October 14, 2026

Dear HHS:

Thank you for allowing me to submit this pertinent letter regarding information on Electromagnetic Fields (**EMF's**), Radiofrequency (**RF)** Radiation, and Wireless Radiation Exposure.

I am responding as a patient who suffers from Electromagnetic Radiation Syndrome (**ERS**). I am also a concerned mother of 3 adult daughters, and a grandmother of four. I belong to **New Mexicans for Utility Safety (NMUS)** an organization of local citizens advocating against the installation of smart meters which are soon to be installed by Public Service Company of New Mexico **(PNM)** in Albuquerque and Santa Fe neighborhoods.

We moved into our new home on September 5, 2019 not knowing what kind of electric meter we had. I assume it was replaced from an analog to some type of digital . Once I became aware of my health issues and called **PNM**, the only answer I could get is that our electric meter is digital. I did not give my informed consent for the change.

My personal story starts with the installation of a wireless alarm system on October 4, 2019. Being uninformed on the health effects of wireless technology, this system was installed throughout our home. Over time, I began having sleepless nights, extreme fatigue, tinnitus, and increased sympathetic nervous system activity. In other words, I could not deeply rest and relax.

Luckily, I realized these symptoms could be coming from the effects of the wireless radiation. I had the home alarm system promptly removed on September 1st, 2021. I have been able to mitigate some of the effects of this wireless radiation, but it is very difficult when traveling and staying in different accommodations like family homes, hotels, etc. Soon we will be experiencing the effects of smart meters due to **PNM's** city wide installation of smart meters in Albuquerque and Santa Fe. It is likely that if our neighbors do not opt-out then those radiation fields from their smart meter will be beaming into bedrooms where we sleep. https://image.shutterstock.com/shutterstock/photos/244533169/display_1500/stock-vector-smart-meter-diagram-illustration-vector-244533169.jpg

Comments from: Dr.Vini G.Khurana, Associate Professor of Neurosurgery, June 11, 2012, article titled "Smart Meters: Correcting the Gross Misinformation." " Wireless smart meters typically produce atypical, relatively potent and very short pulsed RF/microwaves whose biological effects have never been fully

tested. **They emit these millisecond-long RF bursts on average 9,600 times a day with a maximum of 190,000 daily transmissions and a peak level emission two and a half times higher than the stated safety signal**, as the California utility Pacific Gas & Electric (**PG&E**) recognized before that State's Public Utilities Commission. Thus, people in proximity to a smart meter are at risk of significantly greater aggregate of RF/microwave exposure than with a cell phone, not to mention the cumulative exposure received by people living near multiple meters mounted together, pole-mounted routers or utility collector meters using a third antenna to relay RF signals from 500 to 5,000 homes." https://irp-cdn.multiscreensite.com/562d25c6/files/uploaded/GIHN_Health-Effects-of-Smart-Meters_May_1_2017.pdf (pages 11 &12).

Now, our citizen group is having to battle with PNM to not install the smart meters in our homes. Even though we have opted out, we are having to pay a monthly penalty fee and an upfront fee (called a rider) to not have them installed. We should not be penalized for trying to maintain our health by unnecessary and harmful technology plus additional fees. We were not given informed consent by **PNM** over the dangers of this wireless technology. The World Health Organization (**WHO)**/International Agency for Research on Cancer (**IARC)** has classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B) based on an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer [1], associated with wireless phone use. https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf

NMUS/NM4US.org is awaiting a decision from the NM Supreme Court on September 4, 2026. NO. S-1-SC-40723

https://supremecourt.nmcourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2026/06/40723-PRC-Answer-Brief.pdf

https://supremecourt.nmcourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2026/06/40723-Brief-in-Chief.pdf (Deian McBryde,Esquire, counsel for appellant)

To watch the actual hearing go to- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TQJpOdBh1Q This video isn't available anymore; however, you can find an audio recording S-1-SC-40723 NMUS vs. PRC https://supremecourt.nmcourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2026/09/Supreme-Court_20260904-0901_01dd3c4beaef54b0.mp3

NEW MEXICANS FOR UTILITY SAFETY,
Appellant,
v.
NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION
COMMISSION,
Appellee,
and
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF
NEW MEXICO,
Intervenor-Appellee.
In the Matter of Public Service Company
of New Mexico's Application for
Authorization to Implement Grid
Modernization Components That
Include Advanced Metering Infrastructure
and Application to Recover the Associated
Costs Through a Rider, Issuance of Related
Accounting Orders, and Other Associated Relief
NMPRC Case No. 22-22-00058-UT

NMUS is not the only organization that has opposed PNM's decisions. Even though Sandia Heights Homeowner's Association **(SHHA)** won their case with the Bernalillo County Board of Commissioner's (**unanimous vote**) denying PNM's application on May 12, 2026 , PNM has appealed the decision to the New Mexico Second Judicial District Court. " **The dispute concerns whether PNM adequately justified the location, size, transmission route, planning assumptions, and alternatives included in the denied application".** https://sandiahomeowners.org/stop-pnm-towers.

Additional points:

1. Despite the ruling from the US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in August 2021 that the FCC's decision not to review its RF exposure guidelines was "arbitrary and capricious", it was a win for Children's Health Defense **(CHD).** In 2023, **CHD** took the FCC back to court again, yet still no action from the FCC. Perhaps the FCC by asking for public comments now will comply with the court order, review the scientific literature, and protect our health, children's

health, future generations as well as the health effects on animal, plants, insects, and the environment.

2. On Sunday October 11, we received a notice from Blue Streak, USA on our front door, the approved vendor of Gigapower, Telecommunications,LLC informing us that they will be in our neighborhoods from 10/12/2026 -11/27/2026 installing fiber optic on utility poles to improve connectivity in your area. **This action is far from benign**. It precludes local and state control of our health especially for children and vulnerable populations. Is this the new norm… (radiofrequency waves everywhere, smart meters, mesh network, etc.?) This was not in the local news so the public could question the telecommunication infrastructure in our neighborhoods where we live, children play in the park, people walk their dogs, folks exercise etc.

   Repeal the Telecommunications Act of 1996 section 704. "The FCC's exposure standards are outdated and flawed. Their guidelines predated 5G and failed to account for cumulative exposure from multiple sources such as cell phones, WiFi, and Bluetooth." **www.704nomore.org/**

In conclusion: " You may choose to look the other way, but you can never say again that you did not know". William Wilberforce 1753-1833 (British Politician, Philanthropist, leader of the movement to abolish the slave trade).

Thank you for listening to my voice and these extremely important issues.