

ANALYST WORK SHEET		1. PRODUCT <i>Talcum powder</i>		2. SAMPLE NUMBER <i>#1</i>	
3. SEALS ☐ INTACT ☐ BROKEN ☐ NONE		4. DATE RECD	5. RECEIVED FROM <i>A. Schultze</i>		6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE <i>1% Chrysotile on Talc. Collaborative study of microscopic method of identification of asbestos in Talc, #</i>					
8. NET CON- TENTS ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐ NOT DETERMINED ☐ UNITS EXAMINED		☐ DECLARED AMOUNT FOUND % OF DECLARED		9. LABEL- ING ☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED ☐ COPIES SUBMITTED ☐ NONE	
10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS <i>1. Chrysotile - 800 fibers/mg 2. Tremolite - none observed 3. Talc > 95% 4. Carbonate 2% 5. Qtz 1% 6. Hematite Trace 7. Chlorite none observed.</i> <i>% by best vol estimate</i>					
11. RESERVE SAMPLE					
12. DATE REPORTED <i>24 May 74</i>		13a. ANALYST(s) NAME <i>John W. Hunt</i>		13b. NUMBER	13c. PC
					14. CALCULA- TIONS CHECKED
					a. BY b. DATE
15. PROGRAM DATA					
OPERATION		ACTIVITY		METHOD (Check no more than two)	
☐		☐		(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICROSCOPIC	
☐		☐		(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM	
☐		☐		(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) ☐ ORGAN	
☐		☐		(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L) ☐ BIO	
1. PMS NO.		PROBLEM		HIA/DCC NO.	
2.					
3.					

ANALYST WORK SHEET

3. SEALS ☐ BROKEN ☐ INTACT ☐ NONE		4. DATE RECD	5. RECEIVED FROM Talc Prod A. Schulze	6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION # 2
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE 0.1% Tremolite in Talc Collaborative study of Microscopic method of identification of asbestos in				
8. NET CON- TENTS	☐ NOT APPLICABLE	☐ DECLARED	9. LABEL- ING	☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED
	☐ NOT DETERMINED	AMOUNT FOUND		☐ COPIES SUBMITT
	☐ UNITS EXAMINED	% OF DECLARED		☐ NONE

10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

1. Tremolite - 3000 fibers/mg
- 2 Talc 795%
- 3 Carbonate <1%
- 4 Qtz <1%
- 5 Hematite Trace
- 6 Chlorite none observed
- 7 Chrysotile " "

11. RESERVE SAMPLE

12. DATE REPORTED 28 May 74	13a. ANALYST(S) NAME John W. Stewart	13b. NUMBER	13c. PC	14. CALCULA- TIONS CHECKED	a. BY
				b. DATE	

15. PROGRAM DATA		OPERATION	ACTIVITY	METHOD (Check no more than two)	
PMS NO.	PROBLEM	HIA/DCC NO.	NO. OF LOTS	HOURS	(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICROS
1.					(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM
2.					(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) ☐
3.					(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L)

ANALYST WORK SHEET

3. SEALS ☐ INTACT ☐ BROKEN ☐ NONE 4. DATE RECD 5. RECEIVED FROM 6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION

7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Talcum Powder
Collaborative Study

8. NET
CON-
TENTS

☐ NOT APPLICABLE
☐ NOT DETERMINED
☐ UNITS EXAMINED

☐ DECLARED
AMOUNT FOUND
% OF DECLARED

9. LABEL-
ING

☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED
☐ COPIES SUBMITTED
☐ NONE

10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

1 Talc 50-60%
2 carbonate 40-50%
3 Qtz none observed
4 Hematite Trace
5 Chlorite none observed
6 Chrysotile "
7 Tremolite 5000 lbs/ing

11. RESERVE SAMPLE

12. DATE
REPORTED

29 May 74

13a. ANALYST(S) NAME

John W. Stuart

13b. NUMBER

13c. PC

14. CALCULA-
TIONS
CHECKED

a. BY

b. DATE

15. PROGRAM DATA

OPERATION

ACTIVITY

METHOD (Check no more than two)

(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICROS(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) ☐(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L)

PMS NO.

PROBLEM

HIA/DCC NO.

NO.
OF
LOTS

HOURS

1.

2.

3.

ANALYST WORK SHEET

1. PRODUCT

Talcum Powder

#4

3. SEALS

☐ INTACT

4. DATE RECD

5. RECEIVED FROM

6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION

☐ BROKEN☐ NONE

H. Schu/ze

7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Talcum U.S.P.
Collaborative Study8. NET
CON-
TENTS☐ NOT APPLICABLE☐ NOT DETERMINED☐ UNITS EXAMINED☐ DECLARED

AMOUNT FOUND

% OF DECLARED

9. LABEL-
ING☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED☐ COPIES SUBMIT☐ NONE

10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

1. Talc 795%
2. Carbonate none observed
3. Qtz " "
4. Hematite " "
5. Chlorite " "
6. Chrysotile " "
7. Tremolite " "
8. isotropic material (?) < 1%

11. RESERVE SAMPLE

12. DATE
REPORTED

30 Nov 74

13a. ANALYST(s) NAME

John W. Stuart

13b. NUMBER

13c. PC

14. CALCULA-
TIONS
CHECKED

a. BY

b. DATE

15. PROGRAM DATA

OPERATION

ACTIVITY

METHOD (Check no more than two)

(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICROS(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) ☐(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L)

PMS NO.

PROBLEM

HIA/DCC NO.

NO.
OF
LOTS

HOURS

1.

2.

3.

Activities Report
for Month of June 74

1. The following have been taken from
samples were examined by light
microscopy for amount in field
After Aug. 1 #3 149, 152, 154, 151, 153, 155
156, 157A, 158, 159, 160 and 165. From
of North Carolina were taken from
and other counts made as follows:
applicable. The following methods
"after analysis were used."

2. The DTH has been reported as
the most complete in this sample
and are given as follows:
beefsmen (100%).

3. West bank analysis of the
with surface and
DTH satisfactory if practice is
appreciated.

15. 11. 74

ANALYST WORK SHEET		1. PRODUCT <i>Toxic Powder</i>		2. SAMPLE NUMBER	
3. SEALS ☒ INTACT ☐ BROKEN ☐ NONE		4. DATE RECD		5. RECEIVED FROM	
6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION					
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE <i>White Powder, Black & White, Toxic # 682</i>					
8. NET CON- TENTS ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐ NOT DETERMINED ☐ UNITS EXAMINED		DECLARED/UNIT _____ AMOUNT FOUND _____ % OF DECLARED _____		9. LABEL- ING ☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED ☐ _____ COPIES SUBMITTED ☐ NONE	
10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS <i>1. Toxic 79.5% 2. no bacteria were observed 3. GTC with 4. Hemolysis Toxic 5. 3 more were observed 6. negative 7. Toxicity % by best id estimate</i>					
11. RESERVE SAMPLE					
12. DATE REPORTED <i>2-2-73</i>		13a. ANALYST(s) NAME <i>John R. Stewart</i>		13b. NUMBER	
				13c. PC	
				14. METHOD/ CACULA- TION CHECK	
				15. BY	
				b. DATE	
15. PROGRAM DATA					
OPERATION		ACTIVITY		METHOD (Check no more than two)	
☐		☐		(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☐ MICROSCOPIC	
☐		☐		(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM	
☐		☐		(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) ☐ ORGAN	
☐		☐		(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L) ☐ BIO	
PMS NO.		PROBLEM		HIA/DCC NO.	
1.					
2.					
3.					

ANALYST WORK SHEET			1. PRODUCT <i>Toile Powder</i>		2. SAMPLE NUMBER		
3. SEALS ☒ INTACT ☐ BROKEN ☐ NONE		4. DATE RECD		5. RECEIVED FROM		6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION	
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE <i>Whitaker, Child + Daughter, Toile # 6</i>							
8. NET CONTENTS ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐ NOT DETERMINED ____ UNITS EXAMINED		DECLARED/UNIT _____ AMOUNT FOUND _____ % OF DECLARED _____		9. LABELING ☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED ☐ _____ COPIES SUBMITTED ☐ NONE			
10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS 1. Toile 79.5% 2. granulate none observed 3. GTE 2.1% 4. Hematite trace 5. Toile 1.1% observed 6. reactive 7. Tapalite 8. by best vol estimate							
11. RESERVE SAMPLE							
12. DATE REPORTED <i>2/1/5</i>		13a. ANALYST(s) NAME <i>John A. Stewart</i>		13b. NUMBER		13c. PC	
						14. METHOD/CALCULATION CHECK a. BY _____ b. DATE _____	
15. PROGRAM DATA							
OPERATION		ACTIVITY		METHOD (Check no more than two)			
PMS NO.		NO. OF LOTS		(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☐ MICRO			
PROBLEM		HIA/DCC NO.		(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM			
1.		1.		(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) [			
2.		2.		(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L			
3.		3.					

ANALYST WORK SHEET		<i>Talc Pwd.</i>			
3. SEALS ☐ INTACT ☒ BROKEN ☐ NONE		4. DATE RECD	5. RECEIVED FROM <i>A. Schulze</i>		6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE <i>Talc, Italian Stearin Talc M 53460</i> <i>fr All-Brite Trading Co., Metairie, La 7</i>					
8. NET CONTENTS	☐ NOT APPLICABLE	DECLARED/UNIT _____		9. LABELING	☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED
	☐ NOT DETERMINED	AMOUNT FOUND _____			☐ _____ COPIES SUBMITTED
	____ UNITS EXAMINED	% OF DECLARED _____			☐ NONE
10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS <i>1 Talc > 95%</i> <i>2 Carbonate ± 1%</i> <i>3 Qtz < 1%</i> <i>4 Hematite - Trace</i> <i>5 Silica none observed</i> <i>6 2/1450 Lbs</i> <i>7 Hematite</i>					
11. RESERVE SAMPLE					
12. DATE REPORTED <i>3/5/67</i>		13a. ANALYST(S) NAME <i>T. A. Schulze</i>		13b. NUMBER	13c. PC
					14. METHOD/CALCULATION CHECK a. BY _____ b. DATE _____
15. PROGRAM DATA					
OPERATION		ACTIVITY		METHOD (Check no more than two)	
PMS NO.	PROBLEM	H/A/DCC NO.	NO. OF LOTS	HOURS	(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICRO
1.					(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM
2.					(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) [
3.					(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L)

ANALYST WORK SHEET

Talcum Powder

3. SEALS ☐ BROKEN ☒ INTACT ☐ NONE	4. DATE RECD Feb 74	5. RECEIVED FROM Wm Eisenberg	6. DISTRICT OR DIVIS
7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE Peoples Baby Powder. purchased fr. Ste Sample #11 given to Bob Rolfe of J+J CTFA analysis (Round Robin)			
8. NET CON- TENTS ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐ NOT DETERMINED ☐ UNITS EXAMINED	DECLARED/UNIT _____ AMOUNT FOUND _____ % OF DECLARED _____		9. LABEL- ING ☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED ☐ _____ COPIES SUBMI ☐ NONE

10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

1. Talc 90%
2. Carbonate 5-10%
3. Hematite <1%
4. Qtz 1-5%
5. Chlorite none observed
6. Chrysotile " "
7. Tremolite " "
8. x/s of $n_x > 1.59$ material. gr.
along Hexagonal lines (epitaxial
on Talc plates

11. RESERVE SAMPLE

12. DATE REPORTED 31 July 74	13a. ANALYST(s) NAME John W. Stewart	13b. NUMBER	13c. PC	14. METHOD/ CALCULA- TION CHECK	a. BY b. DATE
------------------------------------	---	-------------	---------	--	------------------

15. PROGRAM DATA		OPERATION ☐		ACTIVITY ☐		METHOD (Check no more than two)	
PMS NO.	PROBLEM	HIA/DCC NO.	NO. OF LOTS	HOURS	(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICRO:	(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM	(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) [
1.					(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L,		
2.							
3.							

ANALYST WORK SHEET

1. PRODUCT

Talc Pwd.

3. SEALS

☐ INTACT

4. DATE RECD

5. RECEIVED FROM

6. DISTRICT OR DIVISION

☒ BROKEN☐ NONE

7. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

USP Talc, Fisher Cat # T-4

8.

NET
CON-
TENTS☐ NOT APPLICABLE☐ NOT DETERMINED

UNITS EXAMINED

DECLARED/UNIT

AMOUNT FOUND

% OF DECLARED

9.

LABEL-
ING☐ ORIGINAL(S) SUBMITTED☐ COPIES SUBMITTED☐ NONE

10. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

1. Talc ~ 95%
2. Carbonate 1-5%
3. Qtz < 1%
4. Hematite none observed
5. Chlorite " "
6. Chrysotile " "
7. Tremolite " "

11. RESERVE SAMPLE

12. DATE
REPORTED

31 July 74

13a. ANALYST(a) NAME

John W. Stuart

13b. NUMBER

13c. PC

14. METHOD/
CALCULA-
TION
CHECK

a. BY

b. DATE

15. PROGRAM DATA

OPERATION

ACTIVITY

METHOD (Check no more than two)

(A) ☐ MACROSCOPIC (M) ☒ MICRO:(X) ☐ X-RAY (F) ☐ FIELD EXAM(P) ☐ PHY EXAM (B) ☐ BACT (O) [(C) ☐ CHEM (N) ☐ W/O ANAL (L)

PMS NO.

PROBLEM

HIA/DCC NO.

NO.
OF
LOTS

HOURS

1.

2.

3.