



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

Minutes of July 30, 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 pm. Elyse Kats was excused.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM BOARD AND STAFF

1. ANNUAL ETHICS PLEDGE, DISCLOSURES, AND OPMA TRAINING

Hans Jasperson distributed the ethics pledge and financial disclosure to Molly Miller and Sloane Johnson. All other members had previously completed the forms. Jasperson asked the board to confirm that all members had completed the required Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA) training. Danny Glasser still needed to complete the training.

III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE NONPROFIT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 26, 2025

Glasser asked for clarification on the action taken by City Council in response to the Committee's most recent recommendations. Jasperson summarized the Council action taken on May 1, 2025: Council moved to fund PC Tots at \$27,250 for FY25 and for FY26 and FY27, allocate the \$50,000 proposed PC Tots funding to Emergent Needs, and return to Council in September to discuss the Upwards Scholarship program to increase the levels of funding to ensure PC Tots is viable. Glasser recalled Council discussing using Emergent Community Needs Grant funds for PC Tots, in the event that Council did not move forward with a new childcare plan in the fall. Jasperson recalled that this was discussed, but not included in the formal motion that was approved by Council.

Motion: Danny Glasser Moved to approve the meeting minutes from March 26, 2025. Molly Miller seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discuss Public Service Contract Performance and Evaluations

Jasperson summarized the reporting requirements for Public Service Contract recipients, which include a line-item accounting of how City funds were spent, a summary of the overall project as outlined in the application, and the progress on the Performance Outcomes and Measures identified in the application.

Pam Ross asked how performance reports have been used historically in assessing impact. Jasperson responded that they have provided a check-in to ensure the proposed project is still being carried out, whether any adjustments need to be made, or whether future funds need to be held back.

Jasperson then summarized some of the benefits and considerations of having committee members perform site visits to the nonprofits. Benefits include updating the Committee on progress, identifying strengths, challenges,

and needs, and helping inform the Emergent Community Needs Grant process. Considerations include time constraints on both nonprofits and Committee members and ensuring openness and transparency in the process. Glasser added that Committee members should be discreet in what they share with the group. Chris Neff added that visits should be an example of management by walking around, or oversight by being present, and should not be a surprise inspection. Ingrid Contreras was interested in getting the perspective of the people who receive services.

Jasperson clarified that Committee members should not give a comprehensive report of their site visits but should share any information that would help the rest of the Committee better assess the impact of an organization or program. Ross felt the process should be standardized to make it equitable, as some organizations have more resources to host than others. Sloane Johnson envisioned coming to observe or even volunteer, rather than pulling organizations away from their work to do a presentation. Jasperson summarized the information that should be gathered: What's working the way you would like? What's not working? What are the biggest successes? What are the biggest challenges? Can we be of help? Neff added that an unspoken question for the reviewer would be, is there an articulated or visible result of the funding? Johnson shared a template she had prepared for site visits. Jasperson said he would use the template and tweak it.

Jasperson presented a randomized assignment sheet for site visits. Pam Ross asked to take Mountainlands from Elyse Kats, since Elyse had worked there previously. In exchange, Kats was assigned Summit County Clubhouse. The Committee agreed with the rest of the assignments. The Committee discussed a timeline for initial visits and agreed they should be completed prior to the next Committee meeting at the end of October. Ross suggested that Jasperson email all of the organizations to let them know that Committee members would like to connect for a visit as part of the Committee's process. Then, individual Committee members would set the schedule.

2. Discuss Emergent Community Needs Grants

Jasperson began with an overview of the available budget. City Council allocated \$136,000 for Emergent Community Needs in FY26. He summarized points from the Committee's previous discussions: applications would be accepted around the midpoint of the fiscal year, the process would be informed by nonprofits, applications would be streamlined, there would be no interviews with applicants, awards would be limited to \$10,000, and the Council would approve the Committee's recommendations. Jasperson asked if the Committee agreed with these main points. Glasser suggested there may be exceptions to the \$10,000 limit.

Glasser asked if a Council liaison could be assigned to the Committee. Jasperson responded that, when setting up the Committee, the Council chose not to have a liaison. Ross asked if Committee recommendations could be set on the Council Consent agenda. Jasperson thought this could be possible, if Council agreed to the approach. The Committee discussed a recommended funding range of around \$10,000, with exceptions. The Committee also discussed messaging to nonprofits on what the funds are intended for.

Contreras asked what the definition of "emergent need" is, and the Committee offered feedback to answer that question. Neff suggested that the funding should be for projects that are unfunded, unbudgeted, unexpected, or unmet.

The Committee discussed whether applicants should be required to secure other funding. While smaller organizations without a large fundraising operation may struggle to find matching funds, the Committee agreed that the question should at least be asked on the application, and preference should be given to projects with other funding partners.

Molly Miller summarized the Committee's ideas on criteria for Emergent Community Needs Grants. First, the request must be for funds to meet an unexpected and unmet need, not part of the normal operational budget. These could arise as a demand-driven response to needs coming from the community, a proactive response to emerging challenges, or a fresh approach to get ahead of potential challenges. Applicants should also attempt to secure funding from other sources. Collaboration with other nonprofits is also encouraged.

The Committee then discussed the process and timing for applications and Committee review. It was decided that applications would remain open as long as there is funding, and applications would be reviewed at the Committee's quarterly meetings. Extraordinary requests could prompt a special meeting. Jasperson requested Miller's help in distilling the Committee's thoughts into an actionable plan for Emergent Community Needs Grants. The Committee will consider approval of the plan at their October meeting, present their recommendation to Council in November or December, and then launch the program in the winter.

APPROVED