



PARK CITY NONPROFIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
445 MARSAC AVE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2025

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Danny Glasser – Chair, Sloane Johnson – Vice-Chair, Pam Ross, Chris Neff, Molly Miller, Ingrid Contreras

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Hans Jasperson, Budget & Grants Analyst

I. ROLL CALL

Danny Glasser called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Consideration to Approve the Nonprofit Services Advisory Committee Minutes from February 3, February 4, and February 13, 2025

Motion: Danny Glasser Moved to approve the meeting minutes from February 3, February 4, and February 13, 2025. Sloane Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

III. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM BOARD AND STAFF

Hans Jasperson informed the Committee that the City Council would be considering an ordinance at its February 27 meeting to amend the section of the City code related to the Nonprofit Services Advisory Committee. The amendments would clarify rules around disclosure and recusal for Committee members.

IV. WORK SESSION

1. Discuss Emergent Community Needs Grant Program

Danny Glasser opened the work session. He stated the purpose was to establish the role of the Committee beyond just reviewing and approving RFPs. He added that the Emergent Community Needs Grant Program would be part of that discussion. Pam Ross asked about the Committee's role in the upcoming presentation of funding recommendations to the City Council. Hans Jasperson said he would prepare a staff report. He would give introductory remarks to the Council and Committee members would present on their recommendations. There would be time for questions from Council, public comment, Council deliberations, and a motion.

Danny Glasser recommended that the Committee highlight the challenges of the current environment and how they influenced the Committee's rankings. Jasperson recommended that they should highlight those challenges, while being careful about politicizing them. Glasser responded that he felt the Committee could focus on the urgent needs that nonprofits were seeing without politicizing. Molly Miller read from a draft presentation, outlining how she would frame the discussion: "In light of multi-faceted and critical needs in the current environment, the Committee approached its duty as a form of triage. The following fund allocation recommendations aim to provide urgent support to our most at-risk neighbors, workforce, and businesses. Committee scoring segmented nonprofit applicants into clear tiers of need." Miller would share a draft of the presentation with the Committee members.

Glasser then turned the discussion to how to address emergent needs between RFP cycles. Glasser suggested that sometime in the middle of the next fiscal year, the Committee would return to Council with

recommendations for additional funding to organizations that demonstrate an urgent need. Jasperson suggested that the Committee should first review the current policies regarding the Emergent Community Needs Grant Program. He added that the Committee could recommend changes to the existing policy, but they would need to be approved by Council. Jasperson summarized that the current policy highlights innovation, emergent needs, short-term funding, and a competitive process.

Glasser said that he would prefer not to do a new RFP process for the Emergent Community Needs funds. Rather, the need to deploy those funds would come from performance reports and site visits of the organizations awarded funding through the Public Service Contract process. Jasperson expressed that there might be some pushback to that approach, since it would eliminate competition. He suggested that emergent needs shouldn't be defined by the needs of a particular organization. Instead, the need for a particular service should be identified by the Committee and a call for proposals would go out to the entire nonprofit community to address that need. This process would ensure competition, but it would create more administrative work for the City, the Committee, and the nonprofit community. Pam Ross agreed that there should be a call for applications so that all organizations have the chance to apply. The application process could be streamlined.

Glasser expressed concern about creating a cumbersome process for addressing urgent needs. Ross countered that the Public Service Contract recommendations anticipated needs arising in the coming months and provided organizations with a runway to be able to respond to those needs. She agreed that the process should be nimble and streamlined, but equitable. Glasser worried about the application process not being truly equitable, especially if the Committee already knows where they want to distribute the funds. He suggested that the Emergent Needs funds would be for organizations that already received funding through the Public Service Contracts, since they were identified in a competitive process as having the greatest need. Jasperson reminded the Committee that concerns had previously been raised about needs changing over time. In those discussions, the Committee was concerned about not having funds to pivot and address those changing needs.

Sloane Johnson suggested that once a need is identified, multiple organizations may have different approaches to address it, often in collaboration with one another. Ingrid Contreras wondered about the timeline of the process so the Committee and the nonprofit organizations could plan. Molly Miller expressed that it's difficult to put a timeline on needs that are emerging. She felt it was important to keep the process open to organizations that weren't funded. She wondered how needs are identified, whether by Council, the community, the Committee. Ross added that the community should be a part of that.

Chris Neff mentioned that the Park City Education Foundation has a program called express grants. He worries about a full RFP process being too slow. He agreed that the process should be open to all nonprofits. Miller agreed that express grants would be an approach to consider. Ross suggested a dollar threshold for grants. She suggested that the City could convene a meeting with nonprofits to get their feedback on emerging needs. Glasser felt that it's hard to get nonprofits to get together for something like that. The Committee members, the Council, mayor, and organizations like the rotary clubs could be sources to find out about need.

Pam Ross asked if six months into the fiscal year was a reasonable time for a call for applications. Glasser worried that urgent needs may arise sooner than six months. Ross felt that six months was reasonable. Glasser brought up an example of issue that came up in the school district that resulted in multiple organizations coming together within a matter of six to eight weeks. Ross suggested sticking with six months, but allowing for critical needs to be addressed sooner. Molly Miller asked what would trigger special circumstances that would be considered for funding before the six months. Ross responded that it would be up to the Committee to determine that, but they would know it when they see it.

Jasperson asked the Committee to clarify if this would be a passive process (waiting for the community to bring needs forward) or an active process (the Committee stating the need and asking organizations to respond) or can it be both. Miller worried about the Committee being the authority on what constitutes an emerging need.

Glasser countered that the Committee members, by virtue of their experience in the Community, are well-situated to identify those needs. The Council, Mayor, and staff are also resources for communicating the needs from the community. Ross added that nonprofits should also provide feedback. Glasser mentioned that there are informal meetings of nonprofit leaders to discuss community issues and that it could be a venue for feedback from the nonprofit community. Ross reiterate that she was adamant that nonprofits should be involved in bringing needs forward. Contreras suggested the Committee present an outline of the plan to Council along with an approximate time frame.

Ross summarized the Committee's recommendation as follows: an application deadline six months into the fiscal year, with exceptions for extenuating circumstances that arise outside of that timeframe, the needs will be informed by the community, the application would be streamlined, the Committee would convene to consider applications without interviews, recommendations would be approved by Council. Glasser worried about trying to get the recommendations in front of Council in a timely manner and wondered if the Committee could be authorized to make those decisions. Jasperson said they could make that recommendation, but Council may want to keep the final check on the process of who receives funds.

Glasser asked if the Committee was comfortable with the recommendations as summarized. All assented. Glasser asked what the cap on funds should be. Johnson suggested a cap of \$10,000. The Committee agreed.

Contreras asked when the Committee planned to meet to review applications. Ross suggested the Committee should have regular meetings quarterly. Glasser suggested these quarterly meetings should coincide with site visits and performance reviews.

Jasperson summarized the Committee's recommendation on Emergent Community Needs Grants: \$86,000 would be set aside for urgent or emergent needs. Six months into the fiscal year, the Committee would review requests (with the caveat that extenuating circumstances could expedite the timeline). Decisions would be made based on a slimmed down application and awards would be capped at \$10,000. The Committee would have the discretion to deploy those funds, with authority from the City Council.

The Committee scheduled a debrief meeting for March 26. They also agreed to schedule quarterly regular meetings.

V. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.