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I am Leroy Comrie. I'm the Chair of the Committee on Consumer Affairs. Today, we are holding our first hearing on Intro Bill 727-A, a local law to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York in relation to the sale of tickets to individual consumers by operators of theater, music or sporting events taking place in New York City at places of entertainment.

I'd like to begin by thanking the Department of Consumer Affairs for joining us today, as well as representatives from the ticket resale industry and consumer advocacy groups. In 2007, a law was enacted repealing all restrictions governing the price of resold tickets. Prior to the repeal, licensed ticket sellers could not increase a ticket price by more than $45 \%$ of its original value for large venues or $20 \%$ of its original value for venues seating fewer than 6,000 people. By repealing pricing restrictions, the new law, which is due to sunset next month, leaves the price ceiling on resold tickets entirely up to the market. The law also bans the resale of tickets on the street within certain distances
from the venue depending on its size, but allows theaters to open their own resale locations on their premises.

The repeal was supported by many within the industry, including theater owners, licensed ticket resellers and the owners of certain sporting venues; many of which said that the repeal would ultimately benefit the consumer. It was also supported by such government leaders, such as the Mayor, Michael Bloomberg, then Governor Eliot Spitzer, who preferred to let market forces dictate the price of the ticket. Not surprisingly, consumer advocacy groups criticized the bill saying that it would lead to higher ticket prices and decreased ticket availability to a person of average income.

Here we are today, almost two years to the day after the repeal of pricing regulations. How have the consumers fared? It turns out not too well. Ticket sellers have been using technology that acquire large quantities of tickets in a short span of time, causing entire venues to sell out all their tickets in just a few minutes. For those who were not lucky enough to
purchase the tickets during their brief window of availability, ticket resellers are the only option. Unfortunately for most, ticket sellers often sell the ticket at a cost several times the original price, creating an insurmountable obstacle for the average consumer.

Introductory Bill 727-A seeks to
address this issue by requiring that all venues with a permanent seating capacity of 3,000 , or more, reserve at least $15 \%$ of the total number of tickets made available for purchase to an event for sale at their own onsite box office. This 15\% would not include season tickets, tickets purchased as a part of a subscription package and/or other tickets not available for purchase by the general public. Events scheduled to take place on a daily basis at the same venue over the course of more than a week, such as Broadway and off-Broadway theater productions, would also be exempt.

Furthermore, each customer would be limited to purchasing four tickets per event per day at the onsite box office and each ticket would be required to be printed with the date and time
of sale. Venues subject to this legislation would be required to maintain records disclosing the total number of tickets for sale at the onsite box office and the location of the corresponding seats, which would be made available to the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Affairs. Violators of this law would be subject to a fine of up to $\$ 500$ per violation.

I'd like to point out that Intro 720-A is one of many possible solutions to the ticket scarcity in New York City. In addition to evaluating the merits of this legislation, we will also like to hear what other options we should pursue and have been meeting with many entities to try to work on those options.

As the date to reinstitute New York's anti-scalping legislation draws closer, I look forward to discussing this timely topic and working together to ensure that everyone has access to entertainment at reasonable prices. Again, I'd like to thank everyone for joining us today. And, I will now ask Andy Eiler [phonetic] from DCA to come and give his presentation on behalf of the New York City Department of Consumer

Affairs. Good morning, Andy.
ANDREW EILER: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman. I'm Andrew Eiler. And, I'm the Director of Legislative Affairs for the Department of Consumer Affairs. Commissioner Mintz asked me to thank you for this opportunity to comment on Introductory $727-A$, a bill that would require certain places of entertainment to hold back for sale at their box offices a proportion of tickets for specially scheduled events.

This bill clearly seeks to
effectuate the laudatory goal of ensuring that the general public would have an opportunity to purchase highly coveted tickets for limited engagements at face value at the box office. It requires that entertainment venues hold back a certain number of tickets from resellers who could otherwise corner the market by making bulk ticket purchases and then, charging exorbitant prices for scarce tickets to popular performances or events, like concerts, megastar performers or playoff games.

To achieve this goal, the bill
would require that places of entertainment within

New York City, with permanent seating capacity of over 3,000 persons, set aside at least 15\% of tickets that are made available for purchase to special events for sale to individuals at the box office. It would also require that no more than four tickets be sold to each individual and the tickets have printed on its face the date and time of sale. Intro 727-A also requires that the place of entertainment maintain records of the total number of seats available for sale to individual consumers and the location of corresponding seats.

The bill would empower the Department of Consumer Affairs to enforce compliance with these provisions by requiring places of entertainment to make their required records available for inspection upon request by the Commissioner and issue violations accordingly. While the Department supports the purpose of this bill, we do have significant concerns about our ability to realistically enforce the bill's mandates. One concern is that the Department lacks hearing authority over these violations. Far more troublesome questions include the bill's requirement that $15 \%$ of tickets
made available for purchase be set aside needs clarification. What tickets for each performance or - - is made available for purchase? Is there a possibility that less than a full seating capacity of the place of entertainment be made available for purchase? The bill does not specify on what grounds tickets could be distributed to ticketholders without being counted as made available for purchase. This information is necessary to determine whether the place of entertainment is in compliance with the 15\% holdback requirement. If the number of tickets that could be distributed without being counted as made available can vary with each performance, it becomes even more difficult to determine compliance.

The bill does not specify for how long tickets reserved for individual sales would have to be held back at the onsite box office before they can be sold through outlets other than the box office. Is one day after they go on sale long enough? Should it be for at least one week? Should it be until the date of the performance? The recordkeeping requirements in
the bill do not enable the Department to assess compliance with the law. The requirement that place of entertainment maintain only records of the total number of tickets available for sale to individual consumers and the location of corresponding seats will not, upon audit, inform the Department whether or not there was compliance.

The Department admires the Chair's effort to ensure that the public has the opportunity to purchase tickets to special events and performances at the box office at face value. We also appreciate the ticket sellers' legitimate interest in selling their tickets while protecting consumers. We don't want to unduly burden the marketplace. We remain entirely open to working with the Committee to try to identify a mechanism by which we might realistically be able to achieve these important goals.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the bill. I'll be happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Thank you, Andy. So, you're saying pretty much that the

Commissioner likes the idea and likes the concept, understands that there has been a major problem with consumers trying to obtain tickets to venues, especially for certain special events that have happened in New York City. You're just concerned about some of the technicalities in the bill, correct?

ANDREW EILER: Well, the
technicalities, yes. The nuts and bolts of how to make it work. And, there are a lot of details that need to be filled in before we can, you know, effectively make it work.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. And, you talked about the issue of what-- and let the Commissioner, I heard him about the hearing authority and we'll be talking about that. If we could do hearing authority on just this industry, would the Commissioner be willing to accept that?

ANDREW EILER: You mean overall
hearing authority?
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: On just this industry, yes.

ANDREW EILER: Oh, just this industry. Without having it for this industry, I
mean, the enforcement would be even more problematic.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. ANDREW EILER: But, that's the first and simplest thing to fix. The others are a little more troublesome.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
Well, you talked about the issue of having what the technicality is of $15 \%$ of tickets made available for purchase. We were talking about making sure that the tickets that were offered to sale or the general tickets to offer to sale to the general public, not necessarily what they locked in as a season ticketholder or a subscription package or the luxury boxes, but the tickets that were offered to the general public.

ANDREW EILER: I understand we're not-- the issue that's raised by that, though, is that it's unclear what the denominator is for figuring out that the 15\% has been held back. In other words, the recordkeeping now required would simply say you have to tell us how many you've held back--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
requirement. But, you can't make a determination that that's been done properly unless you know what the denominator was that was used for calculating the 15\%.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
ANDREW EILER: And, without knowing that--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] But, aren't most of these venues, though, already have certain seating capacities for whatever event they put on? And so, if you're dealing with, say, just use an example, the Madison Square Garden or Radio City Music Hall, they have a certain-- their seats are pretty much the same depending on what type of concert. And, some concerts Madison Square Garden may fill up their floor space on the court, but most of the other concerts they are either just using the seating in the area.

ANDREW EILER: Well, if you were taking the seating-- the assembly permit seating capacity as the capacity that that would be the denominator. Then, it would be easy because 15\%
of that, that's how many tickets you're supposed to hold back.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
ANDREW EILER: However, the way
it's said here is that it's tickets made available for sale, which may be fewer than the capacity of the venue. And then, the question becomes which can legitimately not be counted in tickets being made available for sale and what that number is and how it's arrived at and so forth and so on, because that becomes the number that determines what the $15 \%$ will be. And, unless you know that number--

> CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
ANDREW EILER: -- you can't tell
whether the $15 \%$ has been held back.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right, right. But, you understand the need that we were trying to make sure that the venues can still do the tickets like they would to Little Leagues, which we would hope they would still be offering at a significant discount, you know, that the season ticketholders, which they normally set those aside anyway, they don't offer those to the
general public.
ANDREW EILER: We're not trying to say that you shouldn't-- that they shouldn't do that or eliminate that or anything else. I'm just pointing out that unless that's somehow factored into how to compute the $15 \%$ and that's clarified and guidelines given for what is and what isn't allowable, it becomes really problematic in terms of enforcing this compliance.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. But, you think we could get to that denominator with just a little work, where there's-- Okay.

ANDREW EILER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Good. And, even dealing with understanding what are made available for purchase is for the venues by a conversation with the venues over a specific period of time. Okay.

And then, you talk about the issue of the time for individual sales and, how long those times would be. We hadn't clarified time in the specific issue. I think we just talked about making sure that the individuals could get to having an opportunity to get to the venues to
purchase the tickets and with the qualifier of four tickets per credit card that that would-whenever it sold out, it sold out. Probably knowing that if it was an event such as a Bruce Springsteen concert, which happened, or Hannah Montana, which happened, you know, it's going to sell out pretty quickly. So, we didn't want to put a time factor on it or hold them to a time qualifier on that particular issue.

ANDREW EILER: Well, that's
probably, I mean, you know, if it's going to happen very quickly, then it'll be just taken care of the first day probably, the first two hours or whatever.

> CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.

ANDREW EILER: But, the issue does arise that if there's no clear guidelines in terms of what the holdback period is, it is possible to have it too short or, you know, basically that the holdback time is they just hold it back for a short period and then, you know, put it into the resale market. And, unless there's clear guidelines, it's difficult to know whether they have held it back for long enough.

We also did not address the percentage of resale markup. Did the Department have any idea on if you felt that, or if you've gotten any feedback from constituents or consumers regarding the price of resale markup recently?

ANDREW EILER: Basically, I think that's kind of taken out of our hands because there's no cap on the resale markup. So, I think we have not addressed that question at all.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: But, you have received complaints from consumers regarding the ticket prices or the availability to get tickets for different venues?

ANDREW EILER: Actually, we haven't. That's not a very major number, no. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Oh, no? ANDREW EILER: No. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. All right. So, you haven't received complaints from consumers when there have been venues that have happened in the City and they weren't able to get ticket access to?

ANDREW EILER: No, we have not
received a significant number of complaints about that.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: All
right. And, what problems do you see regarding the recordkeeping that could make it better for compliance?

ANDREW EILER: Well, that's a tricky one that we've been sort of trying to think about. And, there's a lot. That's one of the nuts and bolts questions that we'd really have to go over and see how it works because effectively it has to be, you know, enforcement would require considerable recordkeeping. But, we have to fine tune that quite a bit. And, I don't have any suggestions right off the bat in terms of what would make that work.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right,
right. But, clearly, you see that as a possibility for intervention and-- or, not a prospect for intervention, but possibility that the City could embrace if there was a clear path to creating some ability to make a record on it.

ANDREW EILER: Well, right. So, that's something that we'd have to explore to see
whether we can adequately identify what kind of records would make it possible to really ensure or establish whether or not everything has been done appropriately.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
And, if there continues to be no statewide regulation regarding ticket sales, could you see the City doing its own anti-ticket resale law? The sunset is supposed to end next month or later this month.

ANDREW EILER: I don't want to think about that.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. I understand. I hear you. All right. Well, that clearly says that you're willing to take it on one way or the other.

ANDREW EILER: No. I wouldn't quite go that way. But, if it sunset, it sunsets. But, the results are just something I don't want to think about--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right. ANDREW EILER: -- until it happens. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. We've been joined by Council Member Oliver Koppell
from the Bronx. So, you're saying that the consumers haven't reached out to you. But, there've been, as you know, from the articles in the papers, a lot of hue and cry about the ability of individuals to gain access to venues, especially when there's a major concert or a major event that people want to get to and they find that they're blocked. They can't get an ability to get anywhere near purchasing a ticket because of the automatic purchase bots that they've come up with in the industry. So, clearly there's been a general hue and cry. I guess they just haven't felt that since the Department of the Consumer Affairs doesn't have a direct role in it, that's why they're not calling.

ANDREW EILER: I'm sure that that's exactly why. I mean, that's not the first thing people think about that they're going to be able to get tickets by calling the Department.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
ANDREW EILER: So, essentially, that's not their, you know, that's not where they're going to go.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Yeah.

```
they're satisfied. But, it's we're not going to
```

be the first place--
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] First person--
ANDREW EILER: -- they're going to
call.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- to
reach out to, right.
ANDREW EILER: Right.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: And,
clearly, there has been many efforts on the part
of consumers themselves and actually individuals
that have been affected by it, ala Bruce
Springsteen. They try to create their own rules
and regulations to try to deal with this or
opportunity to make-- or try to create an
opportunity for individuals to buy tickets to
their events. Okay. Councilman Koppell, do you
have any questions for DCA regarding this issue?
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I'm sorry
that I was late, Mr. Chairman. So, I don't know,
did--
right.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: -- the
witness discuss efforts in, apparent efforts in, Albany to deal with this issue in a slightly different way?

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: No, we hadn't talked about the Albany efforts as of yet. COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay. Well, maybe we'll talk about it later. I don't know whether-- maybe the witness would answer and say whether he's aware of efforts in Albany to deal with this issue.

ANDREW EILER: I think yes, there is some legislation. And, of course, the sunset bill is pending right now in terms of extending the sunset for the ticket law that's now in existence so that it would sunset in June. So, there's legislation to--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
[Interposing] And, what sunsets?
ANDREW EILER: Well, the current law that repeals the limitation on resale price. COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Yes. ANDREW EILER: That law sunsets at
the end of June.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So then, when that sunsets, we go back to limiting resale?

ANDREW EILER: Well, let me go back. This becomes very tricky because we have a double sunset at work here. So, I'm not exactly sure which law will come into effect once this one sunsets. But, yes, the cap on selling or resale price would, in some form, be put back into effect.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Oh, it's likely that Albany will deal with this issue at least in some respects before the end of the current session.

ANDREW EILER: That's the expectation.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, maybe, Mr. Chairman, we should wait and see what they do. I also understand that there's some pending legislation that would-- I understand that some of the ticket sellers would like to prohibit the brokers from buying huge blocks of tickets. And, that currently there is some software available that allows them to sort of circumvent the
restrictions that the venues themselves have placed or that the people who sell the tickets. And, that there's legislation in Albany to prevent that.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: I was
hoping to hear from people in the industry today-COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- about those issues. But, no one has signed up to testify so far. You can still sign up and testify at this point. Oh, he's testifying on behalf of-no one is signed up to testify at this point, other than one person. You didn't sign up. Okay. Well, we're still confused on whether one person is testifying or not. They didn't fill out a card. And, we're going to check that.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Chairman, I'll wait to see who testifies then.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: All right.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Perhaps they'll make a suggestion to you.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: There is
two different pieces of legislation in the State
that are looking to address the issue. Craig Johnson on the Senate side and I believe Assemblyman Espaillat on the Assembly side have both put in legislation to deal with the-- look at the issue and look at the whole problem regarding the ticket resale industry because of the complaints that they've received from individuals regarding their inability to get anywhere near a ticket without having to go through Stubhub or some independent reseller or even the-- and, the main problem that we received, especially this year, was that a lot of people are upset that they had to go back to even the owners at the stadiums for resale prices that were way above the price of the original ticket. So, that's one of the reasons why we wanted to-- one of the main reasons why we wanted to have the hearing because they were being redirected to the venues own resale vendors, where tickets went for several times the original price.

Is there anything else that you wanted to share with us at this particular time?

ANDREW EILER: No, I think that pretty much covers it.

Well, I want to thank you for coming. Do you know if your Commissioner has talked to the Statewide Commissioner regarding this particular item?

ANDREW EILER: No, I'm not. I'm
not aware.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. Well, I need to do that outreach directly. And, there was one other... And, are there any other entities that do resale of their own product that they distribute within their own entity that's licensed under the Department of Consumer Affairs? Any other entity that you licensed that allow direct resales of the product that they manufacture or distribute?

ANDREW EILER: No, none of the licensees that we have are in this area. I mean, the ticket broker license-- the ticket licensing was taken over by the State. That was the one thing that we used to do--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
ANDREW EILER: -- when the current
law. But, we don't have anything else that involves this kind of resale issue.

All right. Thank you. Well, thank you for coming.

ANDREW EILER: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Next, we have Joseph Freeman representing Ticketmaster and Donald Vaccaro representing TicketNetwork. [Pause] Okay. Whoever would like to go first. You got to turn-- make sure the red light is on. JOSEPH FREEMAN: Joseph Freeman, Senior Vice President with Ticketmaster. Mr. Chair, Honorable Councilmen, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify this morning. We share, Mr. Chair, your proposal's general goal of ensuring the fair and equitable distribution of tickets. We respectfully submit, however, that while well intentioned, it would not have the effects I think you are striving to accomplish. It's important to point out that the public has embraced the internet as the most convenient way to purchase tickets. We find that over 75\% of our ticket sales in North America are done across the internet. We also have a robust network of retail
outlets in grocery stores and otherwise where people can buy tickets at their convenience.

But, by and large, the public has spoken. They don't want to be waiting in long lines on cold mornings outside of a box office for blocks on end. They want to buy tickets from the comfort of their home on a Saturday morning while wearing their bathrobe. But, perhaps more importantly, we view the prospect or this proposal to mandatorily put 15\% of the tickets at the box office not only as a significant logistical and security challenge for our venue clients, but more importantly, it may have the exact opposite consequences as that intended by the measure. Specifically, when tickets go on sale for high demand shows, as we all remember from the past, there were very long lines.

And, the people most motivated to purchase tickets, when tickets are not efficiently priced up front, meaning when the face price of a ticket probably does not reflect its actual value, are going to be the people interested in reselling the ticket. I don't criticize those people, you know, primarily professional resellers for doing
so. It's a legitimate industry under the laws of this State. And, when done properly, delivers a very significant consumer service. But, by and large, those most motivated to go down to the box office and attempt to buy tickets are going to be those also interested in reselling them.

At Ticketmaster, we have invested significant resources into upholding and maintaining the integrity of the initial on-sale, so, that the public can purchase tickets in the most fair and equitable way possible. We have all kinds of cutting edge technologies involved in distinguishing between computers and human purchasers. We continue to invest in those technologies. We monitor the website regularly. When we find suspect internet protocol addresses hitting our website with undue frequency, we will go out and cancel those. We cooperate with law enforcement when we see unlawful activity. And, we can identify it. We, ourselves, have gone to Court and taken out of business through means of a Federal Court permanent injunction a leading purveyor of bots technology.

We share your goal, Honorable

Chairman. But, we do respectfully submit that putting 15\% at the box office may, in fact, be counterproductive.

On top of that, we work very closely with our event provider clients because the tickets being sold up front are not ours. They belong to the teams, the venues, the promoters, the actual event provider. And, they dictate to us what a ticket limit cap should be on a given event. We enforce that. We implement it. And, we do everything feasible to make sure that people are not circumventing that limit.

Most importantly, though, I want to point out how rapidly transforming this industry is. Last year, the rock group AC/DC did a nationwide tour; two to 3,000 of the best tickets in the house were paperless, meaning the credit card used to purchase the ticket, in effect, became the ticket. You didn't need a paper ticket. You came to the venue the night of the show. You swiped your credit card. A little receipt was printed out, almost like an e-ticket for airline travel, and in you went. Tom Waits did a tour last year. Smaller and medium-sized
theaters, 100\% paperless. We think that is the future of this industry, both in terms of consumer convenience, security and, above all, making sure fans have the best access possible to tickets. Thank you very much. DONALD VACCARO: Hi, good morning, Council Members. My name's Don Vaccaro. I'm the CEO of TicketNetwork, a Connecticut-based software company and marketer of tickets. I'm honored that you asked me to speak here today.

I started selling tickets in New York City since 1979. Since then, there have been many changes in the marketplace, but nothing has been more dramatic as the last five years since the worldwide web has come about. We've gained a tremendous amount of transparency. And, the economic principles are starting to kick in now. Nothing can demonstrate those more than the Yankees tickets prices on the secondary market that are selling greatly below face value this year. The actions of the secondary market show that the Yankees price their tickets way over equilibrium price. And, it's caused the Yankees to reduce their prices for the season and most
likely for next year. One thing to keep in mind is Forester Research released a report two years ago that said $40 \%$ of the tickets that are sold on the secondary market are sold for less than face value. So, the secondary market does provide numerous value priced tickets to consumers.

Broadway producers have reached out directly to our company in the secondary market to help them promote and sell events, 'cause we can offer services unique to them that they can't get from the primary market and have offered us shares to invest in some of their shows.

Even though we've seen Broadway adapt to the secondary market and sports adapt to the secondary market, we still haven't seen it as much with concerts. Probably the biggest reason why there's a problem with concerts is lack of transparency, which is something that I think that this meeting has a lot about, exactly how many tickets are sold to the public. To give you the best example that I could, about one month ago, the United States Judiciary Committee had a public hearing where the CEO, Irving Azoff, of Ticketmaster was there. Everyone was sworn under
oath. And, after questioning, he did admit that approximately $20 \%$ of the tickets being the best tickets in the house were hoarded and never put on sale. And, that they were kept by companies like his, a management company, to resell and to keep. And, they, in fact, created the exact shortage that was on the secondary market by holding the best seats for the best shows back. So, he admitted it was a problem in the industry.

There's also a few other problems that are unique to concerts. One is there are discriminatory contracts that venues have signed that diminish the rights of concert artists to sell their tickets as they choose. It's something that Bruce Springsteen brought up. While you might have a venue that he played in New Jersey, might give unlimited access for a sports team to sell tickets however they want, they restrict the concert artist from selling tickets anyway that they want and using a different vendor to sell it.

I do compliment you on the provision to sell tickets at the box office. I think it's very important that when venues, arenas, market tickets and they say tickets are
available at a certain price, that tickets are available at the box office for consumers to buy at the price without any services charges, which through the primary sellers, service charges could be as high as $40,50,60 \%$, depending on the actual concert and the price of the ticket. So, it would be in primary ticketers' best interest not to sell tickets at the box office because they make a lot more money on those service charge.
However, I think a lot of these
issues are going to be working out naturally over the next two years. I know Albany's looking into them. I know the Department of Justice is looking into them on a national level. I know Senator Schumer is looking to find something that acts on a national level. The one thing that $I$ think is important is that the economic principles will come through and we'll get an equilibrium price and finally concert artists will have the freedom that they've been asking for since even before Pearl Jam to distribute the tickets anywhere they want and to whoever they want without cumbersome primary contracts, specifically discriminating against a concert artist, which is definitely a
real problem.
One thing that I would hate to see happen, though, for the New York City market, is for New York to put some onerous provisions on selling their tickets and to make promoters less likely to promote shows in New York because it's another hurdle that they have to walk through. I think that what's going to happen on the State level would put New York in a fair playing ground. And, what we don't need in this industry right now is some sets of laws that differentiate so much between cities and states on what the rules are to sell tickets.

So, I would respectfully hope that we see what happens in Albany first with the sunset provision. I know they're asking a lot of the same questions that you are. I know transparency is a huge issue. You know, some of the solutions that we put in for our TicketNetwork proposals are in the packages of what we want. We want the discrimination to stop against concert artists. We want transparency that venues and arenas, which quite frequently happens in the sporting world that they announce how many tickets
go on sale. We want that transparency to be broadcast by venues and arenas so consumers know that there might be a show in New York where venue seats 18,000 , but they're only selling four or 5,000 seats to the public. Just make that transparency there and the consumers will know. And, what'll happen is the marketplace will start saying to that artist, hey, what are you doing with all these other seats. It happened with Hannah Montana when she was going all over the country after it was found it that there were thousands of tickets for every show that were held back. They were scalped on. Some of them were scalped on Ticketmaster's Ticket Exchange. And, those seats never made it--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: False statement.
DONALD VACCARO: -- to the public.
Never made it to the public.
So, you know, there's a lot of
reasons, you know, there's a lot of things that we can do legislatively to solve these issues and I think it's happening right now. So, again, my recommendation is just to wait, bring up these issues with the legislator in Albany and probably
approach this in a different way that would get you the same result. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Thank
you. We've been joined by Council Member Jim Gennaro. Well, first off, I just want to advise you, we did not include Broadway regular sales in this. We also did not include the sales for long term shows. We were really trying to focus, in this legislation, to deal with those unique concerts and not the long term ticket sales for even baseball.

But, it's become a problem especially, I mean, you brought up the Yankees and the issue of a tipping point with equilibrium, you know. Their whole issue with reselling is a problem as well. They set up a direct resale market within their own entity and a lot of consumers are upset with how they've set that up, as well and not even to deal with the customer service issue. That's a whole 'nother issue.

As you know, that happened this week with just the issue of what the percentage of the tickets are that the actual venue is selling for an event. The transparency $I$ think is real.

And, when you talked about, as in Hannah Montana, when they were only keeping a minimum of tickets out on the open market and, what they were doing with the majority of their tickets, I think that's a real issue for consumers.

Just to the gentleman from
Ticketmaster, you talked about technology and you talked about improving the technology to get rid of the auto bot software that's dominating the market now. Have you come out with some proven technology that you can talk about at this time that's eliminated that unfair advantage to people? JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, we use world-class technology developed by the computer science professors at Carnegie Mellon University, called the Re-capshot [phonetic]. It's a second generation capshot [phonetic] technology prevalent on the internet seeking to distinguish between computers and human users. There's a lot of internal work going on. It is not something I'm prepared to discuss publicly because, quite frankly-CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] Is it operational? that's operational and there's more that's coming. But, most importantly, as we begin to roll out the concept of paperless tickets, and I think you're going to see later this year some major household name concert acts touring across North America with 100\% paperless ticket concerts. And, when they do that, they will probably also offer a resale component capped at face price. The goal being ensure that for these very high demand shows, which, again, suffer from a significant imbalance between supply and demand. It's as simple as that. And, Mr. Vaccaro has built a very successful business around, you know, arbitraging, if you will, that supply and demand imbalance. The rubber will hit the road when the artist and the event provider have controlled their tickets and are able to dictate the pricing and whether, in fact, they're going to allow above face resale. Technology is going to solve this problem, sir.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
But, don't you think that there still should be an opportunity, I mean, not for-- and, when we, I
just want to be clear, when we're talking about having tickets at the box office, we were never talking about creating lines. I mean, you know, the box office could sell over the internet also. But, it's through the box office, as opposed to going through Ticketron one 800 number, you know, if a person gives a personal credit card with the maximum of four tickets, that can be done online or over the phone also. We never, I just want to be clear, we never talked about the issues of having people wait on long lines for tickets just to get tickets at the box office. The box office could also do online or phone sales.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, with all due respect, Ticketron has been out of business for about 18 years. The box office-CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Well, I meant--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: The box office
technologies are operated by an integrated computer system, whether it's Ticketmaster's, whether--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: --it's Tickets.com
or whether it's any of the other major ticketing service providers out there. The whole benefit to the venue, the whole benefit to the promoter is to have its inventory on a single integrated system. And, they would tell you that. And, I believe in our meetings with you, sir, that's been communicated.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: But, the problem with the single integrated system is the resale and the ability of the individuals to get the tickets at the front price and not the resale price.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: There's no reason the same dynamic would not be happening, if not even more so because the security might even be less cutting edge if there were a separate box office system. I respectfully submit, sir, we're talking about two very distinct issues.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: And, your issue is making sure that the venues control the tickets directly.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Making sure that fans have the best possible access to getting tickets at the time of the initial sale at the
face price offered for the ticket, correct. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.

And, but, you can't talk about what specific technology has come out.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I am not
authorized to discuss our confidential and proprietary trade secrets in terms of how the internal workings of the system operate. I can tell you there's absolute world-class technology being implemented. It is also, however, cat and mouse game, given how extensive the arbitrage opportunity is when there's a discrepancy between the initial face price and perceived demand leads to a higher actual market value. There's a huge amount of volume. And, when we block people's internet protocol addresses, we'll often see the same characters coming back through another channel.

## CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.

All right. And, you talked about earlier the need to do things legislatively on a State level. Have you been talking to the State about what those legislative suggestions are?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: We're engaged in

Albany. We're engaged with Senator Schumer's office. There's a lot of attention being given to these issues.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Can you talk about what happened with the settlement with the New Jersey Attorney General?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I can. What would you like to know, sir?

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Just the background and details of that settlement.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Of the settlement? The settlement document itself is public. We elected to enter into a settlement, quite frankly, to put things behind us. There's absolutely no finding of liability. Moreover, there was no finding of any diversion of tickets because the Attorney General, as she should have and did, did her job, thoroughly investigated the situation, saw exactly where each and every ticket went from and went to.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Um, hm.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: And, you know, a settlement was reached. Under the terms of that settlement agreement, it was pretty much to cover
the cost of their internal investigation.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. So, you're saying that what happened with the concerts was that all of the tickets that were resold were resold within proper guidelines?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: There's a lot. I
can go over that day, but absolutely. Aside from, you know, aside from some issues that came up technologically and some bad public misunderstandings about what was happening at the time, for which we were partially to blame. We definitely did not explain ourselves well enough. But, yeah, there was absolutely no inappropriate activity on Ticketmaster's part.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. So, why was there-- well, can you explain to me why there was such a feeling of consumer lockout regarding those concerts that happened?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Very simple
reason, sir. They only make one first row.
Mr. Springsteen could have probably played five times as many shows in his home state--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: --and, not met
consumer demand.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. JOSEPH FREEMAN: You know, a good example that I may have discussed with your office previously is when Garth Brooks had not toured in ten or 12 years and he was going to play a brand new building in Kansas City in late 2007, the artist representatives instructed us to keep putting shows on sale until consumer demand was met. And, we sold out nine Garth Brooks shows for an 18,000 seat arena in less than two hours. There was very little resale market because, quite frankly, supply was created to meet demand. Now, that was very unique circumstance. But, what underlies all this and what underlies, you know, the wonderful business Mr. Vaccaro has built up is simply the discrepancy between supply and demand when ticket inventory is scarce.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: But, when you determine a ticket price for an event-JOSEPH FREEMAN: [Interposing] Let me interrupt you, sir. We do not determine the ticket price for--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: No, I
mean--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- [crosstalk]
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- when
the ticket price is determined for an event, I know it's not done through Ticketmaster, you're just moving the tickets as quickly as possible for the event. So, I was actually talking to the gentleman from TicketNetwork, 'cause you, as was said, you try to determine the prices for the event to make sure that the price point for the event makes sense.

DONALD VACCARO: No, we don't; not as a general rule. Most of the stuff that we do is we allow ticket brokers, consumers, venues to list tickets on our exchange at any price that they want. And, we create a reverse auction where that they constantly lower their prices until the tickets sell.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. DONALD VACCARO: So, that's
basically what happens on our exchange. But, whoever buys the tickets and whoever chooses to resell them sets the price that they want for the tickets. Then, we add a service charge, which is
usually about $15 \%$ on top of that transaction.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: You're an online auction house to a degree.

DONALD VACCARO: Except for we start out at a fixed price. And, what happens is the brokers use almost the Wall Street principle of marking the tickets to market. And, if the market goes up, they make more. If the market goes down, they make less. So, it's whatever the market is. Right now, we're probably seeing, in a lot of sports teams, we're seeing the ticket prices go way below face value. And, we're going to see a lot of probably problems, you know, with leagues over the next year or so with their season ticket base dwindling.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: But, that's due to the economy. That's not due to the desire of people to attend games. That's due to the fact that people don't have the money to sit in the luxury seats.

DONALD VACCARO: I absolutely
agree. And, I think that a lot of professional sports teams have really out-priced their tickets for the marketplace.
right.
DONALD VACCARO: They've lowered the capacity on their arenas to--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
DONALD VACCARO: -- extract more.
So, yeah, I think they, you know, played a game and they played it the wrong way.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.

DONALD VACCARO: And, it's going to end up hurting them. It ends up making them look really bad--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right. DONALD VACCARO: -- that they priced the tickets that high. And, I think, you know, again, over the next year, I know already with the Yankees, you know, we're seeing a lot of issues go up and there's a lot of Yankee fans who are just really ticked off and even at lower prices, you can see the consumer backlash as you're not seeing a full stadium there, which you really should be seeing.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: So, and, do you advise the venues at either entity on what
the ticket prices should be for an event, especially if it's an event that would generate a lot of consumer interest? Or, do they reach out to you at all for price point suggestions? Or, do you have to go back to them with the price point suggestions?

DONALD VACCARO: No, what usually happens after the first person lists, then all of a sudden everybody else lists and they mark everything off that first price that's marked. So, it just happens really quickly once the first transaction happens or something like that, once the first person put in prices. And, after the on-sale, the prices fluctuate greatly and they go up or down depending on supply and demand.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
And, you talked about the issue of the cumbersome primary contracts. But, you don't get to negotiate those contracts. They're something that we have to work with the venues, with the individual artists that are doing the event, correct?

DONALD VACCARO: I think that if you ask musical artists would they like the
freedom in their contracts to sell tickets anywhere they wanted, instead of through the primary seller, you'd see a lot of them want to do that. You've seen fan clubs do that. Artists have their own fan clubs to distribute tickets directly for their fans. Those efforts have been thwarted by the large primary ticket agencies that they don't want those tickets distributed that way, even though a band, who has a fan base, they know who their fans are. They want to distribute the tickets directly there. But, the large primary vendors don't want to do that.

And, I've seen a contract with absolutely discriminatory language against concert artists, which I'd be glad to get you a copy of if there's any disagreement that they have such language in their contracts. So, you know, that really discriminate against concert artists and don't given them near the rights that sports artists get, that family shows get. And, it's just basically over the last 50 years, starting with the record industry, everybody wanted to, for lack of a better term, steal money from the artist in some way. The record companies did it for
years. All right. Now, you're seeing it with the concert business. Okay. That's why when an artist goes to, and does a show and a concert, sometimes $100 \%$ of the price that they sell, they get, because years ago, they used to deal with promoters who had questionable accounting ethics. All right. And now, we're dealing with primary ticketing companies that really restrict those artists' ability to sell tickets on any channels that they want.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Sir, I'm not even going to begin to address the gross mischaracterizations that you just heard. I simply want to say the--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] I'm sorry, what?
JOSEPH FREEMAN: I'm not even going to begin to address the gross mischaracterizations that you just heard. I'm simply going to say the following. The rubber hits the road when the question is asked who's doing what to ensure fans get full and fair access to tickets at the time of the initial sale at the price set initially by the event provider. Not by Mr. Vaccaro, not by

Ticketmaster. We are fighting aggressively to keep automation out. We are fighting aggressively to get tickets directly into fans hands. And, I respectfully request that you not be distracted from what you are legitimately trying to pursue by the many red herrings that have just been thrown out there.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
DONALD VACCARO: Excuse me, I'd
just like to address that. I guess the easiest way is I'm saying that the contracts distribute against concert artists. Are you denying that?

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. We're going to move from that to-- we're not going to get into a back and forth on that.

DONALD VACCARO: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: I'm just trying to make sure that a individual that wants to get a ticket to see a concert or a show that's a special show gets an equal and fair opportunity to see that. And, they can get online at 12 o'clock and be assured that they have a relatively equal opportunity to get into the system to buy a ticket. That's our concern.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: You
know, our concern is that if there's a concert at Radio City for, I forget now, I'm dating myself, let's say that Harry Potter, just to use, there's a Harry Potter show or $I$ forget what the new kids' thing is now. I'm going back-- Jonas Brothers or, you know, whatever it is now that, you know, parents have an equal shot at getting a ticket. I'm not against e-tickets. I just booked a ticket to go see my mom later this month for her $90^{\text {th }}$ birthday. I did it online, you know. But, I'm concerned about the people not getting an opportunity. And, I wanted to talk about the etickets a little bit more. But, I know that Council Member Koppell had a question. But, just one question. Can't you do, even with paperless tickets, a limited amount, 'cause what if one person say if $I$ get on the line and $I$ want to buy 100 e-tickets, aren't I a suspect?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, we enforce
the ticket limits that the event provider sets. And, for almost any event with any meaningful level of demand, there's a four and six--
[Interposing] And, what's the normal limit that-JOSEPH FREEMAN: It depends on what the promoter or the venue request. But, it's typically four, six or eight per consumer. And, we go back and enforce those limits, you know, at our client's instruction.

I would also add that Senator
Schumer has introduced, or talked about introducing, some very interesting legislation in Washington mandating a 48-hour window between which tickets initially go for sale before the time any professional reseller can purchase those tickets. There's some obvious and challenging enforcement aspects to that. And, it's an interesting issue because I think a lot of the brokers, including Mr. Vaccaro, have a trekked to Washington, DC to tell the Senator's office just how horrible an idea that is. But, the intent is similar to yours, sir, and to ours, to ensure that fans have the most fair access to those tickets up front at the time of the initial sale at the price being made initially available.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.

Council Member Koppell, you have some questions? COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Yeah, I just was perturbed at the Ticketmaster response to your question about what the settlement in New Jersey provided. The answer given was the settlement is public. That's not a satisfactory answer. We want to know what the settlement provided. Please do not tell us that the settlement is public.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Sure, I'm happy to go over the terms in-COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Please do. JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- in greatest lengths you want.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Please do.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: So, leading up to
the Bruce Springsteen on-sale, we had a program nationwide in which we provided any consumer, whose primary ticket request could not be met simply because of the supply and demand imbalance, we gave the option to that consumer, go back and try again. Go back and try for fewer tickets. Go back and try for other sections in the house. Or, feel free, by clicking here, clicking through, in
a very transparent way, to look at other options in the resale marketplace. After the Springsteen on-sale, we really heard, loud and clear, how unhappy fans were with how that went. In addition, we had some technology issues. And, we had some server issues that day 'caused by the overwhelming demand for those shows. As a result of that, the Consumer Protection Bureau in the New Jersey Attorney General's office received a very high level of complaints. And, we were very sensitive to that. And, obviously, the Attorney General took great umbrage at the level of consumer distress.

In the days following the Springsteen concert, before we even had heard from the Attorney General's office, we announced two programs. One was that we would suspend the links. They weren't working. The intent, while quite frankly simply to give consumers additional options, were not received that way. And, we needed to step back and try to do better. We also announced that the TicketsNow website, which is a resale site akin to Mr. Vaccaro's that we purchased 15 months ago, would no longer allow
third-party brokers or anybody to list tickets for sale on that marketplace prior to the time of the initial sale to the public. It just created all the wrong perceptions and, quite frankly, it gave rise to a mistaken assumption that Ticketmaster was somehow diverting tickets. Other resale marketplaces parenthetically, including Mr. Vaccaro's, continued to allow those prelistings.

The New Jersey Attorney General and ourselves entered into a settlement, which called for the following. For one year, we agreed, and we'd already announced publicly we were going to do this, but for one year, we agreed that we were not going to do those links and that when we do them, the click-through option links, and that when we do them again, we were only going to do so in consultation with General Milgram's office, which we're more than happy to do.

The agreement also said that we would no longer allow the prelisting of tickets for concerts, which, again, we had announced we were going to be doing even prior to the deal being announced-- the Attorney General contacting
us, excuse me. There was also a provision in which the folks we would work with the event providers to try to get tickets for all of the people who had complained to General Milgram's office. Because we don't control the tickets, we were largely dependent on the goodwill of our client at the Meadowlands, who I think have been able to come through from whatever tickets they had access to, a number of tickets.

There was a provision where those who were not able to be satisfied were going to receive gift cards or gift certificates for future purchases. My latest information is that it won't even be necessary to invoke that provision.

There was a provision, as well, some internet marketing provisions in terms of how the TicketsNow name could be used to market across the internet vis-à-vis Ticketmaster.

And then, as received a lot of publicly, there was the $\$ 350,000$ assessment, as well. That's what $I$ can recall.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, the general provisions that you agreed to in New Jersey, and I've heard them, but I don't
necessarily understand each one, but, do those provisions also apply to sales in New York?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Those sale
provisions apply across the United States. We're doing it in Canada. We're doing it all across North America. We're working hard to improve the consumer experience in every way, shape and form. This entire business needs to do better. The ticketing purchase experience needs to be as enjoyable or close to as enjoyable as going to the event itself. We know we need to do better. And, quite frankly, the entire ticketing and resale industry needs to do better.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, as I understood your testimony, it was that, generally speaking, the venues or the people who are offering the tickets through you, and you, have limitations to limit the number of tickets that any individual purchaser can get.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: We're the agent.
Our client, whether it's the promoter, the venue, the team, instructs us, their ticketing service agent, on the terms of the sales to the public. One of the terms that we typically receive from
our clients, and you can see it for almost any concert that's being offered for sale and most games, is a ticket limit per purchase, whether it's four, six or eight, the event provider instructs us on what they want that number to be. We enforce it on the web. And, when asked by the client, we'll go back, and we did this a lot after Hannah Montana and other troubling events, we'll go back, when requested, and manually go through the names and try to find anyone who circumvented that ticket limit. And, we'll take tickets back. We do it regularly.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, if that ticket limit, if that practice is enforced, it should accomplish what the Chairman's trying to accomplish with the legislation.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Not specifically, because you have to realize, sir, you know, the resale industry in this country is a multi-billion dollar industry. The folks who are using unscrupulous means to get tickets and who are using unscrupulous means specifically by using automation, they're not going to use the same credit card name and the same address and the same
number to purchase tickets through multiple channels. So, they--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
[Interposing] No, you misunderstood my question. I said if those provisions are enforced, it would accomplish what the Chairman is trying to accomplish.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: They are enforced.
And, I believe that the industry's goal to limit the number of tickets an individual can purchase is already being accomplished with the key caveat to the technology issue.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, what I'm trying to get at, I think you're understanding it, is that if those provisions were enforced, if they were enforced and could be followed, the Chairman's objectives would be achieved.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: They are--
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Is that correct?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: They are enforced and they are being followed. And, we are fighting aggressively against any technological means to circumvent our enforcement of those limits.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But, your testimony, and you're being a little bit unclear right now, but, your testimony was that some people are able to circumvent those provisions.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Right. And, we believe they're breaking the law.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So then, if they're able to circumvent them, they're not being enforced.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: They're being-all efforts are being taken by everybody associated with putting the event on to enforce the limits.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: They're taken very seriously, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay.
Now, we've gotten to the essence of it. If we could ensure that they were enforced, we wouldn't need this bill or anything like it. So, it seems to me then, one issue is how do we ensure that they can be enforced?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Um, hm.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Right? Do
you agree with that so far?
JOSEPH FREEMAN: I agree that there is a need for laws to outlaw the use of bots and go after people using automation in an unscrupulous manner, absolutely.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, that would accomplish what the bill is trying to accomplish.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Outlawing the use of automation, as over a dozen states have already, absolutely.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, other states have taken steps to allow these provisions to be enforced.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: No, the provisions are being enforced, sir. There is the use of technology that, at times, gets around these provisions.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, they're not being enforced if they can be gotten around.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: No, I think we need to distinguish, sir, between the event providers and the ticketing company actively
enforcing the limits. If we saw that Mr. Don Vaccaro had bought 12 tickets, when there was a four-ticket limit, we would strike the eight tickets that were--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Oh, I understand.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: --purchased. COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: You're trying to enforce them. But, you're not being able to because people are getting around your enforcement efforts.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I don't see how the proposal, as currently crafted, without specifically addressing the automated technology issue, would enhance the level of enforcement.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: We're getting away from that. I'm not asking about that. I'm asking you-- I don't know why you don't understand this. I don't think I'm being so obscure. If we could stop the manner in which enforcement is being circumvented, then we would accomplish what the bill accomplishes.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Now, I understand.
I apologize. I didn't understand. Yes, I agree
with that statement--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, you
say other states have taken steps that we haven't in New York to allow for proper enforcement of these provisions.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Correct.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Right. Is there effort being made in New York to allow for the enforcement of the-- better enforcement of these provisions?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I believe there is a proposal, a proposed legislation I've seen up in Albany that would outlaw the use of automated technology.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I see. And, is it your understanding that that's proceeding or moving or...

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I'm not sure. I've seen it being introduced in the last couple weeks. And, there's been a lot of activity in Albany with the impending sunset. But, I don't know.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Could we do anything on a municipal level to outlaw this technology?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I don't know what-

- this is getting beyond my realm of understanding. I don't know what enforcement capabilities might exist at the municipal level. I know that states sometimes are even impaired and that it is, you know, computer crimes in general are often best and most effectively enforced at a federal level.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, if state-- but, you say other states have done it on a state basis.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: In the last couple years, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: And, have they been successful in doing it on a state basis?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, laws have been passed. And, we're, you know, eagerly awaiting the day when there are some enforcement actions.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Okay. Well, let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that if the
solution, and I'm not saying I'm opposed to your proposal at this point, but, if the solution is some state legislation and, at the very least, I think we should consider a Resolution calling on the State Legislature to pass such legislation, and maybe explore whether we can do it on a municipal basis. I know there are legal barriers to what we can do as a municipality. But, if that's the solution and, at least this witness seems to suggest it is, then, I think we should pursue that.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: We did get a Resolution suggestion from some members of the industry. But, we want to beef it up before we present it. It was a little too vague and did not really deal with all of the issues that we've been talking about this morning. But, we will hopefully have a Resolution to submit by the next Stated Meeting.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Good. I
endorse that. And, as I said, I'm not necessarily opposed to this legislation--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: -- but,
certainly that is something we should consider. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Well,
again--
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- this
is a hearing clearly, you know, we know that we're not the only entity or legislative body in this role. But, we wanted to weigh in on it. And, definitely, hopefully, give some impetus and momentum to Albany to move on this bill, since the sunset provision is coming up in June.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
Mr. Chairman, you may know that 15 years ago, when I was Attorney General, I tried to deal with this subject somewhat frustrated, but it remains to be a problem. And, I hope we can make some progress. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Well, I hear you. And, hopefully that, you know, from this hearing we can then, $I$ know $I$ will be talking to Senator Craig Johnson and also to the Assembly Chair and also to the Chair of Consumer Affairs in the Assembly to talk about what we can do on this particular issue. We've been joined by Council Member John Liu from Queens.
coming. Was there anything else that you wanted to add, Mr. Vaccaro?

DONALD VACCARO: You know, the only
thing that $\mathrm{I}--$
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

DONALD VACCARO: I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: I'm
sorry, Council Member Gennaro had a question. I didn't realize. Sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: No, thank you. No, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. I was just, you know, listening to the back and forth between the witness and Council Member Koppell. And, I just wish to be associated with Councilman Koppell's desire and your desire, Mr. Chairman, to try to prompt the State to do something with regard to the technology. That really seems to be causing all the problems, right. This is what's happening. And, I'm not an expert on this. But, just trying to get ready for the hearing and, you know, listening to the colloquy here, it is a fact, is it not, that these entities come in with
their technology. They buy up all the tickets in 15 seconds and everyone gets shut out.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: They're not buying up all the tickets. And, for, you know, concerts like Springsteen in New Jersey, those tickets are going to sell out virtually instantaneously even if there's not a single user of technology out there. The demand is so high, our system has sold as many as 14,000 tickets in a minute. When you've got thousands and thousands of people trying to buy the same tickets and, as Mr. Vaccaro correctly points out, you know, Ticketmaster only receives a portion of the inventory. We sell each and every ticket that's made available to us to sell on our client's behalf. But, you know, what we sell, we sell to the public and we try to do it in the most fair and equitable way. But, you know, assume, if there's a 15,000-seat arena and assume for the moment, we get 12,000 seats, we can sell those seats out in minutes, irrespective of automated technology. If the demand--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:
[Interposing] I've been on like when tickets go on sale the stroke of whatever, I mean, I'm on the
internet at one second after. Gone. Nothing. You can't get two seats together.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: It could be
technology. I would bet you're going after some extremely high demand shows and that thousands and thousands of people are simultaneously trying to get those same--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Right. JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- tickets. COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: I thought you were arguing that technology's a problem. Now, you're saying technology's not a problem. JOSEPH FREEMAN: I would distinguish between illegal and unscrupulous technology, which is designed to give people an unfair and illegal advantage when trying to access tickets, as opposed to, you know, wonderful things like internet technology and internet commerce that allow for tickets to be distributed in a much more efficient and consumer-friendly way. The difference is 20 years ago, when you were trying to buy those same tickets, you would have seen hundreds, if not thousands, of people lined up around the block. Now, it's happening online.

You're not necessarily--
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] Well, it's fun. Lining up--
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- seeing
[crosstalk]--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- on
the block was fun. I enjoyed lining up for the Prince concert in the '70s.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: I'm
confused. Is the, you know, technology problem that people are talking about, is it a legal, but unfortunate phenomenon that we want to make illegal or somehow restrict? Or, is it an illegal phenomenon that we already have laws to deal with that aren't being enforced? Or, a combination of both?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: It's a combination of both. We went after a company based in Pittsburgh or eastern Ohio called RMG about a year and a half ago. They provided an automated computer technology to willing users that enabled them to access our system, in violation of our terms of use, in violation of our copyrights, at a rapid pace, far more aggressively, if you will,
than any individual trying to get tickets the fair way by getting online at the stroke of the moment the tickets were made available. We received a preliminary and then, a permanent injunction from a Federal Court in California. And, we effectively shut that purveyor of technology down. We know they're not the only one out there. And, we are continuing to invest a ton of resources in trying to--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO:
[Interposing] And, the way people would have access to that, they buy some kind of subscription or access to that method of getting to your system?

## JOSEPH FREEMAN: Yeah, it was a

 licensed software that people motivated to use unscrupulous means to get access to tickets could go out and purchase. And, it was our understanding, and we didn't actually learn that much about this illegal operator before they shut down their tent, before the Court made them shut down their tent. But, that's our understanding.COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Okay. So, that is illegal now. And so, the question is
making sure that you sort of get at that. Okay. Got it.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Yeah.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Now, with regard to what's going on in Albany, where there's some piece of legislation that is presumably not aimed at that, but trying to make something else illegal, which is now legal?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Your confusion is spot on. There has been, in addition to the computer crime acts and the intellectual property violations that we acted under, as a private entity, there have been probably about a dozen states now, who, in the last two, three years, prompted in large part by the outcry over Hannah Montana, who have passed laws to specifically outlaw the use of the kind of technology that we went after. And, I think the mindset was highlight this as an issue of public policy concern and give specifically the tools to law enforcement, who might wonder whether or not the existing computer crime laws can be applicable; give them the specific mandate that this is something the legislature saw as a matter of
concern. And, here's a mandate to go enforce the law and make sure ticket distribution is as safe as-- fair as possible.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: So, the
State law is going after the same thing that you're going after.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Correct. And,
there are also Federal computer crime laws as well. But, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Okay. I'm
still confused. Okay.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: I'm sorry.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Yeah.
But, my daughter does have $11^{\text {th }}$ row to the Jonas Brothers. So, you know, I'll be able to get past June or July, whenever that show is, yeah.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Hopefully, through Ticketmaster.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: My son took care of it, who knows how to do that stuff, yeah. I just paid for it, yeah. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
Just one last question for Ticketmaster. You
talked about the idea of having a fair and equitable process. Has Ticketmaster come up with what they feel that fair and equitable process could be for people to get online at midnight to get an opportunity to have a fair and equitable process to get Jonas Brothers' tickets or, you know, tickets to Hannah Montana or to whatever that hot topic is or hot venue is for that season? JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, I take it when you say midnight, you mean the moment shows go on sale--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right. JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- which is typically in the morning. You know, there's a saying in our industry, they only make one first row.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: And, we are never
going to be able to make more seats. The supply of inventory is [crosstalk]--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: No, no,
I understand. But, you said--
JOSEPH FREEMAN: But--
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: --
talked about a fair and equitable process-JOSEPH FREEMAN: Absolutely. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- like when you go online with the airlines now, which you go on with, you know, I went on through four different sites before I got my price that I wanted. And, they all tell you that they show you the seats on the plane. Do you show the seats in the venue or--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: You know, we're going to have that--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -before the person--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- capability one day soon, I hope. Right now, we have a best available seating algorithm that distributes tickets as effectively, efficiently and fairly out of the inventory that's provided to us.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Does the person know what seat and row they're getting at the purchase point?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Oh, absolutely. They have two or three minutes to decide, once seeing the specific tickets they have the
opportunity to buy, whether or not they want to purchase them.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. JOSEPH FREEMAN: There's even a clock that ticks down the time because-CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Well, your--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- the reason we rush people in a sense is if someone's using technology and they ultimately aren't purchasing, we want to shove them off the system as quickly as possible.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. But, the issue of fair and equitable, you really haven't been able to deal with it, create a full system yet. Is that what you're saying?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Not at all, sir. To the contrary, we have an extraordinarily fair and equitable system. We simply can't control, you know, whether Mr. Springsteen is going to play a handful of shows or ten shows at a given facility. If the supply were there, it would be much more equitable simply in terms of all the consumers being satisfied at getting tickets at a

```
price initially set by the artist. But, that's
why I mentioned the Garth Brooks example.
                            CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
```

But, your logistical concerns about what
alternative methods could be recommended, will you
have that ready before the hearings are done in
Albany?
JOSEPH FREEMAN: I'm not
recommending logistical alternatives. I'm
suggesting that technology is going to--
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] Will solve itself, right.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- blaze the trail
in terms of making what is the best possible
distribution system right now far more
technologically sophisticated and better and
consumer-friendly.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
But, so, you're saying technology is your
alternative method or technology is your
alternative-- is your means of making that
equitable--
JOSEPH FREEMAN: [Interposing] I
think, I--
hopefully.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- think the
advent of paperless ticketing, as takes place for airline travel, is going to bring a far higher level of consumer satisfaction and transparency to the process.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. But, you would prefer that being done within the industry and not necessarily legislative?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: There are all
kinds of public policy, you know, goals that we share with you. But, mandating a portion of tickets to go back to the box office, I respectfully submit, would take us back to a time of long lines and cold weather.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. Well, I knew you were going to circle back to that in the beginning of your statement. But, I just want to, you know, again, to admit that when we say box office, I'm not necessarily meaning the long lines. I'm talking about having a box office that could do online sales, as well. And, that leads me back to my last question. Do you think
that it's a good public policy for a venue to create a resale department within its own venue of tickets that they're selling, such as the has been happening lately with the Garden and Yankee Stadium, where they're reselling tickets at their own venue?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, let me take a step back. We urge our clients to have their box office open for sales. We want consumers to have that as an alternative if they choose they don't want to go through Ticketmaster and they want to buy at the venue, 'cause when a--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- ticket is sold at the venue, our service charge isn't assessed. And, we want consumers to have that option. To answer your question, I'm not-- we don't do resale on behalf of the Yankees. I know they have a deal through Major League Baseball that makes Stubhub the official resale provider. We have similar deals with the other professional sports leagues. And, as Mr. Vaccaro correctly alluded to, the sports teams have a strong incentive to offer their season ticketholders all kinds of resale
options because they want to attract, retain and grow their season ticket base particularly in these challenging times.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
Thank you. Mr. Vaccaro, did you want to add anything else? I know you've been itching to... DONALD VACCARO: Yeah, the only thing, you know, I think the bot issue is a real issue. But, it's not that big of an issue. I think the bigger issue is transparency. And, I just want to speak specifically to Councilman Koppell, am I pronouncing it correctly, sorry, Koppell's concept. When we talk about fair and equitable distribution of tickets, you know, something came to light last May. It's important to know here that Ticketmaster does sell software directly to ticket brokers through one of their divisions that helps them buy tickets. It helps them purchase tickets quickly. It says on their literature. So, and sell tickets. Okay. And, they also allow those brokers on that exchange to list tickets before the tickets have gone on sale, although they don't sell it on the TicketsNow. They do do that.
various ticket resale companies. One's SLO; One's ILoveAllAccess, which is an Irving Azoff company, and the third one is Ticket Exchange. Well, in May of last year, the CEO, Sean Moriarty, when to Las Vegas. He met with, a closed door meeting, with 100 ticket brokers. And, he basically admitted that look, Ticket Exchange is getting tickets from artists directly. Ticketmaster's using their own software to hold back those tickets from public sale and then, scalp them for whatever they can on Ticket Exchange. He admitted it. It's on tape. He admitted it.

So, I just don't want you to have the notion that the reason why tickets aren't available for the public, the best tickets, is because of software bots. It's really the biggest problem is venues, managers, promoters, venues, managers, promoters, primary ticketers holding back tickets. They sell them in their own packages. ILoveAllAccess, which is now a Ticketmaster company, scalps premium packages and silver packages right through the Ticketmaster platform.

So, when Ticketmaster talks about fair and equitable access of tickets, they're only talking about fair and equitable access to whatever they can't get their hands on. And, the reason why all this stuff is coming to light now is because of the merger with Live Nation and Ticketmaster. Ticketmaster's the number one primary ticket software in the country. Live Nation is the number two primary ticket software company. Ticketmaster is the largest personal manager of entertainment artists in the world. Okay. And, Live Nation is the largest concert promoter in the world.

So, you get into this behemoth of three companies coming together and trying to control the market. That's why paperless tickets is actually so important to them, as well, because if they can control paperless tickets, they can control the whole resale market, as well.

So, I just want to point out to you that the problem is, and I think you alluded to it, is just that those tickets aren't available to the public. And, the one way to do it legislatively is transparency. If everyone had to
say hey, look, we're not going to sell the best three or 4,000 seats to the public, where Hannah Montana, where at some venues, it was almost $50 \%$ of the tickets didn't go to the public. And, if they made that aware to consumers, the consumers-there would be consumer uprising. And, those artists would be forced to put those tickets on sale if they wanted the perception to be good in the marketplace.

So, anyway, I just wanted to address that so, it was a clear view of the secondary market.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: May I briefly respond, just because we're being dragged through the mud so unfairly and inaccurately?

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: Simply stated, the alleged scalping of ILoveAllAccess and Ticket Exchange, what Mr. Vaccaro is grossly misstating is that there is an effort in this industry, with the event providers to dynamically price at the time of initial sale tickets that are among the best. So, Mr. Vaccaro obviously is not in favor of efforts by event providers to price the ticket
right up front and reduce the uplift on the resale side. So, some of the programs Mr. Vaccaro's referring to, when you buy the ticket, it's an initial sale. The price you paid, dynamically priced, is printed on the actual ticket. It's an initial sale. ILoveAllAccess sells VIP access; meet the band; attend the soundcheck; go to a wine and cheese reception. I can speak at length about all the red herrings you've been hearing. I'm happy to go on at length now. I doubt that what you want. I'm happy to meet with any of you individually if you want more information. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite understand what the gentleman just said. Are you saying that some of the tickets are diverted from the sale at the regular price to these resellers? I didn't understand--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: No--
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: -- what
you were saying.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- emphatically
not, sir. What I'm saying is what Mr. Vaccaro is
describing as resale, in fact, is not. We have programs, clearly described on the website, where certain tickets are made available for sale for the first time to the public. Now, they're not our tickets. Remember, we're working in conjunction with the owner of the tickets. They're made available for sale. They're dynamically priced, like an airline ticket. The price can go up and down depending on the time leading up to the show. They've never been made available for sale to the public before. They're not being scalped or redirected or anything like that. And, the price the consumer pays is the price printed on the ticket, because it's an initial sale.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, what you're saying is that, let's say, for an event, let's say a Bruce Springsteen concert, let's say, a popular concert--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Um, hm.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: -- there's a certain number of tickets that are available at, let's say, \$100 a ticket. And then, there are other tickets that are available at some sort of
variable price that depends on demand. Is that what you're saying?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: Well, Bruce Springsteen's a wonderful example because the event provider, including Mr. Springsteen's people, were not interested in that program. We didn't do it. But, many times, in a fully transparent way, all on the Ticketmaster website, all clearly described, tickets are made available. I invite you to look. I think there are Beyonce tickets online for sale right now, specifically delineated. It's called the Platinum ticket program, made available for sale. The goal being, by the event provider, by the artist, who's no longer making the lion's share of their income from selling recorded music because we all know what's happened to the recorded music industry, touring is not a loss leader like it was 20 years ago. So, a lot of the event providers are motivated to capture as much of the actual value of the ticket at the time of the initial sale, quite frankly, to prevent the resellers from getting to mark up the tickets as much as they do. COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, that's
not a resale. It's a price that's set by the event provider for some sort of premium ticket. JOSEPH FREEMAN: It's a very good characterization. We participate. We support the system online. But, yes, that's a very good characterization.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: But, the higher price, does that come with anything? You said it comes with wine and cheese? Or, that's just some--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: [Interposing] No, I was delineating the many different programs that are out there.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: I see.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: Because there's also, and just taking some of the things that Mr. Vaccaro was throwing out there, there are also programs long in existence where you can buy a VIP package, where, for a premium price, in addition to a very good ticket, you can have some kind of a backstage access to meet the artist or attend a soundcheck or something like that.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: So, are those tickets that are in this premium category,
are they like sort of the premium seats at Yankee Stadium? Is that what it is, essentially?

JOSEPH FREEMAN: I'm not that
familiar with the premium seats in Yankee Stadium. It's determined by the event provider; not by Ticketmaster what tickets are made available for these kinds of programs.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Well, I
suppose we never suggested that the event provider couldn't set whatever price they wanted to set.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: It's the initial-COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: That's never been suggested.

JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- sale, it's
their prerogative to--

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Yeah.
JOSEPH FREEMAN: -- if they price the tickets too high, they won't sell.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Yeah.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Council

Member Gennaro has a question.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Yeah,
thank you. I'm just trying to sort through what's
going on, Mr. Chairman. And, Council Member Koppell and I'm not-- there's a market for the tickets. There's supply and demand. And, either you're going to have like some kind of bot problem, where people are going to go in and, you know, buy the tickets and then, you know, they're going to get their market price, whatever people are willing to pay for them. Or, through the sort of Ticketmaster paradigm, where in conjunction with the artist, some tickets are dynamically priced, meaning that they want to get like what the market will bear for them. I mean, I don't think it's, you know, completely unfair to characterize that as holding them back, so to speak. I mean, that's one way of sort of looking at it. But--

JOSEPH FREEMAN: [Interposing] I don't agree with [crosstalk].

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: -- meaning
that it's not something that's--
JOSEPH FREEMAN: [Interposing] Is an airline holding tickets back [crosstalk]? COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Yeah, yeah, I mean, now, let me-- I'm having a little
thought process here. And, but, it's something other than, you know, listing a ticket for like a certain price and selling it. It's dynamically priced, meaning that it's keyed directly to what people would be willing to pay for it. And, I'm not saying that that's un-American. I'm just saying that's a phenomenon.

And, what we really have here, Mr. Chairman, that there is just a, you know, market price for these tickets. And, at the end of the day, like that's what they're going to sell for. And, you know, there you have it. And, the question is whether we, on our own, figure out some mechanism to deal with this in the interests of fairness or whatever or we call upon the State Legislature by Resolution to sort of, you know, institute some transparency, fairness, or whatever, by whatever mechanisms they may be contemplating with regard to the sunset that's coming up and how we go forward from that.

And so, you know, for me, this is less about good guys and bad guys. It's about, you know, artists and other entities trying to figure out how they can, you know, maximize
revenue from a commodity that people are willing to pay a lot of money for. And so, that's more, you know, musings than a real question. But, it seems like, you know, the market is what it is. And, I think we would do well to sort of, you know, call upon the State Legislature through whatever mechanism they feel are, you know, just and appropriate to bring transparency, visibility, fairness so that, you know, people who spent a lot of money through their tax monies and whatever to see some of these venues go up, actually have a chance to see a show.

So, I'd be very supportive of us, you know, reaching out to the State, making sure that on a Statewide basis, the State, with, you know, all the jurisdiction they have, were able to bring some fairness on a State level to these interesting issues, Mr. Chairman. So, I'd be supportive of your attempt and Council Member Koppell's - - to, you know, reach out to the state regarding what we're doing here locally. I know there are issues that would stem from, you know, box office lines and this and that, even other entities like, even in my own district, we have,
you know, St. John's University, who is like, you know, in the ticket business. And, you know, and, people have legitimate issues with, you know, how the, you know, 15\% sort of box office mandate would be administered without a lot of burden.

So, but, I certainly appreciate your desire to try to bring some fairness to like what's going on and in this very, you know, sticky and complicated issue. And, I thought I had my hands full with Environmental Protection. But, I'm going to go running back to my committee after this, you know. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Oliver. Thank you to these gentlemen. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Thank you. I want to thank you gentlemen for coming. We're running out of time. So, I appreciate you being here. And, I will look forward to talking with both of you quickly in the future. JOSEPH FREEMAN: Thank you, sir. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Thank you. Next, we'll hear from Mr. Charles Bell, representing NYPIRG, the Consumer's Union. And, also, I'm sorry, Mr. Leor Zahave [phonetic] from Admit One. Excuse me for mangling your last name.

Mr. Bell, whenever you're ready, just start.
CHARLES BELL: Good morning,
Chairman Comrie, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen. My name's Charles Bell. And, I'm the Programs Manager for Consumer's Union, a nonprofit publisher of Consumer Reports. I'm presenting this statement on behalf of Consumer's Union and also on behalf of the New York Public Interest Research Group, NYPIRG, which is the State's largest nonprofit, nonpartisan studentdirected consumer protection organization.

We very much appreciate the opportunity to share our views on this important consumer protection issue, and matter of great interest to the world's sport and live entertainment capital, which is New York City.

We urge you to enact a strong, comprehensive anti-ticket scalping law for New York City and also to adopt a Resolution calling on the State Legislature to restore the strong state anti-ticket scalping law that we had and to end its failed experiment with unlimited scalping.

In our view, ticket scalping is a deceptive and unfair business practice that
deprives the average sports, music and entertainment fans of opportunities to see popular events. Those that pay scalp prices fork over several times the face price and that's the price that the producers of the event establish as the cost of admission. The best review that we've had of this issue is a report that was done by the Office of the Attorney General in 1999, called 'Why Can't I Get Tickets?' And, through the use of extensive evidence that was obtained by subpoena and other interviews, they found that the problem of ticket scalping is rife with corruption, bribery and tax evasion.

And, I would submit that what we've heard today that this is-- some people are suggesting this is largely a technology problem that can be solved with a technical fix. We find that when you drill into it, it turns out to be much more complex, that there's a lot more conflicts of interest that are creating this arbitrage opportunity, including covert and undisclosed relationships between the venues and various parties, who release tickets that end up in the hands of scalpers. And so, for that
reason, we believe it's important to have a very systematic investigation and public policy approach to the question.

And so, we've got quite a sweeping critique of what we think is wrong with the ticket system. And, I submit our written remarks for the record. But, I guess what $I$ would sort of encapsulate here is we think it's very important that you're asking these questions. In a sense, government turn its back on consumers and created sort of the arbitrage opportunity by deregulating this field, by removing the $45 \%$ price cap that could be charged on ticket resales. And, that kind of paved the way for this Wild West atmosphere where many, tens and tens of thousands of fans are frustrated of not being able to get tickets for the shows that they want to see.

And, as has been noted here, many of the larger venues are impressed with the public trust by virtue of the fact that they got many taxpayers dollars and public subsidies. And so, we think, for that reason alone, there's a public imperative to keep prices affordable so that residents of New York City and the rest of New

York State have a fair crack at getting tickets to see their favorite shows.

We would note that ticket holds, comps, set aside promotional tickets dramatically reduce the amount of publicly available tickets. Many of these tickets end up in the hands of scalpers. It would be as if you were talking about pricing for the airlines, if the airline took half the seats for the flight off the market, but never disclosed that fact to the consumers. So, we do think that more transparency and disclosure to the consumer can be an agent of help in that situation.

There's little transparency in the ticket selling process and no tracking of how tickets and money change hands. This means that consumers have no way to set their expectation about the possibility of obtaining tickets at a fair price. So, in a sense, the public has no reason to trust the way tickets are being sold. People fear that this is a system that's corrupt and that is rigged.

So, we would urge a two-track
approach. We think it's great that New York City
is looking into ways to protect the ticketholder. And, we would urge you to pass as strong a law as possible. We heard the concerns of Mr. Eiler from the Department of Consumer Affairs. And, we think it would be important to address those issues and make sure that he has the means or his department will have the means that they need to effectively enforce the law. We also were concerned that setting aside a certain amount of tickets for the box office should be done in a way that ensures that there are the type of tickets that fans want, that it's not just the tickets in the nosebleed section. And, this sort of goes to the issue of how do the fans get a fair crack at what the venue has to offer.

Also, we would like to see you pass a strong Resolution calling on the State not to extend the sunset that repealed the $45 \%$ cap on ticket scalping in New York State. There's a bill, S-3821 sponsored by Senator Craig Johnson, that would extend the sunset. We think instead the State should be urged to do an extensive investigation of what consumer problems have been in this marketplace. The State Consumer

Protection Board was directed to do a study, which I believe was to be available in 2006 and 2007, which, for various reasons, has not come back to the public. And, we don't see how the State can appropriately address all the consumer problems in this area without a much better public record to create the decision.

So, we would urge you, in your Resolution to call on the State to enact a comprehensive investigation, but also to protect ticketholders and to recognize that this has been a failed experiment. By deregulating this area, consumers and fans have been hurt. The State has an opportunity to put things back right. But, we'd also urge New York City to stay involved because this is an issue where there's a lot of special interest and your ability to get in here and start asking some of these tough questions, which you asked this morning, those are the questions that need to be asked. We need somebody to push for what the truth is behind these questions. And, that, in the long run, is the best guarantor of a good consumer outcome. So, we applaud your interest in the area and would like
to work with you in further refining the law that you've proposed. Thanks very much.

LEOR ZAHAVE: Thank you very much. My name is Leor Zahave from Admit One here in New York City. Firstly, I'd like to apologize. I did not come with any prepared statements. I did not plan on testifying. I came because initially, when I read the bill, I thought it was related more to the primary market. But, after hearing a lot of the conversation here today, as my wife tends to tell me, I'm going to have a hard time keeping my tongue because there were some comments made that I thought I could perhaps shed some light on from our perspective, as well.

So, first, if $I$ could just for a minute or two, give a little bit of a background on the ticket industry in the City itself. You know, back in the '30s, '40s and '50s, there was very limited means of distribution for folks that handled a lot of the venues here. So, oftentimes, there were no ticket limits at all. Back then, a person could walk up to the box office and buy large amounts of tickets and there'd be nothing that could stop the person from doing that.
would work with ticket resellers and give them tickets on a consignment basis. Sorry about that. So, over time, when technology started to present itself to the ticket industry, companies like Telecharge sprung about, which allowed people to go to various locations and purchase tickets from an electronic source that was directly hooked up to the box office. There were phone call centers that were developed. And, over time, there were restrictions put on how many tickets a person could buy.

## So, and then, Ticketmaster came

 about and other companies like Ticketmaster came about, where they took it to the next level and they started to use the internet for distribution. So, while for years people used to be able to go to a box office and buy tickets, today, every single personal computer is a virtual box office. And, when you start thinking of the amount of people that live in the Tri-State area and you take a look at the census and you take a look at how many seats are in a particular venue and you take a look at the fact that there's a ticketlimit, even if you had a venue that had 20,000 seats and there was a four-ticket limit, you know, if every single ticket was put on sale to the public, which $I$ don't know that that always is the case, but, even if it were the case, there'd really only be 5,000 people that could get tickets.

I got to believe for some of these larger events there's far greater than 5,000 people that will be attempting to get a ticket. So, in one of the comments made earlier about how you go online and the ticket sells out in a minute or two, when you think about it, I would hope when you think about it the way $I$ just presented it, it's a lot easier to understand why something can sell out in either minutes or even seconds, in some cases.

So, ever since the internet, the ticket industry has really been at the forefront of anybody who wants to pay attention to it. So, back in 2007, when the folks in Albany were talking about doing something to change the industry and there was some debate about the free market, whether or not you should lift the price
cap or not, there were plenty of people on both sides of the table; those that would say by doing that, you're giving a license for people to charge whatever they want and, in some cases, they could be charging prices that are astronomical. And, there were those that would argue that, you know, by doing that and allowing people to sell their tickets, you're actually going to be putting more tickets into the secondary, therefore, putting pressure on prices and bringing it down.

Now, granted I am in the ticket
business. But, I will tell you that I think both sides were right. There are going to be times when there are going to be events that the prices are going to go through the roof. But, there are also going to be plenty of times where the prices are going to come down.

Now, one of the key components of the bill in 2007 was the fact that season ticketholders were now given the right to do whatever they wanted to do with their tickets. And, by that $I$ mean prior to that bill, if $a--$ and I'll just use the Yankees as an example-- if the Yankees issued someone a season ticket, that
season ticketholder was not allowed to resell the tickets. They were completely forbidden to do so. So, there was also talk about the Yankees creating an exchange that would allow a season ticketholder to trade their seats if they chose.
So, one of the roundtable
discussions that took place in Albany was the Yankees said that they would allow a season ticketholder to do that on their site. But, when the question was posed to them what if $I$ wanted to sell the ticket to my neighbor or a friend or whomever, the response was not unless you do it on our site. So, as that conversation opened up, I think Albany and the rest of the elected officials around the City and State, began to embrace the fact that if a season ticketholder goes and buys a ticket and pays for that ticket, it should be their right to do what they want with that ticket and sell it wherever they want to.

So, that was placed into the law.
Now, I'm sure everybody here's been reading about the Mets and the Yankees and the fact that there are some tickets that are priced very, very high and, unfortunately, because of the economy plus
the pricing that they set, there have been some empty seats. I think some of the things that have not been discussed is the fact that if you go to many of the secondary sites, you will see a very robust market where you can purchase tickets for just about every single game far below the face value of the tickets that were initially issued. What would have happened if that were not the case? If, in fact, the season ticketholder would continue to be restricted, then your only choice would be to buy the tickets from the Stadium, from the primary source. That would mean if you wanted to sit in a certain area, you'd have to pay the only game in town that was charging the tickets. You wouldn't have options. You wouldn't have choices.

And, at the end of my testimony, I'd be happy, by the way, to submit over the last two years, we've done our own research to prove that there are oftentimes on the secondary market where you can purchase a ticket lower than you can on the primary markets. We have taken screen shots that are time-stamped of the various secondary sites, as well as the primary sites to
show that, in fact, a free market does have its advantages; does create an opportunity where there's competition; does create an opportunity for a consumer to have more than one place to purchase a ticket and also for a consumer to have the ability to sell a ticket that they could not either otherwise use because they just genuinely can't attend or, even if it is that they want to do it for a profit.

The season tickets today, as everybody here is aware, are very expensive relative to how they used to be. It's not an easy thing for people to afford to do. I would say a majority of the people that purchase season tickets do so as fans, but ultimately they either need help financially to continue to support the team or they do become part of the system and say you know what, $I$ can keep a certain amount of games and sell a certain other amount of tickets and, therefore, help compensate me for the fact that I was able to get the season tickets for the whole season directly from the organization.

So, I realize that there's a lot of folks that hear the Bruce Springsteen stories of
the world; hear the Hannah Montana stories of the world, and $I$ know it perhaps is a sexier story. But, the truth of the matter is anyone in this room can leave this room now, go on to the internet, go to any of the secondary sites, like Stubhub, TicketsNow, TicketNetwork, any of these sites that you just heard, go to either a primary site or a team site and compare for yourselves. Even though I'll provide the data, no one here has to take this data alone and say that that's the end result. You can take a look at it as you move forward and see that it's ongoing.

My concern now with this year is initially there's been talk about extending the bill. And, I've spoken to some of the folks in Albany. And, they have said that they feel that there's not really enough data yet to support that the secondary market has, in fact, helped consumers. And, I believe that there are organizations, up in Albany and here in the City, that have either not had the time or the resources to get around to doing so. Fortunately for us, we've done that just so that we can help make our case. But, I think this notion of giving
consumers or individuals a restriction on when they can start to resell a ticket is actually going to have the same exact effect that was taking place prior to the season ticketholder having the right.

So now, just imagine, like I said
to you before, if fans did not have the right to resell tickets, where the prices would be today. In today's marketplace, even though there are people that will sell a ticket within 48 hours after it goes on sale, $I$ think it's unfair for everybody here to assume that that means that those tickets are being sold for higher than the primary market. So, if there's no competition in the 48 hours, who's to say that the face value of a ticket cannot be set at a very high price. And, you know, who's going to be out there to compete with that and offer something that is at a lesser price? Again, I do want to emphasize and I don't want to come across as if I'm saying that it's always that way, because obviously there are times when it is higher.

But, this morning tickets went on sale for a John Legend, India Arie concert and
there were tickets on sale on the primary this morning. And, today was the general on-sale. There were presales that led into the on-sale this morning. So, and that's-- we'll get to that in a moment. But, that's a common practice in the industry where you have an official general onsale, but there's half a dozen pre-sales before you get to the on-sale. So, much of the inventory's already out into the marketplace. So now, at the general on-sale today, there were actually tickets on the secondary market that were cheaper than the primary market. If there was a 48-hour waiting period, that could not be something that a consumer could have a choice to do. So, I continue to take the position that, you know, the most important thing as far as I'm concerned is for me, as a broker, and for consumers as well to have the ability to have a choice.

Now, there was also some discussion regarding technology that was used. And, I think that there is probably a unanimous consent on either the primary, secondary or the, you know, the government bodies that that's something that
should be outlawed. When somebody uses something that's being done in a manner that gives not just an unfair advantage, but is potentially illegal, I would imagine definitively unethical, to use those sorts of things to give you that advantage, I would think that that's something that should be either a federal law, a city law or a state law. And, from what I'm hearing today, it sounds like the goal here is to make it that consumers have a fair shot. I believe if you put some very strong penalties in place for people that use those sorts of technologies, hopefully that'll discourage anybody from using that.

But, by restricting a consumer's
right to do what they want with a ticket that they purchased that they've already paid for, all we're doing when we do that is we're allowing whoever it is that does have control of the tickets at that point an unchecked pricing power. And, that has always been my concern.

I also just want to throw out there to you that, you know, today there's been a lot of discussion about prices and how you want to get the prices right and you want to price it to
exactly where the demand it. I respectfully disagree that that can ever be done from the beginning. I think that that's a moving target. When the Bruce Springsteen fiasco happened, prices were very high that first day. Yet, leading into the show at Nassau Coliseum the other day, you not only could buy some tickets at slightly above face, but there were actually some tickets on the secondary market that were below face value. These things happen all the time. They happen the other way around, too, where there's no demand initially and leading into an event, tickets might go for two or three times the face value. I think it's impossible for the primary or the secondary market to guess correctly and have that price stay that way.

> So, again, to me, the emphasis should be creating an environment where there's always the ability to compete, where a consumer has the chance and the opportunity to purchase from more than one location. Sorry. I'm sorry. One more thing.
ahead.

LEOR ZAHAVE: I do want to also
state, I think one of the other underlying issues from the artist's side, and this is just an opinion, when you sell a ticket for a certain price and then, you see it on the secondary market for a far greater price, and if you're the artist, I have to believe there's a sense of that's mine. They shouldn't be doing that to my ticket. Or, I should be the one getting all that money. And, to me, I look at that the same way I look at somebody who might own a stock and sell it at a certain date and time at a price and then, six months later, they see that Google's trading at four times what they sold it at. And, they feel that they made a mistake and they sold it too cheap. These are things that are natural feelings to have. But, it's certainly not something that you can hold the marketplace liable for or hold the person who did decide to purchase the ticket, hold it or resell it or do whatever they wanted to, liable for something that you already had the ability to do. And, that $I$ think is, from the primary side, something that really gets to folks, as evidenced by the Yankees
starting really high, coming out of the gate with the prices that they did, not realizing that the potential backlash would create all this negative press for them. So, there's a balancing act for artists and venues and teams when they come up with these prices. And, I realize they have to take that into consideration. Now, I'm done. CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. Well, thank you. I appreciate the statements from both entities. I really want to align myself, primarily, with both of you in a regard. Clearly, we need to do something to make sure that the consumers have an equal and fair opportunity. And, I kind of agree that the issue of reinstating the 45\% cap, I think is important. So, I would ask you, has your business improved or diminished since the cap was lifted?

LEOR ZAHAVE: Well, in 2007 to
2008, it was a good year. And, the last year, towards the later part of last year and this year, it's not quite as good, obviously, because of economic conditions. But, I think--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:
[Interposing] Before 2007, your business was
consistent and you had the ability to do all of the things that you talked about for--

LEOR ZAHAVE: [Interposing] No, we actually did not.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: We were quite
restricted in what we could do.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: And, it was a very
different business model that we had to approach. Ours was more of a high volume business model because of the price caps.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right. LEOR ZAHAVE: It was very, very difficult to get by on that front, especially when a customer calls you and you'd like to sell them something that they're looking for, but you just can't. Yet, they could go on to the internet and go ahead and fill their order and now, you're losing a customer 'cause they do want to purchase a ticket. Something that you can't offer them because of the caps and the price caps that you might have. But, more importantly--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: So, you-

- I'm sorry. I'm not clear. You can't offer them the ticket because it's beyond their ability to pay?

LEOR ZAHAVE: No, no, back before the laws changed--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: -- there were
limitations as to what $I$ would be allowed to charge for a ticket.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: Oftentimes, the ticket that the customer was looking for was just out of reach of what $I$ was allowed to charge. So, those particular customers would have to go elsewhere. If there was a customer that wanted a ticket within the pricing that $I$ was allowed to charge, I was able to service them.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
LEOR ZAHAVE: But, what has
happened now, which is surprising to some extent, I'm actually able to purchase tickets now below face, sell them below face oftentimes, and still make a living. And, that could only happen because season ticketholders now have the right to
do that. So, there's significantly more inventory in the marketplace. If you go to a Stubhub, let's say, and see how many tickets and they'll tell you how many tickets are there for a particular game, you could have 25 or $35 \%$ of a venue for sale to the public for a game that's within a few days away, so the prices are very depressed. Where, 100, you know, $\$ 150$ face value ticket could be trading right now for 20 or $\$ 30$.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: But, now, I understand that on the seasonal games or events that happen on multiple times. Well, like the Beyonce concert, are you getting resales on that?

LEOR ZAHAVE: Right now, the Beyonce, at least for us, the Beyonce concert is not that big a seller. And, also my agency, we tend to do much more on the sporting side.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.

LEOR ZAHAVE: We do a little bit on the theater and concert side.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
LEOR ZAHAVE: So, perhaps we're not as good an indicator for the concert business.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. LEOR ZAHAVE: But, currently, the demand is not too high for the Beyonce concert. But, there are plenty of concerts that we recently sold where we have sold them below face value and I don't know if Beyonce's tickets will remain above face value, because we are not experiencing significant demand for it.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.

LEOR ZAHAVE: Whereas, some of the other concerts that were discussed here, there was significant demand initially, like the Springsteen concert--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: -- and a few other
shows.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: So, like Jonas Brothers, they're--

LEOR ZAHAVE: [Interposing] There was significant demand there for Jonas Brothers, yes.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: And, you sold most of your product above face value.

LEOR ZAHAVE: I would imagine, and

I don't have the numbers with me here, but $I$ would imagine most of the prices for Jonas Brothers tickets were at above face value.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right, right. And, just the 45\% cap, you would not like to see that reinstituted.

LEOR ZAHAVE: I think the fairest answer to that is this. A person is going to want to procure a ticket and, if they can do it from a licensed ticket broker, they will. And, if the licensed ticket broker tells them sorry, I'm prohibited from selling you a ticket above 45\% above the face value, they will go elsewhere and they will purchase that ticket. So, what good does that do a consumer when now you're putting them in a position where they could potentially be buying it from someplace where there's no recourse if there's an issue.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: And, again, it's
perhaps because I'm a businessman, I feel that pricing should be left to the consumer--

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
LEOR ZAHAVE: -- to decide whether
they want to pay it for that ticket.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay.
And, Mr. Bell, I understand you want to reinstitute the cap. You just heard what Mr. Zahave said. Do you have a reflection on that?

CHARLES BELL: You know, we believe that a cap of $45 \%$ still allows a ticketholder to get the fair price back that they paid for the ticket, plus significant markup, including, you know, the service fees that they had paid. So, we don't see how the individual ticketholder is disadvantaged by that, except, you know, to the extent that you need to distinguish between sort of the use value of a ticket and the investment value or the exchange value. In the sense that, when we talk about, you know, these are venues that are built with public tax dollars and extensive subsidies, if someone wants to buy a ticket to go to see the Yankees, that's one thing. But, to buy tickets to become the, you know, the equivalent of sort of a franchise to resell that for whatever the market will bear all year long and perhaps never even go to a single game. It's
long established that you have people who will go to box offices, who will buy tickets online, really holding them for investment value rather than use value.

And so, what we're saying is the consumer and the ticket seeker deserves a fair deal. And, if you take that as your starting principle, the $45 \%$ cap is sort of the trigger issue. It's sort of like saying hey, the State's paying attention. It's not whatever the market will bear. There's going to be some rules in this marketplace.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.

CHARLES BELL: And, the other rule we'd really like to see is the thing that allows tickets to leak out to the ticket brokers from the box offices, from people who have friends within the venues that somehow get tickets and get them into the hands of the scalpers, that issue absolutely needs to be addressed. So, I think technology can play an element in the solution. More public disclosure of the amount of the tickets that are going on sale and the percent that they're being offered could play an element
in the solution. We've seen examples of where artists took blocks of their tickets and diverted them directly to the secondary market to try to get, you know, with no disclosure to the fans. So, there's a lot of issues relating to enforcement, public oversight and accountability that need to be addressed in this space. And, we don't think, you know, no one has produced evidence to really establish the benefits to the consumer of repealing the cap. The best study we have is one that goes back ten years. If someone wants to produce an independent study that shows that there are benefits, we'd be willing to look at it. We're not just going to take the word of industry sources saying sometimes tickets are cheaper, so it's no big deal. The anecdotal experience of tens of thousands of fans has been actually the opposite and, multiplied by many, many people.

So, we want to see more inquiry, more investigation. And, in the absence of that, we don't want to extend the field experiment at the State level. And, we would be very open to working with New York City to see what kind of
protections you can put in place. As the number one entertainment and cultural capital, we think you should be number one in consumer protection, as you so often are. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Thank
you. Just one other question. You heard the issue of, though, whether or not season ticketholders could do their own resale, which they couldn't do under the provisions before 2007. Do you think that should be changed [crosstalk]?

CHARLES BELL: You know, I think I'm not as familiar as I'd like to be with all the rules that were in place before that was changed. I think you need to balance the rights of someone who can't go to a game, who needs to recover the money they've paid for the season ticket, with the rights of a fan who wants to see that game in an affordable price.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Um, hm.

CHARLES BELL: And, let's remember, you know, we have a big distribution of incomes in the United States. We have a lot of people who can't afford to go to a Yankee game every week. A lot of people that live in New York City will
never get a crack at going if this is viewed as an investment opportunity. It's whatever the market will bear. It almost becomes the equivalent of a taxi medallion that someone has a unlimited franchise to resell their tickets all year long and never go to a game. There are probably people that are working the system like that. We need to investigate this and find out. If that's just an occasional thing, that's one thing. But, we would like to see, you know, a little more deference to the right of a fan or a ticket seeker to get access to an affordable ticket.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Okay. And, thank you. And, Mr. Zahave, you made some very interesting comments. I hope that, you know, we can get the statistics to back up a lot of things that you're saying.

LEOR ZAHAVE: Right here.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Um, hm.
LEOR ZAHAVE: I do want to just
point out a few other things regarding the pricing and the pre-selling of tickets. So, today, if you want to buy a Giants or Jets, or let's focus on the Giants, ticket in the new stadium, you have to
buy what's called a personal seat license.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Right.
LEOR ZAHAVE: They make you pay for this personal seat license over the course of the next year, year and a half. And, even while you're paying for that, they're not guaranteeing you that you're even going to get the ticket that you're paying for. What they are telling you is if the tickets are not available within the parameters that you're requesting, they'll refund you. Now, that PSL is basically a license for that seat. You still have to purchase that ticket on a game-to-game basis. This is one way that they're now taking and trying to take from season ticketholders the ability, or better yet, to charge them for the ability to do what they want with their tickets.

Additionally, if a Broadway show is going to open six months or a year from now, there are group agents where you can place orders before the tickets are ever on sale to the public. You're required to purchase a certain amount of tickets. In addition to that, they don't guarantee you what tickets you are going to get.

But, you do get access to them before they go on sale to the public.

And then, there are venues like Jones Beach and PNC, where you can purchase, through Live Nation, a package where, for a set fee, you can reserve a certain chair for the entire season. The problem is, you don't know how many shows you're going to get. So, you really don't know how much you're paying per ticket. And, you get those seats before they go on sale to the public. So, how are we going to create an environment where people have, you know, the ability to purchase a ticket in a competitive environment when we're looking to restrict the secondary from reselling a ticket? But, at the same token, the primary has the ability of having all these different presales and, you know, ability to allow people to lock up tickets in advance without giving them the ability to be resold on the secondary.

I just wanted to point out that the very same thing that we're potentially discussing doing is already taking place on the primary market. appreciate you opening up another can of worms on this issue. But--

LEOR ZAHAVE: Like my wife said, I can't hold my tongue.

CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: Well, you know, as you told me earlier, you went to Jamaica High School. So, I'm sure you've been investigating as well. So, as also an alum of Jamaica High School, I appreciate you being here. And, thank you for your insight.

LEOR ZAHAVE: No worries.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE:

Unfortunately, I have to close the meeting. I just want to point out that $I$ want to thank my counsel--

LACEY CLARKE: Lacey.
CHAIRPERSON LEROY COMRIE: -- Lacey
Clarke and Damien Butvick. It's been a strange morning. I'm sorry, Lacey. And, I wanted to announce my interns, but they all had to leave, 'cause I had Anastasia and also, Troy and Alvin were here. And, they were great interns with me this semester. I don't think everyone has met

Reggie Thomas, my new Budget and Legislative Director. He'll be talking to all of you about the issues and analyst, Damien Butvick, for all of his work on this issue. And, just like to say hello to Thomas Veruggia [phonetic], past counsel, who is visiting us today.

So, with that, I'll declare the hearing closed. I want to thank you gentlemen for being here. And, I look forward to talking with you soon on this issue. Thank you. Thank you very much. I want to thank all the people that came and all the people that participated in today's hearing. Thank you very much.
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