

Summary of FHEO FOIA regarding RF/EMF Accommodation Requests – 2000-2020

Terms searched: environmental illness, EI, microwave sickness, microwave, non-ionizing radiation, radiation, wireless harm, radar, smart meter, radio frequency, RF, RFR, electromagnetic frequency, EMF, electromagnetic hypersensitivity, EHS, electromagnetic sensitivity, electrical sensitivity, ES, radio wave sickness, electrical allergy, cell tower.

A total of 131 entries were received. Of these, 101 were responsive to RF/EMF bio-effects, and 1 to RF interference to an insulin pump. The remainder were unresponsive. Of the 101 responsive entries, 59 were regarding smart meter emissions, 20, other EMF and RF transmitters and sources, and 22 regarding electromagnetic harassment. Smart meters complaints encompassed the individual and or their family members being forced from their homes due to the radiation, suffering physically in their homes, being prevented from installing an analog meter, and/or suffering discrimination by way of extra meter reading fees. The other EMS complaints included cell towers placed on HUD property, other outside antennas, street light, surveillance camera, water sprinkler system, cell phones, and Wi-Fi antenna radiation, and electric heater emissions. The 22 harassment claims involve directed energy surveillance, and other forms of harassment.

This report is not a comprehensive accounting of all RF/EMF disability complaints, but only those that made it to inquiry or investigation. We do not know the number of claims that were dismissed outright due to the 2017 memos and letters¹ and prior discrimination against the RF/EMF disabled.

RF-related complaints doubled in 2015, nearly tripled in 2016, and fell off the year the memo was issued:

Total number of complaints by year (top line), smart meter complaints (bottom line)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1		1		2		1	1		3	4	1	2	5	5	10*	27*	10	8	16	4
													5	3	6	21	4	8	13	1

*10 of the 2015 and 2016 claims were closed in 2017 – the year the memo was issued.

Only two of the claims were closed as “conciliation/settlement successful.” All others were closed as “no valid issues,” “no valid basis,” “no cause determination,” and “dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.” Closure comments included the claim that because the respondent was not a housing provider (for example, an electric company, a city, etc.), FHEO lacked jurisdiction, and such statements as:

¹ Smyth memo, Pelletier memo, and Smart meter closure letters

“... there does not exist any reasonable nexus between the proximity to a 'Smart Meter' and the exacerbation of any disabling condition. 'A smart meter is usually an electronic device that records consumption of electric energy in intervals of an hour or less and communicates that information at least daily back to the utility for monitoring and billing.’” (FOIA Response II)

“There is no evidence that Respondents, both the utility company as well as Complainants neighbor, are emitting radiation (from WI-Fi, cell phones and wireless utility meters), exposing Complainant and her children differently than any other person, plant, or animal is exposed to the same amount of radiation, in excess of the levels that are tolerable, as determined by the authorities who license the operation of these devices.” (FR II)

“Because there is no scientifically recognized link to health side effects from EMF or Smart Meters, there is no nexus between Complainant's disability and the accommodation requested.” (FR II)

“Electromagnetic hypersensitivity is not recognized as a medical diagnosis.” (FR II)

FHEO assertion that it was unable to negotiate with non-housing providers is false because of the necessity of having utilities. HUD regulation states the the Fair Housing Act (FHA) covers:

“any conduct relating to the provision of. . .services and facilities in connection [with housing] that otherwise makes unavailable or denies a dwelling to persons.... [which includes] refusing to provide municipal services.”² Indeed, one of the settled cases was with an electric company.³ Also, it is hard to imagine that FHEO has never negotiated with other outside entities.⁴

There is no escaping the fundamental problem – unwanted invisible electromagnetic radiation invading people's homes without consent and physically harming them. EMF/RF radiation is invisible, but not innocuous,⁵ and as such, it is the obligation of FHEO to pursue and settle all housing discrimination complaints to insure safe and secure housing for all.⁶ The Smyth memo must be withdrawn.⁷

2 [eCFR :: 24 CFR Part 100 -- Discriminatory Conduct Under the Fair Housing Act](#)

3 [HUD-meter-settlement-Redacted.pdf](#)

4 [HUD Archives: HOC Reference Guide -- Hazards & Nuisances \(Page 1-18\)](#)

5 [Environmental Health Trust et al. v. FCC Key Documents - Environmental Health Trust](#)

6 [The Fair Housing Act](#)

7 [NSS Memo](#)