

I am a regular traveler and have had the opportunity to use WiFi at many hotels. I always try the hotel WiFi on the off chance that the service will be good. Nine times out of ten I have to set up a hotspot using my cell phone because the hotel WiFi is unusably slow. The reason people run their own hotspots is because the alternative is dial-up quality internet. Hotspots are not free - it is easy to go over your cellular data allotment if you use hotspots frequently.

I live in a high-rise apartment building in New York City. I typically see 20-plus of my neighbors' SSIDs. Yet somehow my WiFi works just fine. My apartment closely matches the hotel room scenario, where hotspots are contained to small (room-sized) areas and the layout of the rooms tends to dictate the cell layout.

The scenario in a conference hall is different of course, but the basic principle remains the same: if the hotel-provided quality of service was acceptable and reasonably priced then nobody would need to use hotspots. Why should the government protect the hotel industry from making the investment required to provide expected service?

Based on other comments on this proceeding I can see that there is one area where the rules should be clarified. The definition of "jamming" is too narrow and RF-centric. Obviously the intention of anti-jamming rules is to prevent any interference with legitimate usage of the airwaves. The language should be broadened to include "WiFi de-auth" jamming.