Committee reviewed on 06/10/26, and 2). City Council first review 07/06/26

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City Council's adopted Priority Workplan (Workplan) has matured into a comprehensive catalog of more than eighty initiatives spanning five Major Policy Goals. Today those initiatives are listed *in alphabetic order*, and the majority carry a funding designation of “TBD.” As the City confronts the structural deficits forecasted for the FY 2025-27 period—while operating under a zero-based budgeting model, an FTE hiring freeze, and tightened fiscal-resilience requirements (Priority #413)—the absence of an explicit ranking framework limits the Council's ability to align finite General Fund resources with its highest-impact commitments.

This proposal recommends that the City engage a qualified external consultant to lead a structured upgrade of the Workplan: transitioning it from an alphabetized inventory into a **ranked, defensible, and budget-integrated decision tool** that supports transparent policymaking, weights community-identified priorities, and helps the City Council reach consensus. This document doubles as the scope-of-work basis for a forthcoming Request for Proposals (RFP).

2. BACKGROUND & NEED

The current Workplan organizes priorities under five (5) Major Policy Goals: Build a Healthy Community, Enhance Community Resilience, Expand Housing Options, Focus on Economic Development and Fiscal Diversification, and Improve Public Safety—each in alphabetic and numeric sequence rather than by priority or value. Three observations drive the need for this engagement:

- **No explicit ranking.** Initiatives are not ordered by impact, urgency, mandate, or readiness, making trade-off decisions difficult during budget deliberations.
- **Weak budget linkage.** Most priorities are designated “TBD,” with no systematic connection between policy intent and identified funding capacity.
- **Fiscal pressure.** Forecasted annual structural deficits, flattened Casino annual revenues, Zero-based budgeting (ZBB) planning, use of temporary hiring freeze, and the +\$1,000,000 net-revenue threshold (Priority #405.2) demand a disciplined method for sequencing and funding priorities.

3. PROPOSED APPROACH

3.1 Ranking the Priorities

The consultant would facilitate a Council-driven process to score and rank each priority against a shared, transparent set of criteria, producing a tiered ranking that replaces the current alphabetic listing. Proposed scoring dimensions include:

- **Community impact** — breadth and depth of benefit to residents and businesses.
- **Mandate / legal obligation** — state law, RHNA, or grant-driven requirements.
- **Fiscal feasibility** — availability of GF, grants, or restricted funds; cost certainty.

- **Readiness** — staff capacity, dependencies, and time-to-implementation.
- **Policy-goal alignment** — contribution to one or more of the five Major Policy Goals.

3.2 Introducing Priority-Based Budgeting (PBB)

Priority-Based Budgeting connects the ranked Workplan directly to the budget cycle. Rather than treating priorities as a flat list, PBB ties each ranked initiative to a funding pathway and a tier, mirroring and reinforcing the City's existing revenue-implementation tiers and ZBB framework. The result is a clear line of sight from policy intent to fiscal capacity, and a repeatable method for re-prioritizing as conditions change.

Tier	Designation	Funding Posture
Tier I	Mandated / committed core priorities	Funded within existing GF / grants; protected in ZBB
Tier II	High-value discretionary priorities	Funded as capacity is identified; grant-leveraged
Tier III	Aspirational / contingent priorities	Pending new revenue or external funding (TBD)

Illustrative tier structure; final tiers and criteria to be defined with Council and staff during the engagement.

3.3 Prioritizing Community Priorities

Central to the upgrade is the elevation of community-identified priorities as a weighted input to the ranking model. Building on the City's existing annual community and public-safety survey instruments, the consultant would design and integrate an engagement-and-data component so that resident-expressed needs are systematically captured, validated, and reflected in the scoring. This ensures the ranked Workplan reflects genuine community will—strengthening public trust and giving the Council a shared evidentiary basis for reaching consensus rather than negotiating priorities in isolation.

4. ANTICIPATED SCOPE OF SERVICES

Proposers should address, at minimum, the following four phases of work:

1. **Assessment.** Review the current Workplan and its linkage to the adopted budget; identify gaps, dependencies, and quick wins.
2. **Framework design.** Develop a transparent ranking methodology and the Priority-Based Budgeting framework, including scoring criteria, tier definitions, and a community-input weighting model.
3. **Facilitation & consensus-building.** Lead City Council workshops and a structured community-input process to build alignment around the ranking and PBB approach.

4. **Delivery & institutionalization.** Produce a re-ranked, budget-integrated Workplan together with an implementation roadmap and an annual-review protocol so the tool is sustained beyond the engagement.

5. DESIRED CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

- Demonstrated municipal experience in strategic planning and Council priority-setting.
- Proven implementation of priority-based or outcome-based budgeting for local government.
- Skilled facilitation of elected-body workshops and community-engagement processes.
- Familiarity with California fiscal context (i.e. RHNA, Prop. 218, ZBB) preferred.

6. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Interested consultants should submit a proposal to the City Manager addressing each of the following:

Component	Expected Content
Methodology	Approach to ranking, PBB design, and integrating community input.
Work Plan & Timeline	Phased schedule with milestones and Council touchpoints.
Deliverables	Re-ranked Workplan, PBB framework, and annual-review protocol.
Team & References	Key personnel, relevant local-government engagements, and references.
Cost Proposal	Not-to-exceed fee by phase, with assumptions and optional tasks.

7. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion	Weight
Relevant experience & qualifications	30%
Soundness of methodology & PBB approach	30%
Community-engagement and facilitation capability	20%
Cost and overall value	20%
Total	100%

8. RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS:

- 1. Receive BFLSC recommendation and City Council formal direction to authorize the City Manager to release RFP based on this framework; and**
 - 2. Direct the City Manager to review proposals against Section 7 criteria; shortlist and interview finalists; and**
 - 3. Formalize a City Council Ad-Hoc Subcommittee (Mayor and Vice-Mayor) to coordinate/consult with the City Manager on progress and recommendations on professional service provider/facilitator to the City Council; and**
 - 4. Prepare and award contract via City Council action; appropriate one-time funding from FY 2026-27 City Manager Operating Reserve (Fund 190) funds; and**
 - 5. Convene the first Council priority-ranking workshop beginning in late Summer/early Fall 2026 based on consultant timeline approved by the City Manager and City Council.**
-

Prepared by the Office of the City Manager • Teamwork San Pablo: 2025 Year of Empowerment