



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

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 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 9:30 a.m.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM BOARD AND STAFF

There were no disclosures or communications.

III. WORK SESSION

1. Discuss Public Service Contract Applicants

Hans Jasperson began the meeting by reviewing the Public Service Contract process and the Committee's role. After evaluating written applications and interviewing applicants, the Committee is meeting today to draft recommendations for the City Council. Recommendations are to be based on evaluation scores, interviews, the amount of funding requested versus the amount of funding available, and any current PCMC support to the applicants. The Committee will then present its funding recommendations to the City Council for final approval.

Jasperson presented the Public Service Contract budget for FY25 and the projected FY26 budget. There are \$245,500 in remaining funds for FY25. The total anticipated budget for FY26 is \$638,500. The Committee is making recommendations on the remaining FY25 funding and FY26. The Committee should also recommend holding back funding from FY26 for Emergent Community Needs Grants.

Jasperson shared the results of the Committee's scoring of applicants, based on written application and interviews. Each applicant was ranked by score. Those who scored 80% or higher in the Tier 1 (highest priority for funding), those who scored 70% to 79% were in Tier 2 (middle priority), and those who scored less than 70% were in Tier 3 (lowest priority or no funding)

Jasperson then revealed the rankings and Committee members discussed their impressions. Based on rankings, Jasperson showed a spreadsheet to the Committee that assumed all 10 applicants in Tier 1 would receive their full funding request for FY25, minus any current City Public Service Contract funding, and up to \$50,000. This proposed allocation resulted in a roughly \$16,000 deficit for FY25. Danny Glasser recommended a proportionate cut to each allocation to bring the total to within the budget of \$245,500. The Committee agreed.

FY26 allocations assumed full funding, up to \$50,000 for the 10 Tier 1 applicants. A second tier of approximately 10 applicants would receive partial funding. The Committee discussed the merits of funding various organizations at various funding levels. The budget for FY26 is anticipated to be \$638,500, which

includes both Public Service Contracts and the new Emergent Community Needs grants. After deliberation, the Committee's preliminary funding recommendations had approximately \$550,000 allocated in FY26 for Public Service contracts, and approximately \$85,000 held back for Emergent Community Needs Grants.

Danny Glasser asked Hans Jasperson what the process would be to recommend funding to Council for the Emergent Community Needs Grants. Jasperson replied that the Committee first needs to come up with a process for the Emergent Community Needs Grants because one has yet to be established. He gave some potential options to the Committee: keep the application process open year-round and allow organizations to bring forward applications as needs arise or do a close-ended RFP process. Glasser suggested that the Committee do neither of those. If the application process was open-ended, the City would be inundated with request for funding. Rather than an RFP, he proposed recommendations that would come about as a byproduct of site visits throughout the year to the nonprofits.

Pam Ross observed that the current Committee recommendations are anticipating a high level of need already. Ross asked if \$85,000 was enough for Emergent Community Needs. Jasperson replied that the original intent was to have one process (Public Service Contracts) that provided funding for ongoing critical needs in the community. The second process (Emergent Community Needs Grants) would be short-term or target funding. The preliminary recommendations from the Committee suggest a lot of ongoing need and that may be where we want to deploy the funding. Molly Miller asked what would happen if the remaining funds were not deployed in the next fiscal year. Jasperson replied that they would simply not be spent, as funds in the City's operations are not typically carried forward. Glasser suggested that another RFP process could be done a year from now with the remaining funds. Jasperson added that the recommendations should also include a recommendation on contract length.

Glasser suggested that the Committee establish open communication with the organizations receiving ongoing funding through performance reports and site visits and keep the Council informed of progress and needs.

Glasser asked the Committee if they felt comfortable with the \$85,000 held back. Pam Ross wondered if \$100,000 would be more appropriate and asked Jasperson what Council might prefer. Jasperson stated that the Council would likely look to the Committee for their recommendation. He added that it would be good for the Committee to come up with additional recommendations on the Committee's role in between RFPs, such as site visits or review of performance reports. Glasser recommended the Committee assign liaisons to review performance reports and perform site visits.

Pam Ross suggested that the Committee present three scenarios: 1) the Committee's recommended funding level (which frontloads funding for urgent needs, holding back approximately \$86,000); 2) holding back \$100,000; 3) holding back \$150,000.

Jasperson asked the Committee to clarify the contract length recommendation. Danny Glasser suggested two-year contracts for the top-tier applicants, with one-year contracts for the rest. Pam Ross argued that it would be difficult for a grant seeker to do the work to apply for limited funding every year. Molly Miller asked if the Committee would consider an option to have up to four-year contracts. Glasser asked if RFPs were done annually in the past. Jasperson responded that it was an annual process until FY 2021, when Regular (Core Service) Special Service Contracts moved to a four-year cycle. Mental Health and DEI Special Service Contracts were two-year cycles. Sloane Johnson observed that the needs of the community have changed over the past four years and will likely change again. The Committee agreed that the recommendations should include contracts through FY 2027.

Danny Glasser observed that while the Committee’s recommendation focused on basic and urgent needs, community cohesion in community building will continue to be important topics.

The Committee finalized funding recommendations as follows:

Organization Name	Request	FY25	FY26	FY27
Christian Center of Park City (Food Pantry)	\$50,000	\$22,250	\$50,000	\$50,000
Wasatch Immigration Project	\$25,000	\$22,250	\$25,000	\$25,000
People's Health Clinic	\$40,000	\$15,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Peace House	\$80,000	\$27,250	\$50,000	\$50,000
Park City Senior Citizens	\$50,000	\$22,250	\$50,000	\$50,000
PC Tots	\$50,000	\$37,250	\$50,000	\$50,000
Hope Alliance	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
Mountain Mediation Center	\$22,030	\$17,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
Christian Center of Park City (Mental Health)	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Park City Education Foundation	\$75,000	\$47,250	\$50,000	\$50,000
Youth Sports Alliance	\$20,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000
SOS Outreach	\$20,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000
Holy Cross Ministries	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
Mountainlands Community Housing Trust	\$50,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000
Summit County Clubhouse	\$12,500	\$0	\$12,500	\$12,500
Utah Legal Services	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Park City School District	\$10,000	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000
Park City Community Foundation (Youth United)	\$15,000	\$0	\$11,000	\$11,000
Live Like Sam	\$50,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000
Utah Avalanche Center	\$8,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Special Olympics Utah	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Park City Community Foundation (Equity Cohort)	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Park City Film	\$22,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Summit County Gardens and EATS	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Utah	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

Arts Council of Park City & Summit County	\$26,400	\$0	\$0	\$0
National Ability Center	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Egyptian Theatre	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ballet West	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bike Utah	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Totals	\$955,930	\$245,500	\$552,500	\$552,500

Moved: Danny Glasser moved to advance the Committee’s funding recommendations to the City Council. Chris Neff seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee set its next meeting for February 19 at 6 pm.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved