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Minnesota—Land of 10,000 Lakes
In the Summer
In the WINTER!!!
ORIGINAL SERVICE AREA

- Heartland Community Action
- Prairie Five – P5
- Western Community Action
- Southwestern MN Opportunity Council - SMOC
SERVICE AREA AFTER WESTERN AND HEARTLAND MERGER
$225,000 additional ARRA funds

Needed to be spent out in 3 months

Collaboration on Audits started with 3 of the Caps

Successful completion of over 40 jobs in the 3 months
AFTER ARRA

$0.00

DOE FUNDS
Initial Plan on Collaboration

- WX/Housing Director (1)
  - WX Manager (1)
    - Lead Auditor (1)
    - WX Program Specialist (1)
    - Auditors (3)
  - Housing Manager (1)
    - Housing Intake Staff (1)
    - Housing Inspectors (1)
## PROs and CONs to Collaborating - Initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will make a more efficient, specialized program</td>
<td>Lose individual agency identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will become a more powerful entity for funding</td>
<td>May lose everything-the program, if not proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort looks good, a model</td>
<td>Will take a lot of work to create the positive results wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces risk of not meeting program goals</td>
<td>Politics of such a collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less SPs for the state to deal with</td>
<td>Support costs concerns among the agencies—huge variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only need to do one budget, one work plan, etc.</td>
<td>Cost shifts in an agency due to the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration of CIPs, better use of them</td>
<td>Balancing workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will allow cross training throughout the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will create more funds to spend on program and less on admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will save costs on travel and some support cost immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaboration Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INITIAL COLLABORATION PROGRAM FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$272,442.00 Western</td>
<td>$830,939.00 UCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$208,476.00 SMOC</td>
<td>$258,357.00 SMOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$161,061.00 Prairie Five</td>
<td>$245,313.00 Prairie Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$641,979.00 Total Program Funds</td>
<td>$350,000.00 (approx) CIP funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000.00 (approx) Multi Family DOE funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,784,609.00 Total Program Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Plus: Leverage dollars with other Programs—Minnesota Housing Rehab Loans, Rural Development Rehab Loans, Small Cities Grant Rehab Loans, Energy Related Repairs
WHO DOES WHAT in the Collaboration?

- **Prairie Five** assigns funds to UCAP
- **SMOC** contracts to P5 and UCAP for services
- **SMOC** manages Contactor contracts & licenses
- **Prairie Five** manages the budgets, jobs tracking, and inspections in 5 county service area
- **UCAP** – manages inspection services in 13 of the counties and will assist P5
WHO PROVIDES STAFF to the Collaboration

**Prairie Five**
- 1 Program Manager
- 1 Auditor/Inspector

**SMOC**
- 1 Partial WX Assistant

**UCAP**
- 1 Program Manager
- 1 Lead Auditor/Inspector
- 4 Auditor/Inspector
- 2 Auditor/Inspector Assistant (in training)
## PROs and CONs to Collaborating - Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized audits and forms throughout the service areas</td>
<td>Not all agencies contribute the same amount of expertise but reap the same benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More technically trained staff—auditors</td>
<td>Contract negotiations across the agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effected by staff vacations, illnesses, resignations</td>
<td>Service area could be daunting if we became short staffed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared costs on training opportunities and cross training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor consistency and expectations throughout the service areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team concept is utilized - Expertise of the group has grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring was made easier for the State and the Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders like Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients are better served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY DID WE DO THIS?

- Stability—in staffing and funding
- Staffing capacity maintenance and building
- Using the EXPERIENCED Staff to the benefit everyone involved vs. hiring new staff individually
- Creating more ability to find other funding—a bigger player
- Cross training – learning from each other
- Meet DOE & Commerce requirements
- Sharing contractors training and costs
WHY DID IT WORK FOR US?

- Unique collaboration—will not work for everyone
- Long term relationship of the staff and the agencies of working together
- Willing EDs and Boards who believed in the vision of the long term staff that this could work
- TRUST
WHAT NOT TO DO!
WHAT DID WE LEARN?

- Domineering Partners do not work in the process
- Starting off too big makes it more difficult
- Size of service area can have an affect
- Need to develop a collaborative culture to replace the existing cultures in the various agencies.
- Need trust throughout the entire staff, including Fiscal, and Support Services as well as the Executive Director and Board – This takes time
THE FUTURE
To contact us:

- Laura Milbrandt- 320-269-6579, ext. 1237
  Laura.Milbrandt@prairiefive.org

- Jeff Gladis- 507-537-1416. ext. 2136
  Jeff.Gladis@unitedcapmn.org

Thank you for your attention
Questions?