

PUBLIC INPUT AT CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS - An opportunity for the public to address the Council on agenda items for which public hearings have not been held will be provided at the time the item is considered or during the Multiple Agenda Item Comment period. Members of the public who wish to speak on items shall be allowed to speak for up to one minute per item up to a total of three minutes per meeting. The Council has determined that a cumulative total of 20 minutes is a reasonable minimum amount of time for the Multiple Agenda Item segment of each regular meeting.

The Council will also provide an opportunity for the public to speak on public interest items. Each speaker shall be limited to one minute of general public comment each regular meeting for a cumulative total of ten (10) minutes. The Council shall not discuss or take action relative to any general public comment.

If you wish to provide documents to the full Council for consideration on an item, please present the Sergeant-At-Arms with 35 copies. Otherwise, your materials will simply be added to the official record.

Does everyone remember when AMP and Maersk got hacked almost 2 years ago to the day and was shut down 2017 June, 27th until July 1st of that year not just at Port of LA but across the world costing them over \$300 million in like lost production? Last time I checked man power and human power can not be hacked and who kept the cargo moving during the NotPetya Microsoft zero day exploit ransomware attack on MAERSK at Pier 400? Here's a little refresher for the memory.

latimes.com

Cyberattack cost Maersk as much as \$300 million and disrupted operations for 2 weeks

Jill Leovy

5-6 minutes

A June cyberattack that snarled shipping terminal operations worldwide — and briefly shut down the Port of Los Angeles' largest cargo terminal — has cost the Danish shipping giant A.P. Moller-Maersk \$200 million to \$300 million, the company said this week.

The unprecedented attack forced workers to improvise with Twitter, WhatsApp and Post-It notes as they struggled to get goods moving from ships to shore again, the company said.

The crisis put Maersk in uncharted territory. It responded as best it could, but "there's no benchmark for this," company spokeswoman Katherine Mosquera said. "Is it good? is it bad? We don't know. It happened."

Maersk's revelations were part of an interim second-quarter earnings report in which the Copenhagen-based global transport and energy company gave investors a preview of expected costs from the malware attack. The worm, dubbed NotPetya, locked access to systems that Maersk uses to operate shipping terminals all over the world and took two weeks to fix.

The company said the attack is expected to dampen its third-quarter results, but not enough to overshadow a generally good performance due to improving global economic conditions.

NotPetya, which has been traced to compromised tax-accounting software widely used in Ukraine, began spreading in late June, a few weeks after a similar ransomware attack called WannaCry seized computers in British health clinics. Like WannaCry, NotPetya exploited a vulnerability in unpatched Microsoft

Windows operating systems and relied on a break-in technique that may have been stolen from the U.S. National Security Agency.

NotPetya's malware looked like ransomware on screens. But its function appeared merely to be wreaking havoc. Maersk was just one of about 7,000 companies attacked globally, Maersk Chief Executive Soren Skou said in an investor call.

Ukraine and Russia were hit especially hard in the attack, but the worm also reportedly struck operations of a British advertising agency, a maker of skin-care products, a German broadcaster and U.S. pharmaceutical giant Merck.

For the most part, NotPetya victims have been tight-lipped. That's typical for companies hit by cyberattacks, and "the closer you get to industrials — utilities and gas — the more secretive they are," said Earl Perkins, research analyst at Gartner Inc.

So it's significant that Maersk decided to publicly air some of its struggles, he said. The move is laudable, Perkins said, and signals a shift toward more collaboration as businesses grapple with their dependence on vulnerable technologies.

Maersk's experience should serve as a warning, he added: "I'm afraid this is the future."

Maersk chief Skou told investors that NotPetya "made all of our applications and data unavailable for a while." No data was lost, no workers were endangered, and ships operated normally throughout the ordeal, he said. But for up to two days, affected terminals couldn't move cargo.

Goods started flowing normally again bit by bit, thanks to "many work-arounds" devised by hard-pressed Maersk employees, Skou said. Two weeks later, business was back to normal, he said.

At the Port of Los Angeles, Maersk's APM Terminal at Pier 400 was closed June 27 to July 1, leaving at least one anchored ship waiting in the harbor. Cargo operations ramped back up in subsequent days.

NotPetya affected three of Maersk's global businesses: Maersk Line, Damco and APM Terminals. Not only did the company lose business during the shutdown and subsequent slow period, but it also bled money as it cobbled together ways to operate without the digital systems on which it normally relies, Skou said. Later, he said, the task of "rebuilding IT" incurred additional costs.

Maersk's overall business has improved, however, as rising freight rates have given the company a boost and global trade has ticked back up. Not only are the U.S., Europe and China doing well economically, but also the economies of some struggling countries such as Russia and Brazil that depend on oil and raw materials have stopped shrinking — all good news for shipping, Skou said.

Maersk reported \$389 million in underlying net income for the second quarter for its consolidated business, almost three times last year's \$134 million second-quarter profit. But because the consolidated company also recorded a substantial charge from lower asset valuations in its tanker businesses, total net loss for the quarter came to \$264 million. Revenue was \$9.6 billion.

The company's transport and logistics arm, which controls 15% of the total global container-ship fleet capacity, reported total revenue of \$7.7 billion for the quarter. That's up nearly \$1 billion from the corresponding period last year.

Second-quarter results also included a \$339-million profit in the Maersk Line unit.

Maersk's financial outlook for the year is good, Skou said. "What we see now is probably the strongest fundamentals for container shipping that we have had for quite a while and certainly since the 2010 financial crisis."

<https://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-maersk-cyberattack-20170817-story.html>

Duane Potts said,"At NYK we had a meeting with the CEO and everyone else of importance. After 7 years of the computers in the Transtainer messing up constantly.

Statistics showed we would be much faster. We did a 2 week trial period of going back to the (Longies) Chalk and Walks.

We increased the productivity of containers out the gate by 100%. That's right, we doubled the production.

They shut off the computers and went back to humans, AKA Chalk and Walks.

People solved problems before they happened, proactively. Computers are strictly reactive.

We make More profit and double the production. We can drive electric machines solving the air quality issue.

Going with automated machines is a morally bankrupt idea, for any company who has 100's of billions in the bank because of Longshoremen productivity.

It's nothing less than a political/financial/manipulative invasion into our Port. The largest port in the United States 🇺🇸.

Shame on them!! 🤔'

LA City Council Members and US Senators Contact info. Share any environmental and economic impact concerns you may have with your city council members!

City council member email information.

Councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org

Councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org

Councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org

Councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Councilmember.koretz@lacity.org

Councilmember.martinez@lacity.org

Councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org

Councilmember.harris-Dawson@lacity.org

Councilmember.price@lacity.org

Councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Councilmember.smith@lacity.org

Councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

CALIFORNIA:

Feinstein, Dianne – (D – CA) (202) 224-3841 **Contact:** www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/e-mail-me

Harris, Kamala D. – (D – CA) (202) 224-3553 **Contact:** www.harris.senate.gov/

Marty Cerda

I'm here today to outline a long list of discrepancies found during the entirety of this 18-25 CDP level 1 permit debacle.

OVER 11,000 PEOPLE comprised of the Mayor, Harbor Commissioners, the City Council, business owners, and teachers expressing economic impact concerns that would violate the Port Master Plan agreement. As a collective they've asked for an economic impact and environmental study .

HOW DID IT GET THIS FAR!? WHAT ARE WE DOING HERE!?

What hasn't been loud enough is the fact that APMT's representatives have been lying about what kind of wireless technology they plan on using. They lied at the POLA Harbor Commissioner meeting, they've lied to waterfront personnel and more importantly, they've been lying to the landowners they are leasing from, THE PEOPLE OF LOS ANGELES!

People much smarter than any of us are expressing environmental concerns. More specifically ecosystems concerns.

If scientists, epidemiologists, biologists, firemen and the linesman installing this equipment are asking questions, I think we should all pump the breaks and have some of these questions answered first.

Millions of dollars went into studying wireless technology. Those findings fell on deaf ears for obvious reason\$. I think people need to stand together, lock arms and demand that our environment, ecosystem, health and safety take priority!

We want a study done. This recklessness is dumbfounding.

Duane Potts and that's not the end of it. People much smarter than any of us are expressing environmental concerns. More specifically ecosystems concerns.

If scientists, epidemiologists, biologists, firemen and even the linesman installing this equipment are expressing concern, I think we should all pump the breaks and have our voices heard. Let's have our concerns addressed before we let them use us as guinea pigs.

Millions of dollars went into studying wireless technology. Those findings fell on deaf ears for obvious reason\$. I think people need to stand together, lock arms and demand that our environment, ecosystem, health and safety take priority!

We want a study done. This recklessness is dumbfounding.

If environmentalists, biologists, epidemiologists, the brain tumor association, firemen and now the linesman installing this equipment are asking questions, I think we should all pump the breaks and have some of these questions answered first.

Millions of dollars went into studying this wireless technology. Those findings were swept under the rug and fell on deaf ears for obvious reason\$. I think people need to stand together, lock arms and demand that our environment, ecosystem, health and safety take priority! We demand that these studies circulating be taken seriously. This blatant recklessness is dumbfounding.

NOT ONE INDEPENDENT STUDY HAS BEEN CONDUCTED THAT WOULD HOLD THESE TELECOM GIANTS LIABLE FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT OR HEALTH AND NOBODY WILL INSURE THEM FOR IT!

This was confirmed in front of our Senate, on a live stream.

A lot of people are expressing environmental concerns in regards to infrastructure upgrades at APMT 400 and some are just learning about it.

John Ochs of APMT has lied about what kind of infrastructure for wireless technology they plan on using on more than one occasion. Lied to our POLA Harbor Commissioners, City Council People and more importantly YOU, the people of Los Angeles!

Is it 5G cellular or is it 5Ghz WiFi?

We know Kalmar Global boasts that they are 5G ready. We know that this wireless technology has had zero independent studies conducted that would hold them liable and that no insurance companies will cover them for man made wireless air pollution.

APMT's response to these concerns were to mock those raising this issue and make fun of this concern, by proclaiming that they plan on using 5LittleG and not Big5G. For those of you who are just learning about this environmental issue, there is no such thing as 5LittleG or Big5G.

By now you've all heard about the widespread concerns of 5G cellular, but what do we know about 5Ghz WiFi? We know it's twice the frequency of current technology and that no independent study has been made in regards to the long term environmental and health impacts of this new technology either. We know this

form of man made air pollution is also released of liability and uninsurable. WE KNOW that NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL and HEALTH IMPACTS HAVE BEEN PROVEN with older generations. If we don't fight this, plan on being a corporate guinea pig.

So, HOW DO WE FIGHT THIS? Great question!

One of our biggest issues is getting the word out. At any given meeting you can be limited to 3 minutes of microphone time. It just isn't enough time for a hand full of people to raise all these concerns. We need YOU to get involved!

You will find over 3,000 studies in this bio initiative report. Find a message that resonates with you and bring your concerns to the microphone. Let YOUR voice be heard as an individual!

<https://bioinitiative.org>

https://www.kalmarglobal.com/news--insights/2019/20190110_kalmar-moves-towards-5g/

Marty Cerda
Letter to city council

Hello, concerned citizen and employee on the Port of Los Angeles Waterfront here.

I had some concerns about the level 1 CDP permit for APM terminal. They require more antennas which is an environmental, health and safety concern of mine. They said they will not use untested 5G cellular technology, but all of their autonomous equipment is being purchased from Kalmar Global who absolutely boasts being 5G ready.

During the level 1 CDP appeal with Harbor Commissioners, John Ochs absolutely lied about this. Claiming only 5Ghz WiFi would be used, which is also untested. Can anything be done to protect the environment or the people in this matter? I think an environmental or health and safety study is fair to ask for.

Some interesting information below to consider.

1. 5G has not been safety tested. Workers would be exposed to an agent that has been shown in lab studies to cause harm with no agency ever doing any safety testing on it!

Senator Blumenthal Statement at Commerce Committee Hearing confirming that 5G has not been safety tested:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/oqlwdlyhvnusf9a/>

[Blumenthal%20Senate%205G%20Hearing%20-%20Short%20Version.mp4?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/oqlwdlyhvnusf9a/Blumenthal%20Senate%205G%20Hearing%20-%20Short%20Version.mp4?dl=0)

<https://www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/at-senate-commerce-hearing-blumenthal-raises-concerns-on-5g-wireless-technologys-potential-health-risks>

2. The National Toxicology Program conducted a \$30 million US Government funded study commissioned by the FDA that found clear evidence of cancer for animals exposed to 2G and 3G technology: <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/cellphones/index.html>

3. The people that are pro-wireless will point at the FCC, FDA, EPA, ICNIRP and other agencies to say that these agencies are monitoring the safety of radiofrequency radiation but the reality is none of these agencies have ever safety

tested any of the equipment out on the market for safe levels of exposure.

Here is what you find on their websites:

FCC: <https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-policy-human-exposure#block-menu-block-4>

"The FCC is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to evaluate the effect of emissions from FCC-regulated transmitters on the quality of the human environment. At the present time there is no federally-mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard. However, several non-government organizations, such as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) have issued recommendations for human exposure to RF electromagnetic fields. The potential hazards associated with RF electromagnetic fields are discussed in OET Bulletin No. 56, "Questions and Answers About the Biological Effects and Potential Hazards of Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields."

FDA Cell Phone Regulation: <https://www.fda.gov/Radiation-EmittingProducts/RadiationEmittingProductsandProcedures/HomeBusinessandEntertainment/CellPhones/default.htm>

Under the law, FDA does not review the safety of radiation-emitting consumer products such as cell phones and similar wireless devices before they can be sold, as it does with new drugs or medical devices.

EPA on RF Radiation Research (EPA was defunded when their research showed biological effects at levels that were below heating of tissue):

https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_Report.cfm?Lab=NHEERL&dirEntryID=47568

Some experimental results occur at very low exposure conditions that cause no significant thermal input; these responses are called non-thermal effects. The mechanisms of interaction of non-thermal effects and their physiological significance are a subject of scientific debate. RF radiation research budget reductions, which reflect changes in funding priorities, will leave unresolved many of the questions concerning the biological effects of RF radiation and their possible health implications.

ANSI Membership Roster

<https://eseries.ansi.org/Source/directory/Search.cfm>

IEEE Mission and Vision (to foster technological innovation, it's not to protect the safety of people)

<https://www.ieee.org/about/ieee-strategic-plan.html>

NCRP National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements
<https://ncrponline.org/>

4. All over California consumers are able to opt out of having smart meters on their homes because of recognized health effects from their emissions. 5G and other generation technologies will expose workers to much more radiation and they will not be able to opt out.

Firefighters have written a resolution to ensure cell towers are not placed on fire stations due to health effects and laws in CA have been passed that exempt fire stations from cell towers. (see attachments below)

5. Even Verizon and AT&T 's own cell phone insurance will not cover the harmful effects of radiofrequency radiation. See attached Insurance pamphlets for Verizon and AT&T and article.

These are a couple Youtube videos of Kevin Mottus.

Kevin Mottus Warns About The Dangers To Health From 5G ...<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ts-OaXD2vPY>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bKrvlxfwltg>

Thank you for your time.

Best regards, Martin Cerda

Hi Marty,

You have your work cut out for you. I would start with these 3 websites, they are a wealth of information, well organized and very credible:

<http://www.EHTrust.org>, Headed by Dr. Deborah Davis, a Nobel Prize recipient.

<http://www.mdsafetech.org>, Headed by Dr. Cindy Russell with the California Medical Association

<http://www.SaferEMR.com>, Headed by Dr. Joel Moskowitz out of UC Berkley School of Public Health

<https://emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>, Over 240 scientists from 42 countries signed this appeal warning about wireless health effects. You can contact any one of them and ask them to speak at your meetings.

The firefighter's union was successful in stopping cell towers from going up on and near fire stations because it made their firefighters very sick. This was their Resolution: <http://www.iaff.org/hs/facts/CellTowerFinal.asp>

Your union might be able to draft something similar

This is a statement written to the FCC about a study that was done on firefighters getting sick in stations that had cell towers: <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/7022117660.pdf>

Because of the strong firefighters union California State law exempts fire stations from having cell towers.

AB57 (see the last statement of this bill) - https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB57

SB649 (see section 2) - https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB649

I hope this helps. Let me know if you need more.

Good Luck! Rola Masri says contact Kevin Mattus

Sc.M. Rola Masri and Outreach Director for the California Brain Tumor Association, Kevin Mottus: Talking points.

1. 5G has not been safety tested. Workers would be exposed to an agent that has been shown in lab studies to cause harm with no agency ever doing any safety testing on it.

Senator Blumenthal Statement at Commerce Committee Hearing confirming that 5G has not been safety tested:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/oqlwdlyhmvusf9a/>

Blumenthal%20Senate%205G%20Hearing%20-%20Short%20Version.mp4?dl=0

<https://www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/at-senate-commerce-hearing-blumenthal-raises-concerns-on-5g-wireless-technologies-potential-health-risks>

2. The National Toxicology Program conducted a \$30 million US Government funded study commissioned by the FDA that found clear evidence of cancer for animals exposed to 2G and 3G technology: <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/cellphones/index.html>

3. The people that are pro-wireless will point at the FCC, FDA, EPA, ICNIRP and other agencies to say that these agencies are monitoring the safety of radiofrequency radiation but the reality is none of these agencies have ever safety tested any of the equipment out on the market for safe levels of exposure.

Here is what you find on their websites:

FCC: <https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-policy-human-exposure#block-menu-block-4>

"The FCC is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to evaluate the effect of emissions from FCC-regulated transmitters on the quality of the human environment. At the present time there is no federally-mandated radio frequency (RF) exposure standard. However, several non-government organizations, such as the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) have issued recommendations for human exposure to RF electromagnetic fields. The potential hazards associated with RF electromagnetic fields are discussed in OET Bulletin No. 56, "Questions and Answers About the Biological Effects and Potential Hazards of Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields."

FDA Cell Phone Regulation: <https://www.fda.gov/Radiation-EmittingProducts/RadiationEmittingProductsandProcedures/HomeBusinessandEntertainment/CellPhones/default.htm>

Under the law, FDA does not review the safety of radiation-emitting consumer products such as cell phones and similar wireless devices before they can be sold, as it does with new drugs or medical devices.

EPA on RF Radiation Research (EPA was defunded when their research showed biological effects at levels that were below heating of tissue):

[https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_Report.cfm?](https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_Report.cfm?Lab=NHEERL&dirEntryID=47568)

[Lab=NHEERL&dirEntryID=47568](https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_Report.cfm?Lab=NHEERL&dirEntryID=47568)

Some experimental results occur at very low exposure conditions that cause no significant thermal input; these responses are called non-thermal effects. The mechanisms of interaction of non-thermal effects and their physiological significance are a subject of scientific debate. RF radiation research budget reductions, which reflect changes in funding priorities, will leave unresolved many of the questions concerning the biological effects of RF radiation and their possible health implications.

ANSI Membership Roster

<https://eseries.ansi.org/Source/directory/Search.cfm>

IEEE Mission and Vision (to foster technological innovation, it's not to protect the safety of people)

<https://www.ieee.org/about/ieee-strategic-plan.html>

NCRP National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements

<https://ncrponline.org/>

4. All over California consumers are able to opt out of having smart meters on their homes because of recognized health effects from their emissions. 5G and other generation technologies will expose workers to much more radiation and they will not be able to opt out.

Firefighters have written a resolution to ensure cell towers are not placed on fire stations due to health effects and laws in CA have been passed that exempt fire stations from cell towers. (see attachments below)

5. Even Verizon and AT&T 's own cell phone insurance will not cover the harmful effects of radiofrequency radiation. See attached Insurance pamphlets for Verizon and AT&T and article.

These are a couple Youtube videos of Kevin Mottus.

Kevin Mottus Warns About The Dangers To Health From 5G ...<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ts-OaXD2vPY>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bKrvlxfwltg>

Email your U.S. Senators with the following message; email links are given below:

Subject: Please Vote NO on MOBILE Now Act S.19 and DIGIT Act S.88

The National Toxicology Program has found the electromagnetic field (EMF) of radiation emitted by wireless technology causes DNA damage, and brain and heart tumors. Non-industry funded studies all over the world report other short-and long-term biological effects, ranging from infertility, Alzheimer's and autism to digital addiction, insomnia, headaches, nausea, nose/ear bleeds, skin rashes, cognitive impairment, learning disabilities, behavioral issues, depression, anxiety and more. Children, fetuses, the elderly and those with known health compromises are especially vulnerable. See www.emfscientist.org.

If this subject is new to you, you will likely have questions as we have all rapidly adopted wireless technology into our lives. Please read this high-level three-page overview titled, "EMF Points of Confusion vs. Fact" at TinyURL.com/EMF-Facts.

The FCC and industry are trying to fast-track these bills which will take away local authority from communities to decide whether they want toxic 5G/Internet of Things infrastructure installed at the street-level on poles right outside homes, schools, and offices. Please insist on public hearings, and send a clear message to industry that they need to work with non-industry funded scientists to develop biologically safe technology. Retired Microsoft Canada President Frank Clegg assures us they can, if given a nudge. See <https://virneo.com/134411701>.

Please VOTE NO on the MOBILE Now Act S.19 and DIGIT Act S.88. Thank you.

Look
INTO

Marty Cerda

The FCC and industry are fast-tracking legislation that would take authority away from our municipalities in deciding whether or not we want the infrastructure needed for 5G and

the Internet of Things. They did this back in 1997 too when they circumvented safety testing on cell phone technology then got the Telecommunications Act passed. That left our local authorities powerless as the industry put cell towers near homes, schools, hospitals, churches and senior housing. Many have become very ill, with no recourse.

Now the FCC and industry are trying to push through two bills in D.C. that will put small but extremely hazardous cell antennas in our neighborhoods on utility poles right outside our homes, schools, offices, everywhere. The 5G signal will carry huge doses of data faster, but not very far so the industry wants to install millions of these small cell antennas to carry the data from pole to pole. 5G will also use 3G and 4G technology so existing towers won't come down; 5G will add to the electrosmog. These small cell antennas will pulse biologically hazardous microwave radiation at us 24/7 at close range.

The way the Telecom Act is written today, industry is supposed to submit an application to town officials to put in antennas, and these new bills are trying to override this control measure for local authorities. Why is the FCC and industry in such a rush? The U.S. National Toxicology Program is in the middle of reporting out findings from a \$25M multi-year study that has already found this radiation causes DNA damage, brain and heart tumors. More findings will come out in 2017.

The industry leaders are not concerned with public health, they just want to be first to market. As soon as the NTP findings came out, they pushed to get approval to use the 5G spectrum. The Cellular Telephone Industry Association (CTIA-The Wireless Association) did its own big cancer study in the 1990s which showed the same findings, but they didn't inform the public. Instead, they crafted the Telecom Act and pushed cell phones and infrastructure on an unsuspecting public. Then they introduced wi-fi which exposes us even further indoors, and now they plan to roll out the Internet of Things and blanket our neighborhoods in radiation.

Please, don't take my word on all of this, when you have time I encourage you to investigate on your own (thank you, Katie Singer, author of Invisible Silent Spring, and others for this great resource on these two bills, and thank you world scientists for the EMF Scientists website which presents the facts on wireless radiation).

But for today, we need your voice (and every adult's in your house) in two ways:

1. Call your U.S. Senators' office with the following message; you can read it to the person who answers the phone, or leave it in voice mail. Phone numbers are given at the end of this email:

New health and safety concerns for labor with the implementation of 5G-AI Powered Automation!

Companies like Kalmar Global are raising the bar for competitors.

"In the future, 5G will fulfil port automation needs for reliability, capacity, speed and security. Kalmar has successfully conducted one of the industry's first trials with ultra-reliable, low-latency 5G technology in collaboration with Nokia."

-Kalmar Global

Meanwhile Scientists from all over the world have issued a declaration called the 5G Appeal calling for a moratorium on the increase of 5G cell antennas citing human health effects and impacts to wildlife. This follows the EMF Scientists Appeal in 2015 calling for immediate action by the United Nations- now signed by over 240 scientists in 42 nations.

When concerns with APM Terminals application for a permit to automate raised questions about the use of 5G technology, we were told there was confusion as to what technology we would be using.

"Once 5G reaches its full potential, it should fulfil the needs for reliability, security, speed and bandwidth, even when different applications have varying requirements. Meanwhile, there will be useful wireless solutions with 4G LTE and WiFi, and Kalmar is exploring these as well. But, as Yli-Paunu points out, 5G will be the industrial standard of the future and a concept that combines terrestrial and mobile networks."

New health and safety concerns for labor! The distinction between WiFi and 5G was made. Remember when they said 5G

"In the future, 5G will fulfil port automation needs for reliability, capacity, speed and security. Kalmar has successfully conducted one of the industry's first trials with ultra-reliable, low-latency 5G technology in collaboration with Nokia."

-Kalmar Global

Meanwhile Scientists from all over the world have issued a 2017 declaration called the 5G Appeal calling for a moratorium on the increase of 5G cell antennas citing human health effects and impacts to wildlife. This follows the EMF Scientists Appeal in 2015 calling for immediate action by the United Nations- now signed by over 240 scientists in 42 nations.

“Once 5G reaches its full potential, it should fulfil the needs for reliability, security, speed and bandwidth, even when different applications have varying requirements. Meanwhile, there will be useful wireless solutions with 4G LTE and WiFi, and Kalmar is exploring these as well. But, as Yli-Paunu points out, 5G will be the industrial standard of the future and a concept that combines terrestrial and mobile networks.”

Thought this was interesting, especially the section labeled Just like your Microwave. I copied this from another group called Interesting Engineering.

Interesting Engineering

INNOVATION

The Danger of 5G: 5th Generation Cellular Technology Might Be a Threat to Public Health

Questions remain about just how safe the new 5G cell phone system really is.

By Marcia Wendorf

June 14th, 2019

The Danger of 5G: 5th Generation Cellular Technology Might Be a Threat to Public Health

Tony Webster/ Flickr

5G stands for 5th generation cellular technology, and it's coming your way in 2020. 5G will have an average download speed of about 1GBps (1 gigabyte per second). That means you can download an entire movie in about one second.

While this might appeal to people, 5G also appeals to "things," as in the "internet of things." While 4G has a fifty-millisecond delay, or latency, 5G has a one-millisecond delay, which will make communication between machines connected to the internet much easier. If this makes you think of Skynet in the Terminator movies, you're not alone.

Ultra High Frequency and Intensity

For its incredible speed, 5G uses what are called millimeter waves (MMW). These are radio signals having frequencies between 30 GHz and 300 GHz. While these higher-frequency bands have a lot of capacity, their shorter wavelengths mean their range is lower, and they can be easily blocked by buildings, cars, airplanes, and trees.

Electromagnetic spectrum

The electromagnetic spectrum Source: Philip Ronan/Wikimedia Commons

To get around that problem, 5G requires what are called "small-cell antennas," which must be deployed far more densely than 4G antennas, at roughly every 500 feet, or about one antenna per city block.

At the end of 2017, there were approximately 320,000 4G cell antennas in the U.S. A study by consultant firm Accenture estimates that 5G will require 769,000 small-cell antennas, an increase of 449,000 new antennas.

MOBILE

Is 5G Harmful for Humans and the Environment?

Small-cell antennas are about 4 feet tall, with some as large as a refrigerator. The cell phone operators plan to affix them to streetlights and utility poles, or place them on the ground, sometimes disguised as mailboxes. The City of Portland, Oregon has called these antennas a potential eyesore, especially in historic neighborhoods.

Besides the question of whether these antennas are an eyesore is: are small-cell antennas safe? 5G waves are ultra high frequency and ultra high intensity. Whereas 1G, 2G, 3G and 4G use between 1 and 5 gigahertz frequency, 5G uses between 24 and 90 gigahertz frequency.

Radio frequency radiation dissipates with distance, obeying the inverse-square law. That makes sources close to you far more dangerous than a source that is farther away. Duration of exposure is also an issue, and the new small-cell antennas will be active 24/7.

The Scientists Weigh In

On June 9, 2017, scientists with the International EMF Scientist Appeal submitted a letter of comment to the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in opposition to FCC Docket Numbers 17-79 and 15-180, which would allow streamlined approval of 5G infrastructure to be built on existing utility poles, in greater number than current cellular antennas.

The group is comprised of over 225 reputable scientists from 41 countries who have peer reviewed publications on electromagnetic fields. Their letter calls on "The FCC to critically consider the potential impact of the 5th generation wireless infrastructure on the health and safety of the U.S. population before proceeding to deploy this infrastructure." The letter includes:

"FCC is urging an accelerated deployment schedule for the 5th generation wireless infrastructure, to be installed pervasively throughout the United States. This is being done without public health review of the growing body of scientific evidence that includes reports of increasing rates of cancer and neurological diseases that may be caused by exposure to EMF from wireless sources."

The scientists went on to say: "Numerous recent scientific publications have shown that EMF affects living organisms at levels well below most international and national guidelines." These effects can include an increased cancer risk, genetic damage, structural and functional changes to the reproductive system, learning and memory deficits, and neurological disorders.

Just Like in Your Microwave

5G radiation is similar to the waves used to cook food in your microwave. Because of that, in 2016, Dr. Yael Stein of Jerusalem's Hebrew University sent a letter to the FCC Commissioners, the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, outlining the effect of 5G radiation on human skin.

According to Dr. Stein, over ninety percent of microwave radiation is absorbed by the epidermis and dermis layers of human skin, essentially making it an absorbing sponge for microwave radiation. Also, the sweat ducts in our skin's upper layer act like helical antennas, which are antennas specially designed to respond to electromagnetic fields. In essence, our bodies will conduct 5G radiation, and how this will effect babies, pregnant women, and the elderly is not known.

In fact, the U.S. Department of Defense already has a weapon called the Active Denial System, that uses MMWs to make people's skin feel like it's stinging or burning. Turned up a notch, this weapon could microwave people to death.

A widely cited U.S. National Toxicology Program study of rats that were exposed to RFR for nine hours a day over a two year period showed that they developed rare forms of tumors in both the brain and heart. This study caused the American Cancer Society to rethink its position on radiation and cancer, and they stated that their current understanding of RFR's impact on human health was similar to their previous lack of understanding the connection between smoking and lung cancer.

The U.S. Federal Government's Position

U.S. President Donald Trump is all excited about the new 5G cellphone network. Here's what he had to say in prepared remarks:

"5G will be as much as 100 times faster than the current 4G cellular networks. It will transform the way our citizens work, learn, communicate, and travel. It will make American farms more productive, American manufacturing more competitive, and American healthcare better and more accessible. Basically, it covers almost everything, when you get right down to it. Pretty amazing.

And just as 4G networks paved the way for smartphones and all of the exciting breakthroughs — they made possible so many things — this will be more secure and resilient. 5G networks will also create astonishing and really thrilling new opportunities for our people — opportunities that we've never even thought we had a possibility of looking at."

In January 2017, Trump appointed Ajit Pai, a former lawyer for Verizon Communications, to the position of Director of the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Pai has advocated for the weakening of state and local regulations regarding the deployment 5G.

In 2018, another Republican F.C.C. commissioner, Brendan Carr, announced a plan to streamline the environmental review process for 5G infrastructure, claiming it could cut costs for the telecommunications companies by as much as 80%. To bolster their case, Pai and Carr have trotted out words designed to get every red-blooded American going: "keep pace with global competitors," "bring high-speed internet to underserved areas," "close the digital divide."

The telecommunications companies are pushing to build the 5G systems as quickly as possible. They have deployed a small army of lobbyists working state legislatures to pass laws that restrict local oversight of 5G. Wireless companies are also lobbying the U.S. Congress, which is considering several bills on the issue.

Dr Neil Cherry (1946 - 2003)

held the position of Associate Professor of Environmental Health at Lincoln University, New Zealand. (Assoc Prof (NZ) = Full Prof (US)). Professor Cherry had listened to these concerns of the community and spent many years and a great deal of his own salary income to travel around the world visiting universities and laboratories to collect the published papers and discuss as much as possible with the original researchers to make sure his evidence and conclusions are closely correct.

It is highly likely that Professor Cherry was the first Environmental Health scientist in the world to research and publish strong evidence that:

Professor Cherry

a. Electromagnetic fields and radiation damage DNA and enhance cell death rates and therefore they are a Ubiquitous Universal Genotoxic Carcinogen that enhances the rates of Cancer, Cardiac, Reproductive and Neurological disease and mortality in human populations. Therefore there is no safe threshold level. The only safe exposure level is zero, a position confirmed by dose-response trends in epidemiological studies.

and

b. Solar and Geomagnetic Activity is a Natural Hazard causing serious human health effects through modulation of extremely small natural electromagnetic radiation (0.1pW/cm^2), the Schumann Resonance signal, that is detected by the human brains and alters the melatonin output which causes modulation of many human health effects including cancer, cardiac, reproductive and neurological diseases and mortality. (<http://www.stayonthetruth.com/neil-cherry.php>)

Keynotes for 5G

5G uses higher frequencies and more bandwidth than 3G and 4G, enabling users to transfer more wireless data faster. Existing networks use frequencies between 700 MHz and 6 GHz and have transfer rates of 100Mbit per second. 5G operates on frequencies between 28 and 100 GHz, allowing it to operate at rates of up to 10Gbit per second, 1,000 times the rate of 4G.

The FCC held a 5G network spectrum auction on March 15th, despite rising concerns over the health risks. Not only have residents complained over the lack of 5G research, but so has National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NASA, and a number of politicians.

LA-LB container dwells edge toward normalcy

The volume-driven congestion that gripped Los Angeles-Long Beach this winter is over, but work remains to be done to bring container dwell times back down to their three-year average.

Container dwell times averaged 2.68 days in March, down from 4.32 days in January and 3.2 days in February, but were still higher than the 2.14-day average seen over the past three years. "While the dwell time numbers are decreasing, 8.7 percent of containers remained at a terminal for five days, which is too high for an efficient operation," said Jessica Alvarenga, manager of government affairs at the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA), which publishes container dwell times each month at the largest US port complex.

Los Angeles-Long Beach is a significant link in US import supply chains, and congestion in the gateway translates to delays in the delivery of containers to population centers throughout the eastern half of the country. Congestion in the Southern California port complex peaked in January as importers sought to beat Trump administration tariff deadlines, but it dissipated in February along with declining US imports from Asia. "The two San Pedro Bay ports saw their combined share of containerized import tonnage arriving at mainland US seaports drop from 34.6 percent in January to 27.5 percent in February," the PMSA stated.

Retailers and manufacturers front-loaded shipments to avoid 10 percent tariffs on imports from China in September, rising to 25 percent on Jan. 1. The 25 percent tariffs did not take effect and are still in flux as US-China negotiations continue, but the front-loading of spring merchandise in late 2018 is expected to result in low single-digit growth in imports in the first half of 2019.

The slower growth in volume should prevent a return of congestion in Los Angeles-Long Beach in the coming months as carriers cancel sailings to keep rates afloat, rather than adding extra-loader vessels as they did in late 2018 and early 2019. Carriers deployed about 34 extra-loader vessels in November-December. In order to better match capacity with demand and prevent ocean rates from tumbling, carriers this spring have blanked at least 35 sailings from February into April.

Truck turn times at marine terminals, which had escalated to 90 minutes in December and 98 minutes in January, fell back to 90 minutes in February and they continue to improve, according to the Harbor Trucking Association (HTA), which publishes monthly turn times in Los Angeles-Long Beach. Turn times in March averaged 83 minutes.

The drop in container dwell times at the marine terminals below three days highlighted in the PMSA release, and improving truck turn times noted by the HTA, should push marine terminal utilization rates lower, which will further contribute to improved productivity. When the average container dwell time exceeds three days,

congestion and delays increase rapidly. Alan McCorkle, vice president of Yusen Terminals in Los Angeles, told the JOC's TPM conference in Long Beach in March that terminal utilization in January-February exceeded 100 percent. Port analysts say service levels begin to deteriorate when utilization exceeds 80 percent.

The congestion problems in Los Angeles-Long Beach were due in large part to unprecedented imports in the final months of 2018 and in January 2019. US containerized imports from Asia declined 0.5 percent in the first quarter, after rising 15.5 percent in the fourth quarter of 2018, according to PIERS, a JOC.com sister product within IHS Markit.

PMSA data show that the Los Angeles-Long Beach share of US imports from East Asia in January was 51.4 percent, compared with 46.6 percent in January 2018. The Southern California share of US imports from Asia in February dropped eight percentage points to 43.3 percent. "In terms of sheer volume, the slowdown was most evident at the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, where February saw combined import loads tumble by 10.2 percent," PMSA stated.

PMSA has been tracking container dwell times in Los Angeles-Long Beach since May 2016. The average dwell time before the tariffs changed shipping patterns last autumn was 2.14 days, with 5.5 percent of containers remaining five days or longer on the docks. "Those are the numbers we hope to get back to," Alvarenga said.