0 0 0 0 Advised to take 3 tubes in all future surveys including inspection visit of photostats & letter.

Waukegan
February 24, 1966

C. L. Sheckler - CHQ

cc:
J. D. Anderson
File 1-14-3

RESAMPLED MARRERO PIPE STATIONS
10/18/65 THROUGH 10/21/65

Attached are copies of Marrero Transite Pipe dust stations permanent record pages. On 10/21/65 C. W. Hite, Jr. requested that when these resample results were completed, that the permanent record sheets be returned directly to J. W. Miles. We have made copies of these permanent record sheets for your information.

Samples were taken on each side of the Willows, and behind them on different days. In summary, 16 samples were taken at 8 locations in the wet end. Five samples gave results which exceeded the MAC. Four of these 5 samples were taken in locations which were previously not defined as permanent station locations. While these samples were being obtained, the negative pressure system was being installed in the Willow area. Workmen were installing the new system, both overhead and at floor level during some of the samples. To what degree this work affected the sample results is unknown, but it is felt this activity affected the sample results to some degree.

The following lists the locations which exceeded the MAC:

Date	Station No.	Station Description	Sample Results Dust	Fiber
10/21/65	TP-1B	Between #2 Willow and wall.	6.0	0.0
10/21/65	TP-2B	Between #1 Willow and wall.	6.5	0.2
10/19/65	TP-40*	Left side #3 Willow.	6.0	0.2
10/19/65	TP-40A	Right side #3 Willow.	5.3	0.4
10/20/65	TP-40A	Right side #3 Willow.	5.4	0.3

*Only TP-40 had been defined as a permanent station previously.

Humidity readings were also taken during these samples and are recorded on the permanent record pages. There does not seem to be significant correlation between humidity and dust sample results from these particular samples.

PRIVILEGED

GP

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11530/1

These sample results, in a sense, distort us because the visible conditions at the wet end were quite dusty throughout this sampling period. Of the 16 samples collected here, 11 gave results below the MAC. As you know from your visits to this operation, the visible conditions and 11 sample results out of 16 samples taken do not seem consistent.

The question of temperature and humidity was raised in a letter to the United States Public Health Service last summer, and a copy of the letter is attached. Frankly, at Marrero, we would like to go to using all water in our sampling or to using hemocytometer cells in counting their samples. We understand that the purpose of the alcohol is to inhibit bacteral formation. If it is necessary to add a bacterial inhibiter to our sampling solution, is there something other than alcohol which can be used which will have the same viscosity so that the dust particles will settle?

We have been told that in dust counting for certain granite operations, the hemocytometer is used. Do you have any knowledge of how dust counts correlate between Dunn cells and the hemocytometer cells?

It is realized that these are difficult questions. Our purpose in raising them is to reconcile the visible conditions at Marrero with dust count results. Any information you can give us on this problem will be appreciated.

J. M. Cecere

Prepared by J. W. Szczygielski

PRIVILEGED
J-M 83

GP

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11530/2