



## INDIANA DEPARTMENT of ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

100 N. Senate Avenue • Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(800) 451-6027 • (317) 232-8603 • Fax (317) 233-6647 • [www.idem.IN.gov](http://www.idem.IN.gov)

**Mike Braun**  
Governor

**Clint Woods**  
Commissioner

December 19, 2025

Via Email to: [khouston@responsibleenergy.com](mailto:khouston@responsibleenergy.com)  
Mr. Kevin Houston, Vice President of Engineering  
Responsible Energy Operations, LLC  
625 N. 9th St.  
Petersburg, Indiana 47567

Dear Mr. Houston:

Re: Inspection Summary Letter  
Responsible Energy Operations, LLC,  
Wheatland Railyard  
NPDES Permit No. IN0058742  
Wheatland, Knox County

An inspection of the above-referenced facility or location was conducted by a representative of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Office of Water Quality, pursuant to IC 13-18-3-9. A summary of the inspection is provided below:

Date(s) of Inspection: December 18, 2025  
Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection  
Inspection Results: Conditions evaluated were found to be satisfactory at the time of the inspection.

A copy of the NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report is enclosed for your records. Please direct any response to this letter and any questions to Holly Zurcher at 317-954-8028 or by email to [hzurcher@idem.IN.gov](mailto:hzurcher@idem.IN.gov).

Sincerely,

Kim Rohr, Chief  
Wastewater Inspection Section  
Office of Water Quality

Enclosure



# NPDES Industrial Facility Inspection Report

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

NPDES Permit Number: <b>IN0058742</b>	Facility Type: Industrial	Facility Classification: Minor	TEMPO AI ID A-SO
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------

Date(s) of Inspection: December 18, 2025

Type of Inspection: Compliance Evaluation Inspection

Name and Location of Facility Inspected: <b>Responsible Energy Operations, LLC, Wheatland Railyard</b> 21 N. Nimmicht Rd. Wheatland IN 47557 Knox	County: Knox	Receiving Waters/POTW: Steen Ditch	Permit Expiration Date: 6/30/2026
		Design Flow: NA	

On Site Representative(s):			
First Name	Last Name	Title	Email
Korre	Ubelhor	Reclamation Manager	kubelhor@responsibleenergy.com
			Phone: 812-631-3756

Was a verbal summary of the inspection given to the on-site rep? **Yes**

Certified Operator: Job Wilson	Number: 18636	Class: A-SO	Effective Date: 7-1-24	Expiration Date: 6-30-27	Email: jwilson@rosedaleservices.com
-----------------------------------	------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Cyber Security Contact  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Responsible Official: Mr. Kevin Houston, Vice President of Engineering 625 N. 9th St. Petersburg, Indiana 47567	Permittee: Responsible Energy Operations, LLC Email: khouston@responsibleenergy.com Phone: _____ Fax: _____	Contacted? No
--	--	------------------

### INSPECTION FINDINGS

- Conditions evaluated were found to be satisfactory at the time of the inspection. (5)
- Violations were discovered but corrected during the inspection. (4)
- Potential problems were discovered or observed. (3)
- Violations were discovered and require a submittal from you and/or a follow-up inspection by IDEM. (2)
- Violations were discovered and may subject you to an appropriate enforcement response. (1)

### AREAS EVALUATED DURING INSPECTION

(S = Satisfactory, M = Marginal, U = Unsatisfactory, N = Not Evaluated)

S	Receiving Waters	S	Facility/Site	S	Self-Monitoring	N	Enforcement
N	Effluent/Discharge	S	Operation	S	Flow Measurement		
S	Permit	S	Maintenance	S	Laboratory	S	Effluent Limits Compliance
S	Stormwater	N	Sludge	S	Records/Reports	N	Other:

### DETAILED AREA EVALUATIONS

#### Receiving Waters:

S 1. The receiving stream was visibly free of excessive deposits of settled solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.

Comments:

The receiving stream was free of notable foam, algae or solids.

#### Effluent/Discharge:

N 1. Final effluent was essentially free of excessive solids, floating debris, oil, scum, or billowy foam.

N 2. Pretreatment discharge into sanitary sewers appeared free of excessive oils, grease, solids, or foam and did not appear to be in violation of the local Sewer Use Ordinance.

N 3. Pretreatment discharge into sanitary sewers did not contain materials that pass through or interfere with the operation of the POTW.

Comments:

The facility was not discharging at the time of the inspection.

Permit:

- S 1. Did the facility have a copy of the current permit available for reference.
- N 2. If the permit expires within 180 days, has a renewal application been submitted?
- S 3. Receiving waters are accurately described in the permit.
- N 4. The permit has been properly transferred if there is a new owner.
- N 5. The NPDES Permit Schedule of Compliance monitoring and reporting milestones have been met.

Comments:

The facility has a valid permit.

---

**Stormwater:**

- S 1. The SWPPP was reviewed/updated as required by the permit.
- S 2. Required quarterly and/or annual stormwater inspections have been conducted.
- S 3. Documentation of inspections and annual report is complete and the annual report was submitted to IDEM.
- S 4. Overall housekeeping and implementation of Best Management Practices was adequate.

Comments:

The facility has a SWPPP and adequately conducts and documents the required quarterly inspections.

---

**Facility/Site:**

- N 1. The facility was found to have standby power or equivalent provision, If required.
- N 2. An adequate alarm or notification system for power or equipment failure was available for the treatment facility.
- S 3. Safe and adequate access was provided for inspection of all treatment units and outfalls.
- S 4. Facilities and equipment did not appear beyond their useful life.
- 5. List any safety concerns noted during the inspection in the box below:

Comments:

The settling pond does not require backup power or alarms.

---

**Operation:**

- S 1. All facilities and systems necessary for achieving compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit were operated efficiently, including an anticipated bypass report for steps of treatment taken out of service.
- S 2. An adequate, qualified operating staff was found to be provided to carry out the operation of the facility, including:
  - a. Certified Operator's on-site attendance and/or qualified operations personnel attendance was adequate.
  - b. Adequate documentation of operational activities, including system monitoring and cleaning.
  - c. Adequate funding to ensure proper operation.
- N 3. Solids handling procedures were adequate.
- N 4. Documentation of solids removal, handling, and disposal was adequate.

Comments:

The settling pond appears to be operated efficiently.

---

**Maintenance:**

- N 1. A maintenance record system has been established and includes maintenance/repair history and preventative maintenance plan.
- S 2. Facility maintenance activities appeared adequate.

Comments:

Pond maintenance appears adequate.

---

**Sludge:**

- N 1. Sludges, screenings, and slurries were found to be handled and disposed of properly.

Comments:

No solids were removed during the review period.

---

**Self-Monitoring:**

- S 1. Samples were found to be taken at pre-designated locations and were found to be representative.
- S 2. Flow-proportioned samples were found to be obtained where needed.
- S 3. The facility was found to conduct sampling of all waste streams, including type and frequency, as required in the permit.
- S 4. Sample collection procedures, including automatic sampling, include:
  - a. Samples refrigerated during compositing.
  - b. Proper preservation techniques used.
  - c. Containers and holding times conform to 40 CFR 136.3.
- S 5. Sample documentation was adequate and includes:
  - a. Dates, times, and locations of sampling.
  - b. Name of individual performing sampling.
  - c. Instantaneous flow for flow-weighted aliquots.

d. Chain of Custody records.

N 6. NPDES Permit Total Toxic Organic (TTO) requirements were being met.

N 7. NPDES Permit Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing requirements were being met.

Comments:

The Self Monitoring Program was rated as satisfactory. All sampling practices are conducted accurately and at the frequency required by the permit. The contract operator also documents sampling attempts when "no flow" is reported.

**Flow Measurement:**

S 1. Flow was found to be properly monitored as required by the permit.

S 2. Flow data and calibration records were available for review, and document that monitoring equipment has been calibrated at the frequency required in the permit.

Comments:

The facility's flow measurement program, including all documentation, is adequate and representative. Flow is estimated using area/velocity calculations.

**Laboratory:**

The following laboratory records were reviewed:

Chain-of-Custody                      Contract Lab Reports                      Flow Proportion Data

N 1. The laboratory practices and protocol reviewed were adequate, including:

- a. A written laboratory QA/QC manual was available.
- b. Samples were found to be properly stored.
- c. Approved analytical methods were used.
- d. Calibration and maintenance of instruments was adequate.
- e. QA/QC procedures were adequate.
- f. Dates of analyses (and times, where required) were recorded.
- g. Name of person performing analyses was recorded.

S 2. Review of lab records and/or on-site field testing equipment and protocols was found to be adequate.

**Contract Lab Information**

RSI Laboratory

Henderson, Kentucky

Comments:

The documents reviewed during the inspection appeared to be accurate and complete.

**Records/Reports:**

The following records/reports were reviewed:

DMRs for the period of December 2024 to November 2025 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

S 1. All facility records for the period including the previous three years were available for review.

S 2. DMRs and MMRs were completed properly and accurately including:

- a. "No Ex" column was accurate.
- b. Signatory requirements were met.
- c. Reports were prepared by or under the direction of a certified operator.

N 3. Bypass and Noncompliance reporting are adequate.

Comments:

The requested records were available and appear complete and accurate.

**Enforcement:**

N 1. Agreed Order compliance milestones have been met.

Comments:

There was no Agreed Order at the time of the inspection.

**Effluent Limits Compliance:**

Yes 1. Were DMRs reviewed as part of the inspection?

DMRs for the period of December 2024 to November 2025 were reviewed as part of the inspection.

No 2. Were violations noted during the review of DMRs?

Comments:

There were no reported effluent limit exceedances during the review period.

**IDEM REPRESENTATIVE**

Inspector Name:

Email:

Phone Number:

Holly Zurcher

hzurcher@idem.IN.gov

317-954-8028

**IDEM MANAGER REVIEW**

IDEM Manager:

Date:

Andy Schmidt

12/19/2025