NRC FORM 591M PART 1 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION							
10 CFR 2.201 SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION							
1. LICENSEE/LOCATIO	DN INSPECTED:		2. NRC/REGIONA	AL OFFICE			
Sigma-Aldrich Company			Region III				
11542 Fort Mims St. Louis, Misson			U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210				
St. Louis, 14115500	111 05 140		Lisle, IL 60532-4352				
REPORT NUMBER	s) 03010716/2014001						
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S	3)	4. LICENSE NUMBER	R(S) 5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTIO		OF INSPECTION		
030-10716		24-16273-01	01		4/21/2014-7/7/2014 (in-offic		in-office)
LICENSEE: The inspection was a	n examination of the activities conduct	ed under your license	e as they relate t	o radiation safe	ety and to c	ompliance with	the Nuclear
Regulatory Commiss procedures and repre	ion (NRC) rules and regulations and th esentative records, interviews with pers	e conditions of your l connel, and observati	icense. The insponse by the inspe	ctor. The inspection	ed of select ection findir	tive examination ngs are as follow	s of /s:
✓ 1. Based on	the inspection findings, no violations v	vere identified.		•.			
2. Previous	violation(s) closed.						
non-repe	3. The violations(s), specifically described to you by the inspector as non-cited violations, are not being cited because they were self-identified, non-repetitive, and corrective action was or is being taken, and the remaining criteria in the NRC Enforcement Policy, to exercise discretion, were satisfied.						
	Non-cited violation(s) were discuss	ed involving the follo	wing requiremer	nt(s):			
<ul> <li>During this inspection, certain of your activities, as described below and/or attached, were in violation of NRC requirements and are being cited in accordance with NRC Enforcement Policy. This form is a NOTICE OF VIOLATION, which may be subject to posting in accordance with 10 CFR 19.11.</li> <li>(Violations and Corrective Actions)</li> </ul>							
	·						
	Sta	tement of Correc	ctive Actions				
I hereby state that, within 30 days, the actions described by me to the Inspector will be taken to correct the violations identified. This statement of corrective actions is made in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201 (corrective steps already taken, corrective steps which will be taken, date when full compliance will be achieved). I understand that no further written response to NRC will be required, unless specifically requested.							
TITLE	PRINTED NAME			SIGNATURE			DATE
LICENSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE							
NRC INSPECTOR	Navid Tehrani		NC	N	-		<b>\$</b> /17/14
BRANCH CHIEF	Robert Orlikowski		Wayne	Ald.	for Or	likowski	7/m/14
NRC FORM 591M PART	1 (07-2012)		U				

NRC	FORM	591M	PART 1	(07-2012)	5

NRC FORM 591M PART 3			U.S. NI	JCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	
(07-2012) 10 CFR 2.201	07-2012) Docket File Information				
SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION					
1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPEC	TED:		2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE		
Sigma-Aldrich Company	v		Region III		
11542 Fort Mims Drive			U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission		
St. Louis, Missouri 6314	46		2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210		
			Lisle, IL 60532-435	52	
REPORT NUMBER(S) 0301	0716/2014001				
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)		4. LICENSE NUMBER(	S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION	
030-10716		24-16273-01		4/21/2014-7/7/2014 (in-office)	
6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED		7. INSPECTION FOCU	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS		
87104		Security and Con	Security and Control of Contaminated Material		
	SUPP	LEMENTAL INSPECT	ION INFORMATION		
1. PROGRAM CODE(S)	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTAC	т	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER	
3900	D	Thomas K Spend	cer (RSO)	(314) 286-7686	
✓ Main Office Inspection		Next Inspection	1 Date:		
Field Office Inspe	ection				
Temporary Job S	Site Inspection				
		PROGRAM S	COPE		
				11542 Fort Mims Drive, St. mpounds with C-14 and H-3	

Louis, Missouri. Sigma did research and development, and radiolabeled synthesis of compounds with C-14 and H-3, until they ceased production activities on September 30, 2008. Sigma contracted with an agreement state licensee, Philotechnics, to perform decommissioning activities as described in their Decommissioning Plan (DP) dated October 20, 2008. The first phase of the decommissioning was the remediation of the Fort Mims two-story building to make it suitable for unrestricted use, which was completed in July 2009. The second phase was the demolition of the building down to the concrete slab (completed in October 2009) and the removal of the slab (completed in May 2010). The third phase began in November 2009 and used soil borings to locate and characterize a former septic tank area. Residual soil contamination above previously approved DP limits was found. In February 2011, Sigma submitted a license amendment request to release the site for unrestricted use as supported by a December 2010 site-specific dose model. In June 2012, the NRC accepted for technical review the licensee's amendment request, after requesting and receiving additional information on the site-specific dose model. The NRC is currently reviewing the licensee's request to release the site for unrestricted use. The current Sigma license (Amendment No. 19) has an expiration date of April 30, 2013, but continues in effect per 10 CFR 30.36(c) until the license is terminated by the NRC. DDES describes in a memo dated February 12, 2014, that DDES has been contracted by Sigma-Aldrich to provide radiological oversight and clearance surveys of the parking lot removal.

## PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS

The inspector conducted on in-office inspection. During this inspection the inspector reviewed the following documents: Sigma-Aldrich Company Materials License (24-16273-01), the licensee's Decommissioning Plan (DP), a letter from DDES (licensee's decommissioning contractor) dated February 28, 2014, "Health Physics Support - Fort Mims Facility Parking Lot Removal," and a letter from Sigma-Aldrich dated April 9, 2014, Form Mims Parking Lot Removal, and a DDES procedure dated March 2010, "Unrestricted Release of Material: Procedure No:HP-MA-14 rev. 0."

The inspector verified that the asphalt removal release criteria (Regulatory Guide 1.86) was adequate and was in compliance with NRC requirements. The inspector did not identify any violations of NRC requirements.