

Reply of my comments on RF/EMF – SN 10/21/26

Request for Information

For this RFI, HHS is seeking input from the public, including individuals, families, caregivers, healthcare professionals, public health practitioners, researchers, organizations, equipment or product manufacturers, service or infrastructure providers, and other interested stakeholders that have knowledge of or experience with RF/EMF emission and exposure. Please identify whether your response is based on peer-reviewed research, government reports, industry data, clinical observations, or other sources. If you rely on existing exposure guidelines, regulatory frameworks, or scientific assessments, please identify the specific framework(s) and explain how they inform your response. Respondents are encouraged to include supporting facts, research, datasets, technical reports, and other evidence in their comments, including citations to the published materials referenced, and active hyperlinks, where available.

Instructions

1. Responses submitted at [regulations.gov/deregulation](https://www.regulations.gov/deregulation) should follow the format provided there. You may respond to one or more of the questions listed below and please include question numbers provided in the response. Each responding entity (person or organization) should submit only one response. Unless submitted anonymously, responses should include the name(s) of the person(s) or organization(s) submitting the comment. If a comment is submitted on behalf of an organization, the individual respondent's role in the organization may also be provided. In your response, please describe which perspective(s) your comments represent: individual consumer, patient, family member, or caregiver; healthcare professional; equipment or product manufacturer; service or infrastructure provider; business; industry group; government; research entity; or another type of organization or perspective.

This RFI is voluntary, and responses may be submitted anonymously. Please do not submit proprietary, classified, confidential, or sensitive information, to include personally identifiable (PII) or personal health information (PHI), in response to this RFI.

This RFI should not be construed as a policy, solicitation for applications, or as an obligation on the part of the government to provide support for any ideas in response to it. Comments submitted will become public on [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). The information provided will be analyzed and may appear in anonymized reports, on HHS websites, or otherwise released publicly. Respondents are advised that the government is not obligated to acknowledge receipt of submissions. Those submitting responses are solely responsible for all expenses associated with response preparation. HHS will use the information submitted in response to this RFI at its discretion and will not comment on any respondent's submission. However, responses to this RFI may be reflected in future solicitation(s) or policies.

Questions

Public Experiences and Reported Potential Adverse Health Effects

2. In your response, please describe which perspective(s) your comments represent: individual consumer, patient, family member, or caregiver; healthcare professional; worker with occupational exposure; equipment or product manufacturer; service or infrastructure provider; business; industry group; government; research entity; or another type of organization or perspective.

3. We invite individuals, families, caregivers, healthcare professionals, and organizations to share experiences regarding potential adverse health effects they believe may be associated with

exposure to RF/EMFs. Respondents are encouraged to provide as much detail as they are comfortable sharing, recognizing that responses to this RFI will be public and therefore should not include PII or PHI. Examples of information that may be helpful to include are the following:

a. The type(s) of wireless technology or RF/EMF source(s) involved (e.g., mobile phones, Wi-Fi, smart meters, wireless infrastructure, wearable devices, occupational equipment).

Individual (also a health care practitioner, and organization (West Virginians for Clean Air). In reference to RF/EMF sources that include: mobile phones, Wi-Fi, smart meters, wireless infrastructure, wearable devices, cell towers, satellites and NEXRAD.

b. The nature, duration, frequency, and approximate timing of the reported exposure(s).

Individual: I experienced RF/EMF exposure when my electric company NYSEG installed a smart meter on my home without my knowledge or permission in 2016 /2017. I began having ill effects and called elec. Co. & Fire department. Investigation showed no carbon monoxide exposure as the electric company suggested.. One of the Firemen pointed out that I had a smart meter and that I should investigate it.

c. The potential adverse health effects experienced.

I began having heart palpitations, headaches, breathing difficulties, dizziness, malaise and shooting neuralgic pains, brain fog and confusion, loss of sleep and appetite, feeling on skin and body of pins and needles which made/ makes me feel like I'm on fire, and the hearing and felling the low & high RF/EMF frequencies. It was and is pure hell.

d. When potential adverse health effects first appeared relative to when exposure began and whether any changes in exposure coincided with potential adverse health effects.

Adverse health effects appeared immediately to exposure. After initial exposure conditions only worsened from nearby cell towers, wifi, lap top computers, Mobil phones, GPS from vehicles, and any other RF/EMF devices.

It especially worsened after 6 cell towers went up near my home and the village and township installed not only smart meters for electricity but also installed smart water meters on every home. The entire area became a network of RF/EMF exposure.

e. Whether medical evaluation or treatment was sought, including any diagnoses received (if the respondent chooses to share them).

Yes, I did seek medical treatment, and was diagnosed with a ICD-10 coded condition known as "Effects of Electromagnetic Radiation". My Physician insisted that the only way to my health would be restored was by having an analog meter reinstalled. I do have a letter from my physician stating my condition and her recommendations for restored health.

f. Whether steps to reduce or eliminate exposure were taken and, if so, whether any subsequent changes in potential adverse health effects were observed.

Yes, many steps were taken to eliminate exposure.

1. All personal item such as mobile phone, wifi in the home, connecting to internet via Ethernet, etc. were removed by me.
2. I contacted the electric company to have the smart meter removed and requested an analog be put back on. I was rejected the analog and given the choice of an "opt out" digital meter, which was really my only choice. I was then left with trying to mitigate the dirty electricity coming from the "Opt out" digital meter they put on my home.
3. I wrote a complaint to the Public Service Commission only to be ignored as they supported the electric company and not the public.
4. I joined a grouped of citizens formed to get our analog meters back and stop the RF/EMF poisoning of all of us. We had several meetings and letters written to the PSC.
5. I tried to mitigate with RF/EMF shielding material, which was extremely costly and only was mildly effective.
6. After 21 years in my beloved home & small farm I sold it and moved out of NY State to find relief.
7. I did find another home which the RF/EMF was lower, but now with 5G & 6G installed it is getting bad again. In my new home I was promised an analog meter before I bought it. Once I purchased it the electric company refused to put an analog meter on and I once again have a digital meter with the threat of a smart meter being installed. There are a few cell towers in the nearby area as well as neighbors who have wifi boosters. I am currently very concerned about the escalation of RF/EMF exposure now being added to the mixture through programs such as weather modification, such as NexRad, satellites, HAARP, and other modification. The entire planet is now engulfed in RF/EMF radiation. There is no escaping it. It seems corporations and government rule in these matters and the people have no choice and no protection. The FCC is not for the protection of the earth's citizens, rather corporations. There need to be better regulations for safety and a cap on how far these technologies should go.

I speak not only for m self, but as a retired educator/ National Park Ranger with a background in natural resources, education and social history. I am speaking up for our children, the environment, the ecological systems of our one planet (that when put out of balance will not survive, or we won't survive). I speak up as a newly certified health practitioner who see's many sick individuals, whom are sick from so many factors of environmental ills (GMO's pesticides, preservatives, poor eating habits and most importantly from exposure to RF/EMF's). I am also a member of WVCA and am very concerned about the effects of Geoengineering, Including the network of RF/EMF that it uses in its programs.

g. Any supporting documentation, including scientific reports, exposure measurements, or other relevant information

Yes, I have my doctor's note, the letter written to the Public Health Commission, then there are the NYS Senate Bills to protect citizens from smart meters SB1550, SB8515. Then there is also the issue of the misuse by Electric companies collecting, recording, or storing smart meter data from personal information. The SB6566 exists to prevent the selling of this private data collection. There are many documentations on RF/EMF radiation and the negative effects on humans and other forms of life on earth. This includes the US Navy, and many other divisions of the government. It is unfortunate that I have not had more time to work on documentations. I have a busy life and it is the end of the deadline for this submission. There is much, much more documentation.

<https://www.gao.gov/assets/ced-78-79.pdf>

<https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/Volume-8.pdf>

<https://ourtownourchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/RF-EMR-Exposures-v5.pdf>

<https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/EHT-et-al.-v.-FCC-Factsheet-EHTRUST.org-1-1.pdf>

Patents: I know there are US patents that are inclusive of RF/EMF usage and potential damage that can be caused to humans.

4. We invite healthcare professionals, researchers, and public health practitioners to describe observations from clinical practice, occupational settings, or research that may help identify patterns, if any, of reported potential adverse health effects associated with RF/EMF radiation and exposure. In describing these observations, please include where available:

N/A new to my practice.

5. What existing national and international exposure standards, guidelines, or regulatory frameworks should federal health agencies consider when evaluating the potential adverse health effects of human exposure to RF/EMF?

n. What scientific, technical, or regulatory changes by federal health agencies, if any, would improve the assessment, disclosure, and regulation of wireless radiation exposure?

FCC needs to change their regulations on RF/EMF exposure limits and instill better regulation over the corporations using them. It should not be a free for all. Corporation need to stop being protected by laws imp[lamented without public knowledge. Briefly, what President Clinton instituted for the protection of corporations, not the citizens. There need to be other laws and rules of law to protect people.

o. Is additional research needed to develop, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of procedures and techniques for minimizing exposure to electronic product radiation? Where are the largest gaps, if any, in knowledge? What research is needed to appropriately evaluate current or future national and international exposure standards, guidelines, or regulatory frameworks.

YES, Absolutely!!! Largest gap is the FCC. Also in the network of things and insane agendas such as Agenda 2030 in connection with RF/EMF utilization. Research: Weather modification programs inclusive of RF/EMF, including the spraying of nano-particles and other toxins potentially used in RF/EMF programs.

p. How, if at all, should a classification system account for exposure-related characteristics, including operating frequency, power density, specific absorption rate (SAR), electric- and magnetic-field strength, modulation and pulse characteristics, duty cycle, beamforming,

simultaneous exposure to multiple frequencies, duration of exposure, distance from the source, proximity to the body, and cumulative exposure over time?

First of all these technologies should not have been put in place until they were made safe. Make it possible for everyone to live in a safe space. Through mitigation or elimination of unsafe RF/EMF emissions near homes, schools, wilderness areas, etc. Make the technology safer. Ensure anyone can have a safe home through effective shielding (EMR blocking paint) at reasonable pricing). Build RF/EMF safe homes and living spaces and hospitals and other health care units. Curtail laws of operation of these RF/EMF units. Limit hours of operation, limit use of natural resources, protection of Natural resources, etc. Enforce the laws. Create better regulations to protect us not the corporations.

6. What scientific evidence exists about potential adverse health effects caused by current exposure limits?

The Navy has documentation. I know there are many other resources.

Measuring Human Exposure and Public Health Surveillance

7. What scientific methods are currently available for accurately characterizing individual and population-level RF radiation exposure?

Hand held RF/EMF reading meters. But what good are they if there is no way of regulating the oncoming slaughter of radiation?

8. What, if any, improvements in exposure assessment methodologies are needed to better evaluate real-world exposure conditions?

Honesty, integrity, transparency of all involved corporations and other parties. Accountability from all. Corporations and other agencies need to report usage of RF/EMF and how much, and what for. It should be public knowledge.

9. What, if any, technical and exposure-related information should be disclosed to consumers, residents, workers, schools, healthcare providers, and local governments?

All

10. What data sources or surveillance systems currently exist to monitor potential adverse health effects associated with RF radiation exposure? Should additional data sources or surveillance systems be developed? Please discuss the benefits and challenges of the following data sources and surveillance systems, as relevant:

- a. disease registries.
- b. occupational monitoring.
- c. environmental monitoring.
- d. longitudinal cohort studies.
- e. biomonitoring.

- f. adverse event reporting.
- g. disease or illness clusters.
- h. Other.

11. Should exposure assessment or risk evaluation differ for sensitive populations such as those noted below? Please explain.

Yes to all of the listed below. Seems like a no brainer. They should be the most protected in our world.

- a. children.**
- b. pregnant women.**
- c. older adults.**
- d. individuals with implanted medical devices.**
- e. workers with elevated occupational exposure.**
- f. individuals with preexisting medical conditions.**
- g. Other populations that may uniquely experience potential adverse health effects in response to RF radiation.**

Existing Evidence – Children’s Health Defense has much evidence. “704 no more”

12. What scientific evidence exists regarding potential adverse health effects associated with RF radiation exposure at levels below current federal exposure limits?

See “704 no more” 704NoMore.org

13. According to scientific evidence, how do the technologies below affect cumulative exposure patterns? 704NoMore.org, [Wi-Fi Technology and Human Health Impact: A Brief Review of Current Knowledge - PMC](#), [Health Hazards of Wireless Technologies — Collaborative for Health & Environment](#). There is so much more information available than I have time to include. sorry

- a. 5G.**
- b. 6G.**
- c. Wi-Fi.**
- d. Satellite-based communications.**
- e. Internet of Things (IoT).**
- f. Wearable technologies.**
- g. Smart homes/appliances.**
- h. Smart cities.**

- i. Autonomous vehicles.
- j. Wireless medical devices.
- k. Communication enabled smart meters.

14. What scientific evidence exists regarding potential adverse environmental effects associated with RF radiation?

Again, there is so much more information available than I have time to include. But I will say as a past beekeeper I do know pollinators are suffering and declining. The research is out there.

15. What types of scientific evidence should be considered when evaluating RF exposure associated with wireless infrastructure? Please comment on:

- a. proximity to homes, schools, childcare facilities, healthcare facilities, and/or workplaces.
- b. cumulative neighborhood exposure.
- c. antenna density.
- d. small-cell deployment.
- e. livestock.

Add pollinators

Federal Research Priorities

16. What are the highest priority research gaps regarding EMF and RF radiation and public health that the federal health agencies should address?

FCC Regulations and limits on RF/EMF emission everywhere. What, who, when, where and what controls are in place that need to be changes to protect people.

17. How can federal health agencies improve coordination of EMF and RF radiation research? Please comment on potential roles for federal health agencies including, but not limited to:

Be committed to change for the better, ensure committee funding for research and for change sooner than later. Work with other agencies in collaboration. Visit UN agendas that may be harmful in their utilization of RF/EMF programming.

a. HHS Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Accountability and transparency. Collaborative work with other agencies.

b. HHS National Institutes of Health (NIH). Accountability and transparency. Collaborative work with other agencies.

c. HHS Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Accountability and transparency. Collaborative work with other agencies.

Additional Information

18. Please identify any additional scientific evidence, technical information, data, or recommendations that federal health agencies should consider when evaluating potential adverse health effects associated with RF/EMF radiation exposure.

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.
[FR Doc. 2026-19252 Filed 9-17-26; 12:30 pm]
BILLING CODE 4164-01-P

[Download File](#)