2024 County Feedlot Officer (CFO) Annual Report

(Data for the Period: January 1, 2024 - December 31, 2024) Revised: 4/25/24

County: Steele Contact Person: Dave Stenzel

Phone: 507-444-7488 E-Mail Address: david.stenzel@steelecountymn.gov

Signature: James Brady 5/13/25

(Signature of County Board Commissioner) (Date)

All data must be entered in accordance with the Annual CFO Report Guidance Document.

Except where identified, this report only addresses ***non-CAFO/NPDES/SDS sites*** *required by 7020 to be registered.*

STAFFING LEVEL			
1	FTEs - (Full Time Equivalents) supplied by the CFO(s):		0.7
2	FTEs supplied by other county staff, including administrative and support staff assigned to the feedlot program:		0.02
3	FTEs supplied through contract with other local government units:		0
4	Total Number of FTE positions that supported county program:		0.72
REGISTRATION *(Report your current numbers - base grant numbers are displayed for reference)*		Base	Current
5	Feedlots in shoreland with 10 - 49 AU:	8	9
6	Feedlots with 50 - 299 AU:	113	115
7	Non-CAFO/NPDES/SDS ≥ 300 AU:	45	45
8	CAFOs without NPDES or SDS permits 300-999 AU ("Gap Sites")	0	3
9	Feedlots with NPDES or SDS permits:	25	22
10	**Total - Feedlots required to be registered:**	**191**	**194**
11	**Total - Feedlots Eligible for Funding (FROM AGENCY BASE GRANT AWARD NUMBER)**		**191**
Feedlot Sites Inspected	**Minimum number of FEEDLOT SITES required to register that must be inspected (7%):**		**13.5**
12	Number of **FEEDLOT SITES** that received a compliance, construction, desktop N&P, or in-field land app inspection (count in-field land app inspections as 1/2 of an inspection)		26

INSPECTION REPORTING					
Types of Inspections (at sites required to be registered) Only count first instance of each type of inspection per feedlot		**10 - 49 AU** (in shoreland)	**50 - 299 AU** (except where noted)		**300 or more AU** (Non-CAFO/NPDES/SDS)
13	Compliance inspections	2	9		14
	13.1) How many included a 3 or 6-yr P records inspection (see guidance)				0
14	Construction inspections				
	14.1) How many received a 2nd construction inspection				
15	Desktop N & 3 or 6-yr P records inspection (see guidance) (P review as part of a compliance inspection should be reported in 13.1)		0	*100+ AU & in DWSMA*	1
16	In-field land application inspection				
17	Complaint initiated inspections (any non-CAFO/NPDES/SDS)	0	1		0
18	Routine or follow-up stockpile only inspection				

Other Inspection Related Info		
19	CAFO/NPDES/SDS sites inspected at the MPCA's request	0
20	Number of feedlots inspected within shoreland or a DWSMA	3
21	Number of feedlots inspected within the County's priority areas as designated in the work plan	26
22	Number of sites inspected found to be non-compliant with water quality discharge standards	1
23	Number of sites inspected with 100+ AU found to be non-compliant with N and/or P requirements	3

INSPECTION Performance Credits (Summarized from entries above) NOTE: Inspections assumed to satisfy the 7% minimum are not PC eligible		Total	Not PC eligible	PC eligible	PC	PC Total
24	Compliance inspections *min. # of compliance inspections: 7*	25	13.5	11.5	3	34.5
25	Construction inspections	0	0	0	2	0
26	Desktop N & 3 or 6-yr P records inspections (see guidance)	1	0	1	3	3
27	In-field land application inspections	0	0	0	1	0
28	Compliance inspections that include optional P review			0	1	0
29	Number of facilities that received 2 or more construction inspections			0	1	0
30	CAFO/NPDES/SDS sites inspected at the MPCA's request			0	1	0
31	Complaint initiated inspections (any non-CAFO/NPDES/SDS) (only count 1 per feedlot)			1	1	1
32	Routine or follow-up stockpile only inspection. (only count 1 per feedlot)			0	0.5	0

Additional Performance Credit Calculations and Supplemental Information

Describe below the progress made in meeting your program year work plan inspection goals. You must provide quantitative results for each compliance inspection and land application goal listed in your work plan.

PERMITTING		Number	PC	PC Total
33	30-day construction or expansion notifications received:	0	---	---
34	Interim Permits Issued or Modified:	0	6	0
35	Construction Short-Form Permits Issued or Modified at Sites ≥ 300 AU:	0	4	0
36	Public meetings held for construction or expansion to ≥ 500 AU:	0	---	---
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (EAW)		Number	PC	PC Total
37	EAW petitions received:	0	---	---
38	EAWs prepared by county:	0	8	0
EMERGENCY RESPONSE		Number	PC	PC Total
39	Events where emergency response was conducted: (on-site visit)	5	4	20
ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS		Number	PC	PC Total
40	Letters of Warning (LOW) issued:	1	---	---
41	Notices of Violation (NOV) issued:	0	---	---
42	Court actions commenced:	0	---	---
FEEDLOT SITE SCHEDULED COMPLIANCE (Achieved in current reporting year)		Number	PC	PC Total
43	Feedlots where a partial environmental upgrade was achieved:	0	---	---
44	Feedlots where a complete environmental upgrade was achieved:	0	12	0
LAND APPLICATION SCHEDULED COMPLIANCE (Achieved in current reporting year)		Number	PC	PC Total
45	Land application record keeping returned to compliance at Feedlots **100 - 299 AU**:	0	1	0
46	Land application record keeping returned to compliance at Feedlots **300+ AU** (or 100+ DWSMA):	0	2	0
47	Nitrogen application rate returned to compliance (any size facility):	2	1	2
LMSA CLOSURE (Achieved in current reporting year)		Number	PC	PC Total
48	Sites where a LMSA was closed (verified by field inspection or producer notification):	1	6	6

OWNER ASSISTANCE AND OUTREACH		Number	PC	PC Total
49	Sites visited to provide assistance	116	---	---
50	Workshops/trainings hosted/sponsored by the CFO:	0	6	0
	50.1) Total number of feedlot owners attending these events	0	---	---
51	CFO presentations at informational or producer group events: (per event)	2	3	6
52	Number of mailings to feedlot owners:	8	---	---
53	Feedlot articles placed in newspapers and/or social media:	0	---	---

Describe your workshops, trainings, newsletters, mailings, articles, or other assistance and outreach activities.

Date	Description
7-Feb	Storm & Jenna Sammon - New Feedlot Registration
31-May	J&N Beef - New Feedlot Registration
24-Aug	Jim Borchert - New Feedlot-Laying Hens / MPCA-County Needs / Registration-Manure Management
2-Oct	Brad Hagen - Manure Application in Sensitive Areas / DWSMA / Well Head Protection / Notifications
12-Dec	Balzer Dairy - MMP Assistance / Dairy Initiative Team Meetings
26-Dec	Schmity Holsteins - MMP Assistance

CFO TRAINING AND MENTORING		Number	PC	PC Total
54	CFO - training CEUs: (Enter total training hours earned & list events below - see guidance for more than 18 hr)	30.5	0.5	6
55	Hours mentoring New CFOs in another county (describe on a separate sheet):	0	0.5	0

List the training events attended.

Date	Description	Hours
17-Jan	Engineer Assistance, Data Practices	1.5
29-Jan	MPCA-Feedlot Permits Discussion	1.5
21-Feb	Continuous Improvement (CI) Project Update, New Permit Discussion	1.5
17-Apr	2025 Funding QA, Inspection Prep, Data Entry and Land Application Review	1.5
15-May	Construction Stormwater Presentation	1
29-May	Spring - CFO Regional Meetings - Owatonna	4
17-Jul	MDA Biosecurity & H5N1, Update DAWP, and Feedlot Registration Numbers	1.5
17-Jul	Legislative Update	1
21-Aug	When are EAW's Required	1.5
18-Sep	N/Lysimeter Presentation,General Overview of Manure N in the Field,2025 County Tempo WAL Changes	1.5
23-Oct	County Feedlot Program Enforcement Process	1.5
12-Nov	Fall - CFO Regional Meetings - Owatonna	4
20-Nov	Manure 201 - Mankato	7
18-Dec	CFO Annual Reporting Process	1.5

OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES		Number	PC	PC Total
56	Feedlots where a MinnFARM was conducted (list sites below):	0	2	0
57	Notifications received claiming air quality exemptions:	8	---	---
58	Meetings with other local government and producer groups:	18	---	---
59	Feedlot ordinance revisions likely, in progress, or completed? ☐ Yes ☑ No	If Yes describe below		

MinnFARM completed by CFO

registration no.	Site Name

Describe other county program activities not identified elsewhere.

Feedlot Registrations-New-Re-Registrations-Ownership Changes/MMP Assistance/Ag BMP Discussions to Update Equipment & Site Improvements/Pasture vs. Openlot Education/Public Education on Feedlot Ordinances - New-Existing-Ownership Change

TEMPO DATA ENTRY - completed by MPCA staff via TEMPO review		Max Eligible PC	PC Earned
60	Reviewed registration files have ALL documentation uploaded to TEMPO (if applicable)	1	2
61	All four inspection files have ALL documentation uploaded to TEMPO	1	2
62	Both permit files have ALL documentation uploaded to TEMPO	2	0
63	90% of inspection data entered within 60 days of inspection	4	4
64	All applicable inspection files for sites >100 AU contain land application records	4	4
TOTAL PERFORMANCE CREDITS			**90.50**

	CY2024 MPCA	County Feedlot Financial Report	
	The county may show all county expenditures beyond the required match.		
		Revised 11/15/2024	
County	Steele		
County Feedlot Officer	Dave Stenzel	**507-444-7488**	
	NAME	PHONE	
	Budgeted	**Spent**	**Balance Remaining**
2023 Funds Leftover			0
2024 Grant Award Amount	$ 35,485.13	$ 35,485.13	0
2024 Required Match Amount	$ 24,890.36	$ 39,673.87	-14783.51
TOTAL	**$ 60,375.49**	**$ 75,159.00**	**-14783.51**
PC NUMBER earned (per MPCA) in 2024 for 2023 work	**$ 24.25**		
PC DOLLAR amount rec'd in 2024 for 2023 work	**$ 4,808.19**		
Activity	**Spent**		
Complaint Response	$ 4,105.00		
Inspections & Compliance	$ 28,736.00		
Owner Assistance	$ 8,210.00		
Permitting	$ 684.00		
Registration/Inventories	$ 2,053.00		
Training/Conferences	$ 1,368.00		
Administration	$ 23,262.00		
Other (explain)	$ -		
Activity Total	**$ 68,418.00**		
Choose either "overhead lump sum" or " overhead broken down" below. If Overhead is figured into CFO's salary which is in turn figured into program activity costs above, state that here -> and do not enter Overhead costs.	*Example: Overhead is figured into salary. Program activities include overhead.*		
Overhead Lump Sum (If you do not break down overhead expenses but track them in a lump some or in addition to salary, enter that amount.)	**Spent**		
Overhead Broken Down (If you break down overhead expenses please enter amount spent for each.)	**Spent**		
Office (lease, utilities, furniture, insurance, etc.)			
Vehicle (lease, fuel, mtnc., etc.)	$ 3,851.00		
Supplies (computer, internet, phone, copier, fax, paper, postage, etc.)	$ 2,890.00		
Other (explain)			
Reasearch fees			
OVERHEAD TOTAL	**$ 6,741.00**		
GRAND TOTAL (ACTIVITY & OVERHEAD)	**$ 75,159.00**		
Employee Name	**FTE**	**Grant Salary Expense** (includes insurance/benefits)	
Dave Stenzel	0.7	$ 65,984.00	
Dale Oolman	0.01	$ 1,598.00	
Tiffany Wentura	0.01	$ 836.00	
TOTAL	0.72	$ 68,418.00	
FTE = Full Time Equivalent; the percentage of employee's time dedicated to the feedlot program in 2024.			

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Feedlot Program
[2024] Year-End Review Worksheet

COUNTY: Steele

COUNTY FEEDLOT OFFICER: David Stenzel

MPCA REVIEWER: Isaac Johnson

DATE of REVIEW: 04/04/2025

Annual review reminders and what you need to complete this worksheet:

- The data used to complete this form can be found in the Tempo data warehouse and in Tableau reports.
- The data needed to complete the form includes:
  - Number of sites that were registered;
  - Number of Compliance inspections conducted;
  - Number of sites brought back into compliance; and
  - Number of sites that received a permit
- A total of **20** Non-inspection Minimum Program Requirement (MPR) are possible for this review.
- A County cannot receive a partial point two years in a row for the same MPR. Either the County earns a full point the second year or no point.
- *MPCA Reviewers*: When conducting the review, ensure you have the County's most current documents in front of you. This includes:
  - Delegation Agreement Work Plan (DAWP);
  - DAWP Addendums (if applicable);
  - The most recent mid-year review worksheet; and
  - The previous year-end review worksheet

Minimum Program Requirements (MPR) Reporting

INSPECTION MPRs	Agency-approved number of feedlots required to be registered (See Attachment A):	191
	Number of inspections conducted that count towards the 7% inspection rate:	26
	Inspection rate achieved by the county (%):	13.6%
NON-INSPECTION MPRs	Number of applicable non-inspection MPRs:	13
	Total non-inspection MPR points:	13
	Non-Inspection MPR rate (%):	100%

Registration Section (☐ NA)

Review two to ten files completed by the County. If there is only one file, review one file. If there are no registration files, mark "NA" for this section.

MPR No.			
1.	Did the County enter registration information into the online registration system correctly according to MPCA instructions and the Delegation Agreement Work Plan (DAWP)? (Tempo HELP/Feedlot folder//Registration Information//"Online Registration FAQs.docx". This will be updated as needed.) If a CSF or interim permit is issued with an increase of AU the review should indicate the registration was updated using the online registration system. **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: Of the files reviewed, at least 80% are entered correctly and in accordance with MPCA instructions and the DAWP. • **One half point**: Of the files reviewed, 50%-79.9% are entered correctly and in accordance with MPCA instructions and the DAWP.*(i.e., not entering complete or accurate information, not updating location information when necessary (moving the dot), not updating the registration when a permit is issued, etc.)* • **No point**: Of the files reviewed, less than 50% of the files are entered correctly and in accordance with MPCA instructions and the DAWP and/or issue(s) identified are the **same issues** that were identified and documented during last year's review *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to County entering new data and County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review, beyond the two previous reviews, to address the issue.)*	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt
2.	Did the County meet the 30-day registration receipt requirement? *(If a producer does not have a contact e-mail the County will need to mail via USPS a registration receipt within 30 days of entering site information into the online system to the producer. If the registration is entered in-person with the feedlot owner present the County will need to document the receipt was given to the owner.)* **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: Of the files reviewed, at least 80% contain an acceptable 30-day letter or met other agency acceptable notification requirements • **One half point**: Of the files reviewed, 50%-79.9% contain an acceptable 30-day letter or meets other agency acceptable notification requirements or both files contain a 30-day registration receipt, but documentation is inadequate • **No point**: Of the files reviewed, less than 50% of the files contains a 30-day registration receipt or agency acceptable documentation	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

Files Reviewed:

1. J&N Beef- Sec 25 AI 259824 OK
2. Straight River LLC AI 82229 OK

Reviewer Comments:

Dave does a good job getting producers emails in when he can so they get the registrations right away, and also sends letters with the registration updates.

letters with the registration updates. **Inspections and Compliance Section**

Review **four** compliance and/or desktop N & P inspection files. If there are less than four files, review available files. Reviewers may look at additional files to verify consistency of initial files reviewed.

- For Item 8, review two inspection files. If there is only one file, review that file. If no files, mark "NA".

3.	Did the County correctly document inspections? **Scoring Criteria:**	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

	• **One point:** All files contain the correct documentation • **One half point:** At least 50% of files contain the correct documentation or there are issues with how the County completed the documentation. *(i.e., components like an open lot or an LMSA existed at the feedlot site, but they were not inspected or site did not have records, yet the site was marked compliant or non-compliant for nitrogen rate requirements and/or phosphorous requirements)* • **No point:** Less than 50% of the files contain the correct documentation or the issue(s) identified are the **<u>same issues</u>** that were identified and documented during last year's review *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to County entering new data and County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review beyond the two previous reviews to address the issue.)*		
4.a.	Did the County enter inspection information into Tempo correctly according to MPCA instructions for entering an inspection into Tempo? (Tempo HELP/Feedlot folder/Inspection Information) **Scoring Criteria:** • **Half point:** All inspection files are entered correctly. • **Quarter point:** At least 50% of inspections files are entered correctly or there are issues with how the County entered inspection information in Tempo *(i.e., part of feedlot is non-compliant for open lot or manure application records, when entering the inspection in Tempo, base requirements - final compliance indicators - were loaded, but checklist section sub-questions were not OR inspection date is incorrectly entered as data entry date rather than actual inspection date OR incorrect inspection "Activity Type" or "Compliance Evaluation Type" is selected)* • **No point:** Less than 50% of inspections files are entered correctly or the issue(s) identified are the **<u>same issues</u>** that were identified and documented during last year's review. *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to County entering new data and County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review beyond the two previous reviews to address the issue.)*	☐ No	☒ ½ pt ☐ ¼ pt
4.b.	Review should indicate at least seventy five percent (75%) of inspection data was entered into Tempo within 120 days of the inspection. Minimally funded counties can enter data less frequently. This question is evaluating ALL inspections completed by the county, not just the four inspection files that are being reviewed for the annual review. The Tableau Inspection Entry Timeliness report should be used to evaluate this requirement. **Scoring Criteria:** • **Half point:** 75% to 100% of data is entered within 120 days and by reporting deadline of February 1. • **Quarter point:** 50% to 74.9% of data is entered within 120 days and the remaining inspection data is entered by the reporting deadline of February 1. • **No point**: less than 50% of data is entered within 120 days and/or not by February 1 deadline.	☐ No	☒ ½ pt ☐ ¼ pt
5.	Did the County follow their Delegation Agreement Work Plan Inspection Strategy? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** County followed inspection strategy. • **No point:** County did not follow inspection strategy.	☐ No	☒ 1 pt
6.	Was the producer notified of inspection results in writing (paper or electronic)? For a compliance and/or desktop N & P inspection was the producer notified of inspection results in writing (paper or electronic) within **30 days** of compliance determination? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: all files reviewed contain a letter/e-mail (sent when required)	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

	• **One half point:** at least 50% of files reviewed contains a notification letter/e-mail (sent when required) • **No point:** less than 50% of the files reviewed contain a notification letter/e-mail (if required)		
7.	Did the County follow their Delegation Agreement Work Plan Compliance Strategy for inspections that resulted in non-compliance? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: County followed compliance strategy • **No point**: County did not follow compliance strategy		☒ 1 pt
8.	Did the County maintain documentation of corrective action for any site that was returned to compliance in the program year? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** documentation was maintained for each file reviewed (audit data screen & violation screen completed in Tempo.) • **One half point:** documentation was observed in at least one of the files reviewed (audit data screen & violation screen completed in Tempo.) • **No point:** no documentation was observed (audit data screen & violation screen not completed in Tempo.)	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

Files Reviewed:

1. Kashome Holsteins-sec 12 AI 82021
2. Jeff Larson Farm-Sec 32 AI 83221
3. Matt Deml-Sec 27 AI 120626
4. Kruckeberg Nursery AI 81993
5. Schiller Dairy Farm LLC- Sec 2 AI 72380

Reviewer Comments:

Dave has a firm understating of feed lot rules and uses it to performs thorough inspections. He collect detailed documentation and it is entered in Tempo in a timely manner.

Permitting Section (☒ NA)

Review two permit files. If there is only one file, review one file. If there are no permit files, mark "NA" for this section. Reviewers may look at additional files to verify consistency of initial files reviewed.

9.	Did the County issue permits within the required 60/120 day time period? • Did the County clearly document a received date on all paperwork (permit applications, MMPs, and plans & spec documents)? ☐ Yes ☐ Most ☐ No • If applicable, did the County send incomplete letters within 15 business days? • ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** all paperwork (applications, MMPs, and plans and specs) clearly document a received date and County met 15 business day requirement for applicable incomplete letters • **One half point:** most paperwork (applications, MMPs and plans and specs) clearly document a received date and both files met 15 business day requirement • **No point** – a received date is not documented on paperwork or neither file met 15 business day requirement	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt
10.	Did the County correctly complete the most recent permit application checklist? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** all files contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist • **One half point** – at least 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or there are issues with how the county completed the checklist. *(i.e., application information is not verified as accurate and/or complete through the use of the permit application checklist. Ex: animal numbers indicated on application meet threshold of large CAFO and County issues permit OR parts of application left blank (i.e., barn dimensions) and permit issued without that information OR application only includes proposed information and not existing animals/barns and permit is issued without having existing information.)* • **No point** – less than 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or the issue(s) identified are the **same issues** that were identified and documented during last year's review *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to new data entry and the County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review beyond the two previous reviews to address the issue.)*	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt
11.	Were notification requirements met? • Public notice $\geq$500 AU: ☐ NA • Government notice: ☐ NA	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

	Scoring Criteria: • **One point:** all notification requirements were met • **One half point** – half or more required notifications were met • **No point** – notification requirement was not met		
12.	Were permits issued no sooner than 20 business days after public notice (>500 AU)? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point** – applicable permits were issued 20+ business days after public notice. • **No point** – one or both applicable permit(s) were issued sooner than 20 business days.	☐ No	☐ 1 pt
13.	Did the County correctly complete the most recent MMP checklist? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: all files contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist • **One half point:** at least 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or there are issues with how the County completed the checklist *(i.e., the* MMP *shows planned over application of nutrients and permit is issued anyway OR MMP does not include items that are identified in feedlot rule and on MMP checklist and a permit is issued anyway.)* • **No point**: less than 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or the issue(s) identified are the **same issues** that were identified and documented during last year's review *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to new data entry and the County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review beyond the two previous reviews to address the issue.)*	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt
14.	Did the County correctly complete the most recent LMSA checklist? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: all files contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist • **One half point**: at least 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or there are issues with how the County completed the checklist *(i.e., LMSA plans do not include items that are identified in the feedlot rules and on the LMSA checklist and a permit is issued anyway.)* • **No point:** less than 50% of files reviewed contain a correctly completed standard/approved checklist or the issue(s) identified are the **same issues** that were identified and documented during last year's review *(County was previously informed regarding the issue prior to new data entry and the County did not correct the problem/issue in the following year. If there is a new CFO, the County will be given one additional year-end review beyond the two previous reviews to address the issue.)*	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt
15.	Did the County conduct an inspection within the last year prior to permit issuance at applicable sites to ensure that the proper permit was issued (CSF vs. INT)? (☐ NA) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** both sites were inspected prior to permit issuance and correct permits were issued • **One half point:** one of the two sites was inspected prior to permit issuance and correct permit was issued • **No point**: neither site was inspected, or permits were not issued at all or at least one incorrect permit was issued	☐ No	☐ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

Files Reviewed:

1. [Enter Text Here]
2. [Enter Text Here]

Reviewer Comments:

Not applicable. There was no permits to process in 2024 in Steele county.

Complaint Response Section (☐ NA)

If the County received no complaints, mark "NA" for this section.

16.	Did the County maintain a complaint log in accordance with the Delegation Agreement Work Plan? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** complete complaint log is maintained • **One half point:** some complaint log information is maintained • **No point:** a complaint log is not maintained *The complaint log should include:* *a. Type of complaint;* *b. Location of complaint;* *c. Date and time complaint was made;* *d. Facts and circumstances related to the complaint; and* *e. A statement describing the resolution of the complaint*	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

Reviewer Comments:

Dave maintains a detailed complaint log with results of the complaint.

[Enter Text Here]

Owner Assistance

17.	Did the County follow their Delegation Agreement Work Plan Owner Assistance Strategy? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point** – County followed owner assistance strategy • **No point** – County did not follow owner assistance strategy	☐ No	☒ 1 pt

Reviewer Comments:

Dave does a great job following the Delegation agreement work plan for owner assistance.

Staffing Level/Air Quality Exemption/Web Site Posting Requirement Section

18.	Did the County earn the required 18 continuing education units (CEUs) of training? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point**: 18 or more CEUs earned. • **One half point: 9-17.99 CEUs earned.** • **No point: Less than 9 CEUs earned.**	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt ☐ 0 pt
19.	Did the County maintain an air quality exemption log in accordance with the Delegation Agreement Work Plan? (☐ NA for no notifications received) **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** complete air quality exemption log is maintained. • **One half point:** some air quality exemption log information is maintained. • **No point:** air quality exemption log is not maintained. *The log should include:* *a. Names of the owners/legal facility name;*	☐ No	☒ 1 pt ☐ ½ pt

	b. Location of the facility (county, township, section, quarter); *c. Facility permit number; and* *d. Start date and number of days to removal*		
20.	Did the County post their 2023 Annual CFO Report and MPCA Financial Report on their website by July 1, 2024? **Scoring Criteria:** • **One point:** information is posted. • **No point:** information is not posted.	☐ No	☒ 1 pt

Reviewer Comments:

Dave maintains a log of air quality exemptions and enters them in TEMPO as well.

Financial Report (No points awarded for this section.)

Does the financial report show how much grant money the County received and spent? ☐ No ☒ YES

Does the financial report show that the County spent the total match amount? ☐ No ☒ YES

Record Keeping (No points awarded for this section.)

Do all the compliance inspection files reviewed have a copy or photo of a representative sample of manure application records for sites ≥300 AU? ☐ No ☒ YES ☐ NA

Uploading Documentation (No points awarded for this section.)

- Did the County upload the registration documentation (form, letter and if a permit reflects a change in registration information, then complete permit materials [application, MMP, LMSA plans, permit, cover letter, review checklists, etc.]) into Tempo for both files reviewed? ☐ No ☒ Yes ☐ NA
- Did the County upload all inspection documentation (checklist, letter, photos, nitrogen and phosphorus worksheets, etc.) into Tempo for the four files reviewed? ☐ No ☒ Yes
- Did the County upload all permit application materials (application, MMP, LMSA plans, permit, cover letter, review checklists, etc.) into Tempo for the two files reviewed? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☒ NA

If the County uploaded documentation, award the appropriate number of performance credits on CFO Annual Report (*refer to Tempo Data Entry section of the CFO Annual Report*) as indicated below.

Registration:	2
Inspection:	2
Permit:	0

All registration files have **all** documentation uploaded into Tempo:

# of Feedlots	Performance Credit
0 - 200	2
201 - 400	4
401 - 600	6
601 - 800	8
801 – 1000	10
1001 - +	12

All four inspection files have **all** documentation uploaded into Tempo:

# of Feedlots	Performance Credit
0 - 200	2
201 - 400	4
401 - 600	6
601 - 800	8
801 – 1000	10
1001 - +	12

Both permit files have **all** documentation uploaded into Tempo:

# of Feedlots	Performance Credit
0 - 200	4
201 - 400	8
401 - 600	12
601 - 800	16
801 – 1000	20
1001 - +	24

Tempo Data Entry – Additional Performance Credits

Award the County 4 Performance Credits (PCs) if 90% of ALL inspection data was entered into Tempo within 60 days of the inspection. The Tableau Inspection Entry Timeliness report should be used to determine if the County should be awarded the additional 4 PCs.

☒ Yes – 4 additional PCs ☐ No

Manure Application Records Part of Inspection File – Additional Performance Credits

Award the County 4 Performance Credits (PCs) if ALL applicable inspection files contain a copy of manure application records for sites ≥ 100AU.

☒ Yes – 4 additional PCs ☐ No

Year-End Review Notes of Discussion

Good Job this Year! Keep up the excellent work.

Signatures

By signing below, I acknowledge that I participated in the year-end review process. I understand that my signature does not necessarily reflect my approval of the final results.

County Feedlot Officer:

Signature: Dave Stenzel
(This document has been electronically signed.)

Title: CFO

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/09/2025

MPCA Reviewer:

Signature: Isaac Johnson
(This document has been electronically signed.)

Title: Environmental Specialist

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/04/2025