Massport should allow individual tenants to set up their own WiFi internet access on their properties and offer this access as a service (either free or for a fee) to their customers and employees, for the following reasons:

- competition between providers will increase service levels and decrease prices for the public
- Massport is a non-elected state agency and therefore should not be trusted to offer services in the best public interest
- Cited reasons not to offer services concering possible interference are unwarranted, as Massport's offer to provide similar service (for a fee) does not mitigate or better any interference
- Massport's cited danger to public safety / Homeland Security is are untrue, since these dangers are similar on Massport's network, and offering of multiple networks will add to reliability of the overall service offered.
- Quoted Central Antenna rules do not apply to this situation, since the service offering between the providers (including Massport's provider) are different enough for the public to be benefit from different providers
- Central Antenna rules are generally implemented to avoid households from putting up antenna structures that are perceived to be visually unestethical; this surely doesn't apply to WiFi structures, that generally are very well hidden from public sight.

Therefore, it is my strong and pertinent opinion that Massport overstepped its boundaries and that lease restriction based on setting up public or private wireless 802.11b/g networks should be deemed invalid.

Thanks,

--Ramon Kolb
Belmont, MA