FORM TI-1 CASE RESOLUT	FION					
Case Status as of 09/16/2002	Open	_X_ Closed				
RCODE: 654						
Region: RIV						
OLD - Complete Name, Address, Contact, Phone Number: San Francisco Chemical Company Leefe, WY						
NEW - Complete Name, Address, Contact, Phone Number: Stauffer Chemical Company (Leefe, Wyoming Plant) address, contact: NA						
Agreement State Licensee? (Double Check) unknown	Yes	No				
Moved to an Agreement State? NA	Yes	No				
Describe Follow-up: (Telephone, Internet, Chamber of Commerce, Other) Internet: EPA Superfund website. Listed as EPA ID no. WY-000000240. Inspection: 08/2002 - found large site devoid of major structures. Site was fenced off with emergency contact number posted - number was bogus. Contact: Pat White, ASRC Contractor ((303) 312-6680), US EPA Region VIII. Ms. White sent hundreds of pages of documentation regarding the Leefe site. See below.						
Describe Communication with Registration Vendor: Called Aptec-NRC 1/2002 - said they would research but did not return followup calls.						
Vendor Follow-up Action: None.						
Final Action Taken: Update RIV database, notify NRC GL Project Manager.						

F

Cause of Bad Address/Lesson Learned:

The San Francisco Chemical Company originally leased the Leefe site in 1956. The site encompassed 1650 acres and was located near the junction of US 30 N and US 89, near the town of Sage. Open pit mining of phosphorous began in 1959. In 1963, SF Chemical Company was bought by Stauffer Chemical. In 1976, mining activity ceased at the site though the plant continued to process and ship ore at that time. The plant operated until 1986 and reclamation measures were begun. Documentation from EPA Region VIII states that mining and milling equipment at the site was sold for scrap. In 1987, Stauffer underwent a series of mergers and the Leefe site was transferred to ICI Americas. The title was subsequently transferred to Atkmix Thirty-seven, Inc. The EPA began accessing the site in what appears to be 1988. At that time, a complete review of the site was performed, including a radiological analysis (there was concern over U-238 in tailings). The radiological analysis included taking dozens of samples as well as surveying the site with a sodium iodide scintillation detector and a micro-R type meter. The survey covered all three mine pits, the tailings area, as well as the plant and buildings areas. After reviewing hundreds of pages of EPA documentation, there is no evidence to suggest that the gauges were located during radiologic surveys. Likewise, there is no evidence to confirm that the gauges were sold as scrap when the mining equipment was dismantled. Without any evidence or documentation from Aptec regarding disposition, we cannot determine the fate of the gauges. We speculate that the gauges were not on the property when the EPA did their surveys; therefore the gauges were likely disposed of before 1988.

Page ___1_ of __1__

FORM TI-2 DEVICE INFORMATION

RCC	RCODE: 654							
ID	Model Number ¹	Serial Number	Isotope	Activity mCi	Sold Date	Vendor	Status (A² or N³)	Comments
1.	SH-301	unknown	Cs-137	50	1969	Aptec-NRC, Inc.	N	Documentation from EPA Region VIII states that mining and milling
2.	SH-301	unknown	Cs-137	50	1969	Aptec-NRC, Inc.	N	equipment at the site was sold for scrap. In 1988, the EPA began
3.	SH-301	unknown	Cs-137	50	1969	Aptec-NRC, Inc.	N	accessing the site, including radiological survey. Gauges not located during survey. Likely disposed of pre-1988.
For a	For additional GLD's received by the licensee identified during the inspection: NA							
ID	Model Number	Serial Number	Isotope	Activity	Sold Date	Vendor	How obtained	Comments

¹Include only registerable gauges identified by Headquarters as "open" cases.

²Accounted for: A device is accounted for if (1) the device is located at the licensee's facility, (2) it has been verified that the device has been transferred to an authorized recipient or properly disposed, or (3) a reasonable assurance has been provided that the device has been transferred to an authorize recipient or properly disposed.

³Not Accounted for: A device is not accounted for if the location of the device is unknown and/or the licensee cannot provide a reasonable assurance that the device has been transferred to an authorized recipient for proper disposal.

	FORM TI-3 GENERAL LICENSEE INSPECTION DOCUMENTATION							
RCC	DE: 654							
Gen	eral Licensee Information:							
	Check Box if Current Complete Name, Mailing Address, Contact, and Phone Number is Same as Provided by ORNL. If not, include correct information below:							
	Stauffer Chemical Company (Leefe, Wyoming Plant) address, contact: NA							
Resi	ults of inspection: (check the appropriate boxes)							
	The general licensee of record is located at the address of record and							
	all GLD are accounted for							
	not all GLD are accounted for							
	The general licensee of record is <u>not</u> located at the address of record, however GLD are being used under new ownership at the address of record and							
	all GLD are accounted for							
	not all GLD are accounted for							
	The general licensee of record is <u>not</u> located at the address of record, however they are using GLD at another location and							
	all GLD are accounted for							
	not all GLD are accounted for;							
	Neither the general licensee of record nor the facility operated by the general licensee are located at the address of record and the site has been abandoned or is being used for an alternate purpose.							
X	Other: (explain) Site inspected 08/2002 and found to have no major structures. Site was listed on the EPA Superfund web site. Followup with EPA Region VIII indicated that the plant was dismantled at closed by 1988.							
Gau	ge Information:							
ID:	For each gauge for which status is unaccounted for (see last column of Form TI-2), provide any conclusions about location of the gauge:							
1, 2, an d 3	There is no documentation to suggest that the gauges were located during EPA's radiologic survey conducted in 1988. There is no documentation to indicate that the gauges were sold as scrap when the mining operations were dismantled. Without any evidence or documentation from Aptec regarding disposition, we can likely conclude that the gauges were not on the property when the EP did their surveys; therefore the gauges were likely disposed of before 1988 (either properly by return to vendor or sold as scrap).							

Inspectors:

Janine F. Katanic, Health Physicist, Region IV Robert A. Brown, Senior Health Physicist, Region IV

Charles L. Cain, Acting Chief, Nuclear Materials Inspection Branch, Region IV Approved by: