



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

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2024

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sloane Johnson, Pam Ross, Chris Neff, Ingrid Contreras, Lindsay Carreto, Danny Glasser, Molly Miller

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

I. ROLL CALL

Hans Jasperson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All members were present.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Introduction of New Members

Hans Jasperson welcomed all new members and explained that he would be conducting the first meeting, as the Committee had not yet elected a Chair. Jasperson invited all members to introduce themselves.

2. Open and Public Meetings Act Training

Hans Jasperson introduced Luke Henry, Assistant City Attorney. Jasperson played a video on the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA) produced by the [Utah Office of the State Auditor](#). Danny Glasser asked Henry if all aspects of OPMA apply to the governance of the Nonprofit Services Advisory Committee. Specifically, he wanted to know how the open and closed meeting requirements would apply when leaders of nonprofits want to attend Committee meetings where decisions are discussed that affect those organizations. Henry responded that all Committee meetings would need to begin open but that the Committee could vote to close the meeting when discussing RFPs. Any actions, including recommendations on funding, would still need to be done in an open meeting. Chris Neff asked if the Committee could close a meeting to deliberate on a stack of grant applications, but then reopen the meeting to discuss findings. Glasser asked if the Committee could maintain anonymity regarding individual applicant scores in a closed meeting as long as the Committee's final recommendations and votes were in an open meeting to which Henry affirmed. Glasser asked if a Committee secretary would be selected from among the members to handle agendas and minutes or if one would be provided by the City. Jasperson and Henry responded that they could choose to select a secretary but that most City boards don't, and that Jasperson could serve in that capacity. Jasperson added that the intent of the Committee is to conduct business in an open meeting whenever possible. More conversations are needed to determine when it's appropriate to have a closed meeting. Glasser asked what financial information nonprofit applicants typically share. Jasperson answered that independent audits or financial statements are required. Henry clarified a previous point that individual votes from Committee members on funding must be done in an open meeting and recorded. Glasser asked a question about meeting socially with members of the Committee. Henry clarified that Committee business shouldn't be discussed in those settings.

3. Nonprofit Services Advisory Committee Election

Hans Jasperson described the duties of the Committee Chair and Vice-Chair and explained that the Committee Chair would conduct future meetings.

Motion: Molly Miller moved to elect Danny Glasser as Chair. Chris Neff seconded the motion

Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Motion: Danny Glasser moved to elect Sloane Johnson as Vice-Chair. Chris Neff seconded the motion

Vote: The motion passed unanimously

4. FY25-28 Public Service Contracts Request for Applications

Hans Jasperson gave a presentation on the background of Park City's support for nonprofits and Public Service Contracts. Jasperson went over the criteria and evaluation process for Public Service Contracts. After the presentation, Jasperson took questions and feedback from the Committee. Chris Neff asked how to handle funding decisions when multiple organizations are providing the same or similar services. Jasperson answered that the first step in the evaluation process is to have each Committee member review and score applications individually, on their own merits. Those aggregate scores would be used as a basis for later discussions about funding allocations.

Pam Ross asked about the potential for the Committee to reweight the evaluation criteria. Ross suggested making *Alignment with City Council Priorities* a prerequisite for applying and giving more weight to *Demonstration of Public Benefit*. She suggested requiring a logic model to demonstrate public benefit. The Committee agreed with these recommendations.

Danny Glasser asked how the Committee should evaluate programs that benefit Park City but aren't limited to full-time residents. Jasperson responded that programs should target people who live and work within Park City limits.

Pam Ross expressed trepidation about locking in four years of funding while the City is still trying to launch a new process. Jasperson proposed two-year contracts with an option to renew for two additional years, at the City's discretion. Glasser was concerned with providing nonprofits with more certainty for long-term planning and suggested that a two-year renewal option at the City's discretion would provide no more certainty than just doing a two-year grant cycle. Jasperson recommended making the contract renewal automatic, contingent upon performance and availability of funding.

Jasperson went over an evaluation rubric. Ross recommended requiring an executive summary in the application. This would provide a brief synopsis of the application to help evaluators keep all of the proposals clear. The Committee agreed with this recommendation. Neff asked what the page length of the proposals would be. Jasperson proposed keeping each response to less than a page. The Committee agreed that word limits for the applications were appropriate.

Glasser asked how past grant history should be considered in making funding decisions. Jasperson replied that the Committee should consider past grant funding, as well as other types of City support, such as rent subsidies and fee waivers. The Committee will have some discretion on how to use that information in crafting their recommendations. Ross asked the Committee to think about messaging around the applications that don't get funded.

Neff suggested that the process should include the ability for one or more Committee members to advocate for lower-scoring applications, pointing out to other Committee members things they may have overlooked. Glasser suggested considering providing small organizations with consulting fees so they could grow and build their capacity. Jasperson suggested that it would be a good idea to roll into the Emergent Community Needs Grant process.

5. Discussion of Committee Meeting Schedule

The Committee discussed the timeline for issuing the Request for Applications, reviewing applications, scheduling applicant interviews, and presenting recommendations to the City Council. The Committee planned to have recommendations ready by the last City Council meeting in February 2025. Jasperson would schedule some time from mid-January to early February for interviews, which would be conducted virtually. Jasperson mentioned that the Committee will need to adopt a rule to conduct business virtually.

III. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED 01-13-2025