Public Comment on Electromagnetic Fields and Wireless Radiation

Re: HHS-OASH-2026-0397-0001

To the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services:

I am submitting this comment to share my personal experiences with electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and wireless technology and to request stronger scientific investigation, transparent information, and meaningful lower-exposure alternatives for consumers.

Since approximately 2020, I have experienced debilitating physical symptoms that I associate with exposure to certain electronic devices, wireless technologies, vehicles, and buildings. These experiences have affected my health, independence, ability to work, transportation, travel, and finances. I recognize that a reported association does not by itself establish the cause of symptoms. Nonetheless, the practical effects on my life are substantial, and people reporting these experiences deserve serious, respectful scientific study.

Health Effects and Loss of Independence

Symptoms I have experienced in environments or around devices I associate with electromagnetic exposure include severe pain, headaches, neurological sensations, fatigue, and cognitive difficulties. I have had to reorganize major parts of my life around finding environments and technologies I can tolerate.

I have been unable to drive since March 2024 and rely on rideshare transportation and other arrangements. Finding suitable transportation has become increasingly difficult as more wireless and electronic features are built into vehicles. These changes have reduced my independence and added financial and logistical burdens.

Modern Vehicles and the Need for Consumer Choice

My 2021 Acura TLX Technology model was a vehicle I tolerated well. When I tried newer models, however, I experienced symptoms that I associated with their technology. I obtained an Acura Integra Technology model but experienced severe pain and had to return it. An Integra A-Spec model was tolerable for me, whereas other newer Acura models I tried were not. I have also experienced problems in newer Lexus SUVs and Kia vehicles.

I report difficulty tolerating electric and hybrid vehicles as well. Even gasoline-powered vehicles can present challenges when equipped with more wireless features, such as built-in wireless phone chargers that cannot be disabled, Wi-Fi hotspots, Bluetooth connections, voice assistants such as Alexa, and other continuously connected systems.

I am not asking manufacturers to abandon innovation. I am asking them to preserve practical lower-exposure choices: vehicles with wired alternatives, truly disableable wireless transmitters, clear emissions information, and configurations that do not require customers to use every wireless feature.

Cell Phones: Modern Options Comparable to Older Models

Cell phones are now essential for communication, healthcare, work, banking, and transportation. Yet newer phones have become particularly difficult for me to tolerate. In my experience, iPhone XS-generation and earlier models have generally been more tolerable than newer devices. I noticed especially strong reactions around the iPhone 11 generation.

This is a description of my personal experience, not a claim that every newer phone emits more radiation than every older model. The emission characteristics and operating conditions of different phones should be compared independently.

I urge HHS and relevant agencies to encourage manufacturers to offer new, secure smartphones with user-controllable wireless functions and lower measured emissions under realistic usage conditions. Consumers should not have to rely on obsolete phones that no longer receive essential security updates in order to find a model they can tolerate.

- Support independent, transparent testing of phone emissions across models and operating conditions.
- Provide simple, reliable controls for wireless transmitters and connected features.
- Preserve wired accessories and communication options.
- Study why some people report tolerating certain devices better than others, using rigorous blinded and physiological research methods.

Smart Meters: Free Wired Alternatives and Safe Exposure Reduction

Wireless smart meters on homes are another major concern. Unlike a personal device that can be switched off or left behind, utility meters may be installed on or near living spaces without a practical way for the resident to avoid them. Some utilities impose installation fees or ongoing charges on customers who decline wireless metering.

I believe customers should be able to request wired or nontransmitting meters without extra installation or recurring opt-out charges. Access to essential electricity, water, and other utility services should not depend on accepting wireless equipment or paying a penalty to decline it.

Where a wireless meter remains installed, utilities should offer and pay for professionally assessed exposure-reduction measures, including appropriate shielding where technically feasible and safe. Such measures should be independently verified and must not compromise electrical safety, meter accuracy, communications needed for essential service, or compliance with applicable codes.

- Require meaningful, no-cost wired or nontransmitting meter options for homeowners and renters wherever feasible.
- Eliminate recurring opt-out charges for customers requesting lower-exposure metering.
- Require transparent disclosure of meter frequencies, power levels, transmission schedules, and measured exposure under representative conditions.
- Study residential installations, including meter banks adjacent to bedrooms and other occupied areas.
- Provide utility-funded, independently evaluated mitigation options when requested.

Housing, Hotels, and Other Buildings

Finding suitable housing and hotel accommodations has become an ongoing challenge. I spend considerable time and money researching properties, investigating cell tower proximity, requesting particular rooms, and sometimes moving when I experience symptoms.

Distance from a cell tower is not enough to predict how I will experience a building. Even when a hotel or residence appears suitable because it is farther from cell towers, the property may contain extensive wireless infrastructure: Wi-Fi access points, smart televisions, wireless thermostats, smart locks, and other connected devices.

I would like hotels, residences, and workplaces to retain practical wired options and the ability to disable nonessential wireless equipment, while providing transparent information about installed systems. Buildings should not become inaccessible to people who report difficulty tolerating these environments simply because everything has been made wireless by default.

Financial and Personal Consequences

These challenges go well beyond inconvenience. I have spent substantial time and money trying to locate transportation and accommodations I can tolerate. The need to research and evaluate each new vehicle, room, or device makes ordinary activities uncertain and expensive. I want to regain my independence and participate fully in society, but the disappearance of nonwireless choices makes that increasingly difficult.

Independent Research and Public Health Policy

I understand that the scientific evidence regarding symptoms attributed to EMF exposure, the mechanisms involved, and the adequacy of existing exposure standards remains debated. I am asking HHS to address those uncertainties through rigorous, independent research rather than dismissing the people reporting symptoms or assuming causation without sufficient evidence.

- Investigate long-term, repeated, and combined exposures from radiofrequency and extremely low-frequency sources, with careful exposure measurement.
- Evaluate whether current standards adequately address real-world patterns of exposure and relevant vulnerable populations.
- Conduct well-designed, independently replicated studies of reported electromagnetic sensitivity, including blinded exposure protocols and objective physiological outcomes where appropriate.
- Study potential neurological, inflammatory, and other biological responses without presuming a particular result.
- Publish clear, accessible information about uncertainty, study quality, and actual measured exposures.
- Include people reporting significant symptoms in research planning and accessibility discussions.

Requested Actions

I respectfully urge HHS to coordinate with relevant federal and state agencies, regulators, researchers, manufacturers, and utilities to promote independent science, transparent product testing, and meaningful consumer choice. In particular, I request modern lower-exposure smartphone options; no-cost wired or nontransmitting smart meters; utility-funded, safety-verified mitigation where appropriate; vehicles with disableable wireless systems; and wired options in buildings and accommodations.

Conclusion

My experiences have fundamentally changed my daily life. Driving, using a phone, finding a place to stay, and obtaining ordinary services have become far more difficult than they once were. I am not asking society to abandon technology. I am asking that innovation preserve choice, that claims about health effects be investigated rigorously, and that people reporting serious difficulties not be left without workable options or forced to pay extra for essential services.

Thank you for considering my experience and these recommendations.

Public Spaces, Involuntary Exposure, and a Precautionary Approach

I also believe the public-health discussion should address involuntary exposure to electromagnetic fields and wireless signals in shared spaces. To me, this raises an issue similar to secondhand smoke: a person can encounter an exposure in a public place without choosing it, and may have limited ability to avoid it. I use this as an analogy about consent and shared environments, not as a claim that EMF exposure has been scientifically established to carry the same health risks as tobacco smoke.

Wireless technology is now built into transportation, stores, offices, healthcare settings, schools, hotels, and other public places. People who report symptoms associated with these environments may find it difficult to participate fully in everyday life. I believe we need practical ways to use technology more thoughtfully so that public spaces remain accessible to everyone.

I am also concerned that many people may not recognize or question their everyday electromagnetic exposures. Consumers reasonably expect manufacturers and government agencies to evaluate products and protect public health. While existing exposure standards and regulatory oversight do exist, important scientific questions remain, including questions about long-term, cumulative, and real-world exposures. I believe these questions warrant continued independent research, transparent communication, and periodic review of safety standards.

Technology provides tremendous benefits, and I am not opposed to innovation. But its development should put safety first. Where reasonable questions or accessibility concerns remain, manufacturers should prioritize safer design, reduce unnecessary emissions where feasible, provide wired and lower-exposure options, and make wireless features genuinely optional. In my view, technology should be deployed responsibly, with meaningful safeguards, rather than adopted simply because it is possible.

I ask HHS to consider how research, product design, public-space planning, and consumer choice can work together so that technological progress does not come at the expense of inclusion, public confidence, or health.