

Subject: What Is In Chemtrails? Part 4.

From: "John Winston" <johnfw@mlode.com>

Date: 19/10/2011, 06:23

Newsgroups: alt.conspiracy.area-51

Subject: What Is In Chemtrails? Part 4.
Oct. 18, 2011.

I mentioned that the last posting would tell what rat po-son is in Chemtrails. That was a mistake. It will be mentioned in this part of the material.

.....
.....
This same sample also showed barium at a level of 8 ug/l. Using the same sample method and laboratory, he took a sample on Oct. 14, 2009 which showed aluminum at a level of 611 ug/l. The barium should not be there in any amount. Chemtrails have been known to consist of both barium carbonate and barium oxide. Barium carbonate is used in rat poi-on. The normal level of aluminum in rainwater is .5 ug/l. These samples show levels of aluminum at 2020 times and 1222 times the normal levels. There is no heavy industry in the Mt. Shasta area. There is no reason, other than chemtrails, for this stuff to be showing up at these levels.

Mr. M[ngles writes on Oct. 30, 2009:

The soil scientists from the U-DA Soil Co-servation Department visited private property east of Shasta Lake, California, on Oct. 27, 2009. Mr. B-iley, K-mar, and O-ens tested the pH with standard federal meters. All agreed the pH should be 5.5.

Under Douglas fir, the ph was 7.4, astoundingly basic for that habitat. Under Poderosa pine, at the precise soil-needle interface, I would expect a pH of 5. At that point, Bailey's meter showed 6.5. This is high for a microhabitat that should be very acid. Old soil surveys indicate this soil should be very acid, around pH of 5.5.

I bought a house in Mt. Shasta old black oak/pine pasture in 2002, tested the pH at below 6, good for vegetable gardening. It was a major reason for purchase, and proceeded with highly acid composting of leaves and grass to drive the pH down or at least keep it low, as every m-ster gardener knows.

I added a touch of sulphur and avoided wood ash to insure acidity, and proceeded to teach organic gardening courses out of my yard through COS. The pH tests were an embarrassment because now my garden is pH 7, sometimes higher. This is the opposite of what should happen.

The pH meter of Jon M-Clellan proceeded to show pH in McCloud gardens also running close to 7 or 8, which is too high for heavy organic mulch with no ashes. General lawns were also running over pH 7 under oaks and pines and fir trees. This is contrary to everything I learned in college and the Soil Con-ervation Service for 35 years.

The old data sheets say these soils should be running at a pH of 5-6. I tested my rainwater in a plastic NWS rain gauge set high on a pole, and got 1010 ug/l aluminum, with substantial amounts of barium and strontium included, where it should be non-detectable. Others from the West Coast have similar repeated results, from the Bay Area to Washington.

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) produced data showing elevated levels of barium in surface water between 1988-2004. Along with other elevated readings, a sample from the East Verde River near Payson, AZ taken on July 19, 1999 showed barium at a level of 340 micrograms per liter (ug/l). The E-A says the average surface water concentration of barium is 43 ug/l.

The ADEQ analyzed many water samples taken at different times from the Nogales Wash Channel between 1993 and 2002. Among other elevated readings, they found barium at levels of: 850 ug/l, 950 ug/l and 900 ug/l. The EP- says that 99.4% of surface water contains 2 to 340 ug/l barium.

The ADEQ analyzed many water samples taken at different times between 1988-2004 at the Verde River Below Horseshoe Dam. Among many other elevated readings, a sample taken on July 19, 1990 showed barium at a level 560 ug/l and another sample taken within a year showed barium at a level of 700 ug/l.

In June of 1996, the ADEQ analyzed water samples taken from the Buckeye Canal. The lab report showed barium at a level of 570

parts per million.

In July of 1999, the ADEQ sampled water from the Little Colorado River Basin and found aluminum at 150,000 ug/l or 150 mg/l or .15 g/l. This reading is made even more interesting by the fact that in September of 2002 AND in March of 2005, the ADEQ tested the same river basin and found NO aluminum. What accounted for this giant aluminum spike?

As far as water contamination is concerned, I must report that a lot of available data which would otherwise support the chemtrail hypothesis is misleading and unreliable.

The data to which I am referring is that which comes from the California Department of Public Health Drinking Water Program (CDPHDWP). Online, this organization is also referred to as the California Department of Health Sciences Drinking Water Program. The CDPHDWP produces and distributes publicly a data CD entitled California Drinking Water Data. This CD purports to represent toxicology data collected from all California water districts. The problem is that, after checking with my local water districts and the CDPHDWP, it is apparent that the data contained in this CD is very unreliable.

My local water districts tell me that this is because the CDPHDWP is using an outdated data collection method. Furthermore, websites which use this data as support for the chemtrail hypothesis miss the point that the data CD in question represents (and poorly so) PROCESSED DRINKING WATER when we should be looking at UNPROCESSED or SURFACE WATER (the water found in reservoirs).

Online you will find many graphs based on data contained in the CDPHDWP data CD showing incredible levels of many different toxins. All these graphs are not to be trusted without a local water department confirmation and even in that case, the data is not wholly pertinent.

Data produced by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) shows elevated levels of chemtrail toxins. Between 1990 and 2002, CARB ambient air statewide average data shows elevated and increasing levels of aluminum and barium. From 1990 to 2002, aluminum was detected in the range of 1500 to 2000 nanograms per cubic meter.

Barium, which between 1990 and 2002 consistently trended upwards, reached a peak of 50.8 nanograms per cubic meter in 2002. The CARB classifies aluminum and barium as toxic compounds. The CARB website says, For toxics compounds, there is generally no threshold concentration below which the air is healthy. For toxics compounds, the greater the quantified health risk, the more unhealthy the air is. In other words, ANY aluminum or barium is unhealthy. There ARE NO SAFE LEVELS except zero. Remember, these are STATEWIDE AVERAGES. God forbid you might be living in an area that increased the average.

You may ask why I am only referencing data up to 2002. This is 2011. Where is the missing data? The answer is that data from between 1990 and 2002 is the only data which the CARB has widely distributed.

As far as statewide averages for ambient aluminum and barium are concerned, these years are the only years which their website and their California Ambient Air Quality Data DVD show. Their Public Information Officer Dimitri S-anich curiously refused to answer questions about the missing data. He referred me to documents which did not address the issue.

After discussions with staff, Mike Mueller, the chief of the Quality Management Branch of the Monitoring and Laboratory Division, wrote me saying, It is my understanding that the toxics air monitoring network (samples collected in Summa canisters) stopped analyzing for these compounds due to the low concentrations. However, the PM2.5 network does analyze for these compounds and that data was provided in the analyses and CD. [sic]

A statewide average of barium at 50.8 nanograms per cubic meter and aluminum at 2000 are low concentrations? Any levels of detectable aluminum or barium have been classified as unhealthy. The concentrations were trending upwards. They stopped analyzing for these compounds?

I have scoured their website, written letters and made many phone calls to the CARB and I have not heard of or seen this missing data presented in any CD. Thankfully, other people have been asking for this missing data as well. The organization known as Environmental Voices requested the missing data and on September 15, 2010 they got it.

Amazingly, after data showing many years of elevated and increasing levels of aluminum and barium, this newly produced

data showed MUCH LOWER levels. That's good news, right?

I want to believe that everything is as it has always been!

The problem is that the newly released data contradicts the previously released data.

Let us look at data for the year 2002 both new and old. 2002 is a year for which the CARB widely distributed data AND it is a year for which they have provided data to only a select few researchers such as I due to the efforts of Environmental Voices.

I will refer to the widely distributed data as the old data and the thinly distributed data as the new data. The old data says that in 2002 the statewide average for ambient aluminum was 1980 nanograms per cubic meter. The new data says that the statewide average in 2002 was 67.5 nanograms per cubic meter. The new data also says that statewide average aluminum concentrations generally remained at this level through to 2009. As far as barium goes, the old data says that the statewide ambient air average barium concentration for 2002 was 50.8 nanograms per cubic meter. The new data says it was 27.5 nanograms per cubic meter. The new data says that statewide average barium concentrations only trended lower from 2002 to 2009. Why does the new data contradict the old data?

Part 4.

John Winston. johnfw@mlode.com