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morning everyone. Welcome to the Consumer Affairs Committee of the New York City Council. Today is Friday, October 28th. My name is Dan Garodnick and I have the privilege of chairing this committee. I am joined today by Council Member Julissa Ferreras and Council Member Oliver Koppell, and we will be joined in a moment by Council Member Leroy Comrie and certainly others. Council Member Comrie is the sponsor of Intro 247 , which is on today's agenda.

New Yorkers have been for years frustrated when trying to simply buy a ticket to an event because of controversial ticket sale practices that leave consumers without fair access to tickets priced for initial sale; that prohibit transfer of tickets once purchased, for even less than face value, in some instances; and that keep fans in the dark regarding the number of tickets made available to the general public.

> Purchasing tickets just shouldn't be the extraordinary hassle that it has become. A fan wants to buy a ticket to see a favorite band, logs into Ticketmaster the moment the tickets go
on sale, and in a nanosecond, those tickets are all sold out. The fan wonders who is at work here: Speculators, ticket bots, the artists, Ticketmaster, all of the above? Still wanting a ticket, the fan logs on seconds later to TicketsNow or StubHub where tickets for the band's performance are somehow now available, but all priced much more than the price set for the initial ticket sale moments earlier. Reluctantly, the fan pays the original ticket cost, the additional couple hundred bucks, the convenience fee charge in the secondary market, and after completing the purchase, finally has a ticket. This is a scenario that plays out again and again and happened with great fanfare just last month when Radiohead performed at the Roseland Ballroom. Trying to get tickets for those concerts had Radiohead fans climbing up the walls in frustration, as tickets were unavailable just moments after going on sale to the general public. Curiously, however, tickets did appear on TicketsNow--Ticketmaster's proprietary secondary market website--not only after tickets went on sale, but reportedly before as well.
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To be clear, some artists insist on will-call only tickets as a fan-friendly means of preventing tickets from entering the secondary market, thus, ensuring that consumers can purchase tickets at the price set by the artist. However, requiring fans to be present in order to claim tickets is controversial because it restricts or even denies a consumer's right of a ticket transfer.

As for tickets that make their way to the secondary marketplace just seconds after the start of the public sale, of course, that's not an occurrence that is specific to the Radiohead concerts. LCD Soundsystem sold out Madison Square Garden earlier this year within one minute of tickets going on sale, leaving fans tired of the tribulations associated with trying to score high demand tickets when competing against speculators and illegal automated ticket purchasing software, or ticket bots, that eat up all available tickets within minutes in order to sell those tickets for wildly inflated prices on the secondary market.

Kid Rock also posted on his website
last week that, in times like these, they continually try to thwart the efforts of scalpers, such as when AC/DC adopted a paperless-only policy for an entire tour. However, scalpers found a way around that by using prepaid debit cards to purchase the paperless tickets and then mailed the prepaid debit card to the ticket buyer--which I thought was particularly novel.

To provide a little history
regarding New York State's ticket sale law. In 2007, the long-standing price cap on ticket resales was repealed, giving way to a legal secondary market in New York. The impact of deregulating ticket resales was striking. In September 2007, just months after the price cap repeal, tickets to all 54 Miley Cyrus concerts sold out in 14 minutes, with brokers reselling those tickets at more than 65 times the original price. Bruce Springsteen tickets in February 2009 sold out on Ticketmaster with fans then redirected to Ticketmaster's TicketsNow website where tickets were available, but for several times the original price.

New York State's ticket sale law,
which will sunset on May 14,2012 was amended to regulate the use of a paperless ticket system, without clear definition of paperless ticket system. The law required that if paperless tickets are used, consumers need to be able to transfer them at any price, at any time, without additional fees, and independent, of the operator or operator's agent. The intent of the law is to provide consumers with the right to transfer their tickets. Tickets that may be transferred, or at least refunded if a will-call system is employed, should, very simply, be the right of every consumer, and this committee will explore legislation that would make that a requirement or clarify otherwise unclear areas in the state law. In addition, this committee will consider legislation to address the current lack of transparency in the ticket marketplace regarding the number of tickets artists make available to the general public. When tickets sell out at a venue--whether the seating capacity is 300 or 20,000 --the general public may reasonably assume that all of those tickets were up for grabs. However, that is frequently not the
case as artists often hold back tickets for VIPs, fan clubs, and, increasingly, for initial sale in the secondary market. That's right. As a number of media outlets have reported, artists, including Katy Perry and Neil Diamond, they are scalping their own tickets. However, fans are often unaware of this practice, as the secondary market does not always identify the origin of a ticket. Now, while it is not the role of government to require artists to divulge the number of hold backs for a particular event at private venues, a different standard may be needed for performances at venues that are supported, at least in part, by taxpayer dollars. General transparency and greater transparency in the ticket marketplace will allow consumers to know just how many tickets are out there for a particular event, and may even shame artists into adopting business practices that don't stick it to the very people supporting their livelihoods.

The rest of today's hearing will be spent discussing how to reconcile seemingly competing interests, namely, how to provide consumers with the right to transfer tickets while
ensuring fair access to tickets priced for initial sale. One potential solution we will discuss is Council Member Comrie's Intro 247, a bill that would require places of entertainment and their agents--there he is, right on cue, Council Member Comrie--to reserve for on-site box office sales 15\% of tickets available for purchase. And in a moment I'll give him a chance to introduce his own bill.

But as a general matter, this requirement would be restricted to venues with seating capacity greater than 3,000 and would exempt events that occur on a daily basis at the same venues, such as Broadway and off-Broadway shows. Individuals would be limited to the purchase of no more than four tickets per day; and recordkeeping requirements would be imposed on operators and their agents, including documenting the total number of tickets made available to individual consumers at the box office. So-[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --so now I'd like to turn the microphone over briefly to Council Member Comrie to hear his introductory
comments on Intro 247, and then we will get into the rest of the hearing. So, Council Member Comrie, welcome--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --the floor
is yours.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Thank you, Council Member Garodnick, and thank you for putting this hearing together.

This hearing stems out of a few issues. The original issue, why we brought the bill to pass, was the phenomenon of Hannah Montana and the inability of regular constituents to have a shot at getting tickets. And because of that issue, we started to look into the whole idea of how the public can actually get a opportunity to purchase tickets for events vis-à-vis the fact that so many events are sold out within minutes of them being advertised--of the event being advertised.
Parents who are trying to get
opportunities for their children, people who are trying to get the opportunity to come to an event believe that there are so many tickets on sale,
only to find out that the amount of tickets on sale at any particular event at any particular venue are flexible and rotating, according to the desires of the producers, the desires of the venue, the desires of the artist, and it's becoming to the point where the general public has no idea how many tickets are actually available to the general public.

So we are looking to develop a
truth in advertising bill, a transparency opportunity so that the public can actually know that if a venue has an event, how many tickets are actually available to the public, how many tickets can the public actually have a real opportunity to purchase. We are looking to set aside at least $15 \%$ of the tickets to be available so that people can come to the venue.

And now there's a new issue of the ability to actually purchase a ticket and use it as a gift if necessary. If a person gets sick at the last minute, how can they transfer a ticket properly without losing money.

So hopefully, we can hear from all of the folks about their issues on this, but we're
looking to protect the public, we're looking to give the public maximum access and opportunity to have a free and unfettered right to purchase tickets without having to run into ticket bots or ticket brokers or ticket resalers as the only market to purchase tickets for events.

So I am thankful that we can have this hearing today. I look forward to hearing all of the testimony from all sides, and I look forward to a productive meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you, Council Member Comrie. And with that, we're going to get right into it, invite the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs to the witness table.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Mr.
Chairman--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Yes,
Council Member Koppell.
COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: --before they speak, I would like to raise a point, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Please go ahead.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: They can go to the table, I don't want to stop them from doing that. First of all, you're very brave to take on this issue. I might mention that the issue of ticket scalping was one that I spent a great deal of time trying to deal with many years ago when I was Attorney General of the state. We tried to enforce the then-restrictions on scalping, which was both difficult to do and also very controversial.

Some people were very critical of our trying to enforce those rules, other people supported us in that. And the legislature, obviously, has had difficulty grappling with this issue because they have tried different approaches, and then they repealed all the restrictions, and some people think that's a good idea and others don't. So this is a very tough issue.

I do not see in the questions that we were presented the issue of the degree to which we have the right to regulate this, in light of the considerable state activity that's taken place. And I would appreciate everybody who
testifies who has some thoughts on that, on preemption--both legal preemption and also whether we should do this on a local level. I think it would be worthwhile to hear that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Well thank you, Council Member Koppell, and I certainly appreciate those comments. And as we look to possibly develop legislation in this committee and certainly with the bill that is currently pending before this committee, that is an important question that we need to explore--preemption and whether, as a municipality in New York State, we should be taking this action or any action ourselves. And we certainly appreciate your presence on this committee, Council Member, as the former Attorney General, and we look forward to your input on all of this.

So with that, DCA, it's all you.
Come on up.
[Pause]
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Turn on the
microphone.
ERIK JOERSS: So good morning, Chairman Garodnick, members of the Consumer

Affairs Committee. I am Erik Joerss, Director of City Legislative Affairs for the Department of Consumer Affairs. Commissioner Mintz and I thank you for this opportunity to comment on Intro number 247 , a bill that would require certain places of entertainment to offer for sale a proportion of tickets for specially scheduled events directly at their box offices.

This bill seeks to effectuate the understandable goal of ensuring that the general public would have a direct opportunity to purchase highly coveted tickets for limited engagements at face value at the box office. It would require venues to hold back a certain number of tickets from bulk buyers and resellers. Specifically, places of entertainment within New York City with a permanent seating capacity of over 3,000 persons would have to set aside at least 15\% of tickets made available for purchase to special events for sale to individuals at the box office and limit those individuals to four tickets each. It would also require that the ticket have the time and date of sale printed on its face and mandate the maintenance of certain records.

Intro 247 gives the department the authority to enforce compliance with these provisions by requiring the venues to make their records available for inspection by the commissioner and issue violations accordingly. While the department is sympathetic to the purposes of the bill, we do have significant concerns about our ability to enforce its mandates. Troublesome questions include: First, the bill's requirement that $15 \%$ of tickets be made available for purchase to be set aside needs clarification--what seats for each performance are counted as made available for purchase?

As anyone who's been to a show knows, not all seats are created equal. Can the 15\% be nosebleed seats? Can they be priced differently? The bill does not specify how tickets could be distributed without being counted as made available for purchase. DCA would need this information to determine whether a place of entertainment was in compliance with the $15 \%$ requirement. If the number of tickets that could be distributed without being counted is made available for purchase can vary with each
performance, it becomes even more difficult to determine compliance.

Second, the bill does not specify
for how long tickets reserved for individual sales would have to be held back at the box office before they can be sold through outlets other than the box office. Is it one day? Would it be one week? Should it be until the date of the performance?

Third--and perhaps most importantly
from a regulatory perspective--the recordkeeping requirements of the bill just do not enable the department to assess compliance with the law. The requirement that venues maintain only records of the total number of tickets available for sale to individual consumers and the locations of the corresponding seats would not, upon audit, inform the department whether or not there was compliance.

If the Barclays Center--and we'll
pick on them 'cause they don't really exist yet-if they say that a Black Eyed Peas show has room for 15,000 seats, but a Jay-Z show has such an elaborate set that only 12,000 are available, and

Wilco can only fill 9,000 seats so they've covered up the obstructed view seats, how does DCA know if these numbers are accurate? The bill, as crafted, would require us to take them at their word. And an electronic recordkeeping requirement could help solve the problem, but we are mindful that such necessary electronic recordkeeping can be very costly to the regulated entities.

And fourth, the department lacks the docketing authority that would allow us to hold those who violated the law accountable if they chose to ignore adjudicated fines--a particularly serious impediment to holding accountable industries that are not licensed by the department.

> DCA appreciates the Council

Members' efforts to ensure that the public has the opportunity to purchase tickets to special events and performances at the box office and at face value. We also appreciate tickets sellers legitimate interest in selling their tickets, and, while protecting consumers, we do not want to unduly burden the marketplace.
We look forward to hearing
testimony today from artists and ticket sellers in both the primary and secondary markets regarding their perspectives on both the fairness and practicality of Intro 247.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the bill. I'm happy to take questions.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you.

I am sure that Council Member Comrie has questions for you on the bill, but let me just start off with a more general question for you--

ERIK JOERSS: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --about the practices that $I$ cited in my opening statement. Does DCA get complaints via the 311 system about problems, either with purchases at a venue, purchases from one of the online sites, either primary or secondary? What are you hearing--
[Crosstalk]

ERIK JOERSS: [Interposing] We look back over the past, I believe it was five years, to check our records, we had zero complaints on this issue specifically--about being, you know, tickets being scalped, tickets being overpriced,
this sort of thing, or not being able to--we had a total of 28 complainants as resulted--as in any way, shape, or form connected with ticket sellers--not being able to obtain a refund, not being delivered the tickets they thought they were getting. But there's been zero--we have zero calls on that we've taken on specifically the issues raised in--
[Crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] I mean, that's an interesting statistic. I am certain it does not reflect the consumer frustration, but it may reflect that perhaps the City is not the first place that they are calling as a result of their--
[Crosstalk]
ERIK JOERSS: [Interposing] Of course, and we're not the oversight agency for it, it's regulated by the state so...

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Right, so that makes some sense. On the concepts that you did testify on, on Intro 247 , just to go to

Council Member Koppell's point about
jurisdictional legality preemption, any reason to
think that New York City could not do what we are proposing in this legislation?

ERIK JOERSS: Be honest, we have not studied the preemption issue, we are very happy and looking forward to hearing more about it and whether it is appropriate for the city to get involved in this, but at this point we don't have an opinion on whether or not the city should be involved in it, and legally we have not studied the preemption issue.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Do you wish to weigh in preliminarily on concepts that we have articulated already in this hearing, such as requiring venues to be transparent in terms of the number of tickets that they are offering to the public?

ERIK JOERSS: I think all of us are in favor of greater transparency in most things, and philosophically, that seems like the way to go, but specifically, as this is not an issue that DCA has regulated, it's not something that we have looked into nearly enough for me to comment on behalf of the agency. I learned more about this in your opening remarks than $I$ think $I$ knew in my
life leading up to it, so we would want to hear more before offering opinions.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. So then I'm not going to push you on helping us to interpret transferability of paperless tickets as per the state law amendments, I probably will hold that for--
[Crosstalk]
ERIK JOERSS: [Interposing] I greatly appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Not a problem. And I'm going to turn to Council Member Comrie for some questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Well first I would say that I'm disappointed that there was no research done by the agency at all regarding the bill. And I'm concerned that, in the light of trying to create transparency, that DCA's lack of desire to make some suggestions, only questions, is a little--it doesn't surprise me, but disappoints me.

But just to reaffirm a couple of things. We talked about the idea of trying to create transparency so that consumers can have
real knowledge of what a venue is, and we are asking that the venues be clear about how many seats are VIP seats; how many seats go to, say, American Express Black card owners; how many goes to the promoters or the artists themselves so that, if there is an artist that says as you--I forgot which one you said was a 9,000 seat artist, I didn't--

UNKNOWN VOICE: Black Eyed Peas.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Black Eyed
Peas? No, I think that was the 15,000 .
ERIK JOERSS: Very good, 9,000 was Wilco.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah, Jay-Z was 15,000 , sor you know, let's just use 15,000 in Jay-Z. You know, we would expect that, you know, these venues would have at least some honesty in the amount of seats that they're actually offering. I can understand that there would be some artists that they wouldn't want the nosebleed seats included or the seats that have no clear vision of the stage, but there are other opportunities where they want every available seat done, but that reporting could be done
electronically. And we would be looking for the venues to be honest, we're looking for honesty in reporting here, and I would hope that DCA would want to take this up to try to protect consumers. I would hope that DCA would want to try to find out what we can do to ensure that our consumers that are looking to get an opportunity to purchase a ticket understand what their real opportunities are, and that if they can purchase the ticket directly, they would prefer to do that, rather than going through a secondary or tertiary market to purchase tickets. And that if a venue is providing an event, that they would be clear about how many tickets are actually available to the public versus how many tickets are going to VIPs.

So just to, you know, talk about this in specific, $I$ think there is a major role that DCA can play in addressing this particular problem, and I would hope that DCA would work with us after this hearing to really drill down into what we can do to create an opportunity. I'm not going to go in depth since you did say that you just heard about it on Council Member Garodnick's presentation today, but

I will say that I'm disappointed that DCA didn't do more to prepare for the hearing.

So I'll leave it at that. I'm going to give you a pass and send you on a mission to do some research so that when we have our meeting after this, we can have some real answers from the agency, since we have other people who want to testify.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Council Member Comrie. And I also do wish to echo the sentiments that we do want to make sure that you guys are fully briefed and prepared as our partner in all of this and we'll look forward to working with you in greater detail down the line.

Council Member Ferreras.
COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Good morning.

ERIK JOERSS: Good morning.
COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Just for the record, I know that you said that you've gotten zero calls, but let's say once this goes up and it's made public and someone decides $I$ want to call the Department of Consumer Affairs to be able
to file a complaint because of whatever process that they went through, what happens to that call when it comes in?

ERIK JOERSS: Well if somebody called, they would probably call through 311 and the call would come in, in a case like this, it would likely go to our consumer--if it was appropriate for DCA, it would go to our Consumer Services division, get recorded, and then there would be a decision on whether or not this was something that DCA had authority over and whether or not we would docket it and try to mediate the complaint for the consumer.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: So as it stands right now, that decision would be that it does not, as the legislation speaks right now?

ERIK JOERSS: We don't have
authority over ticket sellers right now.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Okay.
And then what does that complainant get from DCA? How do they know that that's what was determined?

ERIK JOERSS: They would get either
a phone call, $I$ believe, a phone call or a letter from us saying that we're sorry, but this is not
the appropriate place, this is not the appropriate agency to handle your complaint.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Are they told what the appropriate agency is?

ERIK JOERSS: Yeah.
COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Yes, in this letter--

ERIK JOERSS: Yeah.
COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: --or call.

ERIK JOERSS: And as I said, you know, the calls that came in, like, you know, of those ones that came in, because DCA enforces the Consumer Protection law, if it is that this consumer--there was false advertising and this consumer was not given what was promised, that is the kind of case that DCA would be able to take. But specifically on the idea of somebody in the secondary market tried to overcharge me or this, that's not something we have any jurisdiction over.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Okay. Thank you.

ERIK JOERSS: You're welcome.
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CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you, Council Member. With that--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Council, that raises some questions--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Go ahead.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --for me. But wouldn't DCA want to have the authority or autonomy if there was a ticket scalping situation and her consumer is to have some oversight in this particular opportunity?

ERIK JOERSS: Well, as I mentioned, Council Member, it's not that we don't think that the businesses necessarily--that we don't think that it's a bad--that we think it's a bad idea for the city to be involved in this. What I mentioned in the testimony was that we can't depend on the ticket sellers, we can't depend on their honesty in order for us to enforce the law. That we actually need a--we would need, if we were going to regulate, we would need a system where we could verify, rather than have to take them at their word. If we could come up with such a system, we would, of course, like to discuss that and pursue it further.
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COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. So you would like to explore looking at a system that would give DCA the autonomy to protect the consumers dealing with these particular issues.

ERIK JOERSS: We're happy to look into it further; if it's appropriate for us to do, we would want to take it on.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. All right, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thanks very much for your testimony. And we're now going to call up George Fertitta--

ERIK JOERSS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --of New York City and Company; John--forgive me--Breyault of the National Consumers League; and Gary Adler of the National Association of Ticket Brokers as our first official panel here. And, George, whenever you are ready, you can kick it off. GEORGE FERTITTA: Great.
[Pause]

GEORGE FERTITTA: Good afternoon, my name is George Fertitta, I'm CEO of NYC \& Company, the city's marketing and tourism
organization. I would like to thank the Council, Chairperson Garodnick, and the entire Consumer Affairs Committee for allowing me to participate this morning on this very important topic.

As you know, New York City is renowned all over the world for its mix of people and cultures and its spectacular array of unique and exciting things to see, to do, and to experience. Even the current global financial climate has not dampened the enthusiasm and demand for travel to the five boroughs. In fact, a record 48.8 million visitors came to New York City in 2010, and we are on pace for another recordbreaking year in 2011. One major draw of the city is the wide range of events that take place in the city on a daily basis, particularly large-scale events that have interest on the national and even international audiences.

Of course, these events are not just for visitors but also for our 8.4 million residents. NYC \& Company, in fact, focuses a portion of our programming and our website to encourage New Yorkers to actively participate and immerse themselves in many of the activities that
are available to them. To this end, we support the spirit of Intro 247. We want both our residents and our visitors to enjoy these offerings at a reasonable price. However, we are concerned that the bill will not significantly address this issue; rather we feel that it will impose unfair restrictions on New York City businesses and venues and not solve the illegal scalping problem.

The legislation immediately raises several questions regarding restraint on trade. It is the right of venues such as Madison Square Garden, Radio City Music Hall, the Metropolitan Opera, Citi Field, Yankee Stadium and others--and these are the ones that are 3,000 seats or more-to make a fair profit at market value in the majority events they are able to procure and produce. This legislation runs the risk of impairing their ability to maximize the attendance by requiring them to limit where, when, and how they can sell tickets. Furthermore, this limitation could prove an impediment for these venues as they recruit events to the city. Competing venues in other cities could take
advantage of the restriction and use this as a selling point for large-scale shows, and performances or games.

Beyond our philosophical concerns about the bill and its potential limitation on trade, there are also some implementation concerns. Will venues be compensated or have means to recoup lost profits if they cannot sell out the 15\% allotment to walk-ups? Will there be a requirement to make available a certain amount for each ticket price point that was mentioned before? Will there be security support for venues when lines build up due to last-minute walk-up consumers? You mentioned Miley Cyrus and people like that, $I$ can only imagine the chaos that somebody like Lady Gaga could potentially create in that environment. How will the bill curb third-party operators from hiring people as standins to buy tickets in bulk? Will this be a deterrent for consumers visiting the city for events, even if they can't guarantee themselves seating? How do we handle the huge consumer disappointments as online and telecharge tickets sell out even faster?
right of legal third-party operators to resell
tickets. If demand allows them to raise the
price, it is really not the role of ourselves or government to restrict them under the free market principles.

We believe overall Intro 247
represents more challenges than solutions as it's presented. We sincerely appreciate the committee's role in protecting the consumer interests and we want to make sure that New York City events are affordable and available to everyone. However, we do not believe that Intro 247 will help curb ticket prices or lessen illegal price gouging in the market.

In our view, the real issue is
illegal black market scalping--a dangerous condition for consumers that costs the city millions in tax revenue. Whether through a consumer awareness campaign or better collaboration with the venues, NYC \& Company would welcome the opportunity to help the Council address this issue.

And thank you for the opportunity
to testify. Although we oppose 247, we at NYC \& Company share many of the same goals and interests with the Council. We look forward to working with the Council to find ways to keep events affordable and conveniently available to all New Yorkers and visitors.

And I should point out, Mr.
Chairman, that, you know, your presentation was enlightening to me, and it's hard to argue with almost everything. And I think that, you know, Councilman Comrie, the same thing, this is the one area that we have a lot of difficulty is, is the allocation of $15 \%$.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Well thank you, we appreciate the testimony. I'm going to start with Council Member Comrie, but I have a few questions for you by the way. So I also want to also probe a little further on the broader questions and how NYC \& Company would respond to those. But before we do any of that, let's just go through the panel and we'll get to that after. So welcome.

JOHN BREYAULT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name
is John Breyault and $I$ am the Vice President of Public Policy, Telecommunications and Fraud for the National Consumers League. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee to provide the consumer point of view on live event industry business practices.

Founded in 1899 here in New York City, NCL is the nation's oldest consumer advocacy organization. Our non-profit mission is to promote social and economic justice on behalf of consumers and workers in the United States and abroad.

NCL is a strong supporter of proconsumer ticketing protections at the state and national levels. In 2010, we organized a broad coalition of public interest groups, businesses, and more than 10,000 consumers in opposition to the Ticketmaster-Live Nation merger. We continue to pursue consumer-friendly policies in the live event industry today.

> My testimony focuses on three significant problems consumers experience when buying live event tickets. First, there's a lack of transparency and, as a result, consumers are
misled by artists, event producers, and ticketing agencies; second, ticket buying bot software harms consumers; and third, restrictive ticketing eliminates competition and denies consumer choice. First, transparency. Purchasing an event ticket is frequently a confusing and frustrating experience. Too often, consumers are at the mercy of ticketers, promoters, and artist managers who control the supply of tickets and profit handsomely from ticket sales that occur outside public sales channels to VIPs, fan clubs, ticket brokers, and elite credit card rewards club members.

This problem is widespread. For example, at a 2009 Taylor Swift show in Tennessee, only 1,600 of 13,300 tickets were made available for general public sale. Similar incidents have occurred at Keith Urban and Miley Cyrus shows, and more recently Katy Perry was found to have included in her touring contract a provision that permits her to withhold as many tickets as she chooses from public sale so that she can sell them directly to consumers on resale markets for inflated prices.

Consumers are hurt when they are misinformed and misled. Consumers unable to purchase tickets for a performance may erroneously believe that high demand or evil scalpers led to the quick sellout, but in reality the quote unquote sellout was just as likely to have been caused by artificially low supply engineered by the artist, promoter, and venue. Increasing transparency would reduce this information gap and give consumers a fighting chance in the ticket marketplace.

Several states have considered legislation that would do just this. For example, Massachusetts recently held a hearing on a bill that will require venues and ticket sellers to publish in advance of an event the percentage and number of tickets made available to the general public.

Second, ticket buying bot software is the bane of consumers, artists, and ticketing companies alike. These programs bombard online box offices with thousands of simultaneous purchase requests, and thereby jump ahead of legitimate consumers who are diligently waiting
their turn to purchase tickets. We believe that these bots violate one of consumers' basic rights: The right to fair access to events. For example, in one case, a Nevada-based company known as Wiseguy Ticketing used bot programs to purchase more than 1.5 million tickets between 2002 and 2008 for shows by artists like Bruce Springsteen, Miley Cyrus, Kenny Chesney, and Bon Jovi. We submit that the Wiseguys are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to bots. That Radiohead felt the need to embrace the extreme tactic of requiring all tickets to be picked up at the will-call window for their September shows at the Roseland Ballroom is just the latest proof that more should be done to control this program. Perhaps the Committee can ask Ticketmaster and venues to deliver empirical evidence of bot usage to the Committee so that you can review this documentation and turn it over to law enforcement.

> Finally, with regard to ticket
transferability, we submit that consumers have generally benefited from the growth of the online secondary market. Unfortunately, Ticketmaster has
seized on the problem of ticket bots to promote increasingly restrictive ticketing practices that are in reality thinly-veiled attempts to control one of the last parts of the live event industry that it does not dominate.

Instead of them embracing a competitive resale market that benefits consumers, primary ticketers, event producers, sports teams, and venue owners are seeking to monopolize it and eliminate consumers' choice of where to buy and sell tickets.

Onerous ticketing rules and anticonsumer restrictions can be used to prohibit ticket transfers and resale, or to force consumers to a single resale market where there is no competition and where fair market prices are often constrained.

In conclusion, given the importance of the live event industry to New Yorkers, it is no surprise to us that the city and state have historically been at the forefront of protecting the ticket buying public. On behalf of the National Consumers League and New York consumers, I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss
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this important issue; I applaud your leadership on this issue; and I look forward to answering your questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you very much.

GARY ADLER: Yes, good morning, Chairman and other esteemed members of the Committee, my name is Gary Adler and I am the general counsel of the National Association of Ticket Brokers, the NATB. I have acted in that capacity since the NATB was formed in 1995-CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Let me interrupt you just for a second and make sure that you don't have any written testimony for this--

GARY ADLER: I do have--
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: You do.
GARY ADLER: --testimony, yes.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: That you've copied and handed out?

GARY ADLER: I have not handed out, I was going to give it to the Sergeant-At-Arms, but--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
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[Interposing] Now is a good time, actually. We're going to ask the Sergeant to come grab it from you and we will--

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: So we can [Off mic].

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Yeah, you know, we'd like to follow along as you go.

GARY ADLER: Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Gary, I'm sorry.

GARY ADLER: No, thank you, thank you, Chairman. As I was saying, I'm the general counsel of the National Association of Ticket Brokers, or NATB, and I've acted in that capacity since the NATB was formed in 1995. The NATB was formed by a group of concerned ticket brokers who had the foresight to recognize the importance of self-governance in cleaning up the industry. The number one primary purpose of the NATB since its inception was to represent the interests of legitimate ticket brokers by promoting consumer protection measures and educating the public about the secondary market. One of the foundations of the NATB is assuring that the public that when
they deal with an NATB member, they are working with an honest, reliable businessperson who will deliver what is promised.

Through self-governance, the NATB has provided enhanced protections for ticketbuying consumers. We've worked with law enforcement agencies, state and federal legislators, local legislators, Broadway producers, and professional sports leagues and teams. The NATB has enacted basically since it's inception a lengthy and detailed code of ethics that is more stringent and copious than any consumer measures $I$ have seen in any of the state legislations.

I've submitted written testimony so I'm not going to read from that, I think I'm just going to maybe talk a little bit about some of the trends. And I've had an interesting perspective on the secondary market in that I'm not a ticket broker, but I've been involved in it since 1995 when, at that time, there were probably 20 states that outlawed or severely restricted or put caps, including New York, on the resale of tickets and we've seen a revolution, a tidal wave of free-
market--one of the king linchpins of the NATB has been free and open markets. And we've fought against any artificial restrictions, any caps, or any illegality. We've recognized, my people have recognized, and now a lot of people recognize that you're never going to legislate ticket brokering out of existence; if you try to legislate it out of existence, what you're going to do is hurt consumers because there's going to be same demand and less supply and prices are going to go up, and you're going to drive the business back to the back alleys and out of the back of cars.

> At the same hand, we've always advocated consumer protection measures. We have been on the forefront of consumer protections in the secondary market. We have, as I mentioned before, a code of ethics that if you don't deliver what you promised, you can't just refund that money, that's not good enough, you have to give $200 \%$ of the contracted price or the contracted price of and $\$ 1,000--$ so severe penalties. Fortunately, ticket brokers, my members, have done what they've promised, and the complaints that we get, as the same as the DCA, are few and far
between.

So we've watched the secondary market explode. We understand the advent of the Internet and companies like StubHub have legitimized the secondary market, but we also have been given praise, and $I$ think we deserve some credit for regulating, self-regulating, and doing the right thing.

I've talked to legislators before, and when they have a problem arises, 'cause invariably there's going to be a problem at some point, very infrequent, but they go--you know, I said, if every problem there is 10,000 good stories of people who are getting tickets at good prices or below face value or getting what they want, they're living their dream, they're getting them, and the legislators always say, well we know that 'cause whenever there's a problem, we hear about it. So ticketing and the ticket industry, and this is something that engenders a real passion and I recommend and I commend you all for looking at ways to improve or enhance consumer protection measures.

From my view, the industry, there
are a few issues that should be looked, and again, the concept of free and open markets is important to us, even at the disadvantage to some brokers who probably had a competitive advantage when there wasn't as much competition. There's much information for consumers to go search around. But what we're seeing now, as this industry has become legitimized, people, you know, big 800 pound gorillas and others are coming and trying to make a mouse trap, capture this market, and we think the number one responsibility or focus of a legislature should be to make sure that competition remains free and open.

And we see different vehicles being used under the guise of getting--you know, of helping consumers, such as restricted, paperless ticketing. I use the example that we would see, oh, restricted paperless ticketing, you can't transfer it and then all of a sudden there would be a way to transfer it, but you'd have to go back and pay a VIP fee or get a VIP ticket or pay some fee to transfer it. So we commended the New York State legislature for enacting the law that really has to give an option for restrictive paperless
ticketing.

So to me, the number one issue is restrictions on competition that are being used by primary sellers. I think a good example is this Radiohead issue with will-call only. In the vast majority of instances I've seen, the design is not to protect consumers, but to funnel the secondary sales into a specific single site, rather than free competition. And in those rare instances where those efforts are well-meaning, they may be well-meaning but the intention results in higher prices for the consumers because the supply is distorted.

As far as bots, I've read--one of the reasons I'm testifying today is I saw the comments in the legislative intent section about the use of automated devices. Let's be clear, the National Association of Ticket Brokers long ago took a position on this: We do not countenance the use of automated devices; we've never opposed legislation that makes them illegal; we have not seen a whole lot of evidence that that's the problem. And in fact, what we have seen is it has been used as a means of diverting public attention
from the real problem. And I'll give you an example, Councilman Comrie mentioned Hannah Montana. Well we had, of course, when Hannah Montana came out and there was tickets were sold out, people couldn't--politicians and other people couldn't get--or nobody could get tickets, we got blamed, but then it turns out, lo and behold, Attorney General--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Let me just be [off mic] I was so frustrated.
[Laughter]
GARY ADLER: But so Attorney
Generals were frustrated too and investigations were done and, lo and behold, it wasn't bots that were the reason. And 'cause my brokers were going, we didn't buy up all these tickets, this is--and it turned out there was a gigantic hold backs, there was, I would say, an artificial, you know, frenzy because all of a sudden, when the Attorney Generals got involved, tickets became available. Where were those tickets? Never got the answer to that.
So to be clear, the use of
automated devices is something that is a perfectly legitimate target of legislation. I don't believe it's the problem that is causing, but we would not oppose measures that outlawed the use of bots.

You know, transparency is the other key element in our view of a free and open market. My members are transparent about the fact that they resell tickets. They are, again, a lot of the times, it's not the best business to be in because of the competition, and the margins are low, and lots of tickets are sold below face value. So transparency on the part of primary sellers is something that we've always advocated because we're the easy target when we're not really the responsible party so...

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So thank you for your testimony, and you all have raised a number of different and very interesting issues. Let me just jump in with a couple questions right off the bat, and, Mr. Adler, I'm going to start with you since you were the last to speak. We appreciate what you said about the bots, they are now illegal in New York State, but we have no sense, sitting here today, as to how the relevant
sellers are preventing the use of bot software. It's one thing for it to be illegal, it's another thing for it actually to be stopped. Can you give us any sense from your perspective as to what your members have done to be able to prevent the use of bot software, or any measures that you know of that actually have been employed successfully to keep bots from being used?

GARY ADLER: Well I don't know if I can approach it from that perspective because, again, we have not received any complaints about our members using bots. But, having said that, I think the criminal enforcement of the Wiseguy case that Mr. Breyault mentioned is a great deterrent against the use of bots.

You know, a lot of my members get harmed as well by the use of bots because they're competing for the purchase of tickets just like consumers are. You know, so I have no real evidence or anything to share with you on how to combat that other than enforcement of laws, and I know that the primary seller, Ticketmaster, is pretty good at--has pretty good security and has pretty good means of addressing that. So I would
leave it to--if it was me, $I$ would leave it to them to enforce that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: You
represent the National Association of Ticket Brokers which, presumably, has members that are based right here in New York City and New York State, correct?

GARY ADLER: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: How many
members do you have based in New York City?
GARY ADLER: I don't have that exact--we have 220 members nationwide; in New York City, we probably have a dozen, I would guess. A lot more now, you know, since New York legalized it. So I would say, I can look that up and get back to you, but my guess is from my experience and being involved basically in the day-to-day operations, there's anywhere from 6 to 12--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Okay. So it's not a huge number.
GARY ADLER: Not huge.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Give us a
flavor of how your members secure the tickets that they ultimately resell.

GARY ADLER: Mm-hmm. And again, as the association, we don't get too much into the business of our members, but I've--they get tickets from mostly from purchasing season tickets. We've had at our national convention lots of sports teams that have come there. In fact, the president of the Washington Nationals was a keynote speaker and he said, you know, people think we hate brokers, we love brokers. The Brooklyn Nets, the Nets were a vendor at our-you know, we are a good source for the sale of season tickets, both in sporting events, and then you buy with that the right to buy tickets to other events. Anyone with a ticket now is that-one of the problems you see with this, the problem of the public getting tickets is, I think, a result of the fact that it's an international world now, that there are people buying tickets to New York events that are never intending to go to it, they're somewhere in California or somewhere else, and they just see--I have hundreds of friends who have lost a lot of money thinking that they could do this.

So you know, I think there's a lot
of people that have tickets that want to sell those tickets, sometimes the price becomes too good to refuse, so instead of putting it on the market or putting it on eBay or paying the fees that are associated with it, they come to my members, and my members hopefully buy the tickets for less than they sell them for. So the idea that, like for a Super Bowl, its face value, let's say, $\$ 1,000$, if it's $\$ 2,500$, the idea that NATB members made that markup is misplaced, there's a whole wholesale level of sale with people who have tickets and things like that. So--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] So it sounds like from your experience, that the vast majority of the tickets are secured through complete season of purchases and then made available on the resale market.

GARY ADLER: You know, I don't know if I'd say, but I'd say in the sports, sports is a little bit different than concerts and I would say in sports that--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So that's--

GARY ADLER: --a lot of my members
make huge investments in sports tickets.
about for concerts?

GARY ADLER: In concerts, I think some of it is from your ownership of a suite or from an investing in a sports team, you get the right to purchase tickets, and with that comes the right to buy tickets to concert events. I think that there are people who work hard to buy tickets legitimately through Web, I think there are. But I think a large portion of it is a wholesale market of people who get tickets, see that they can make money on those tickets and don't want to go out on the open market and go wholesale them to ticket brokers.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Let's talk
about will-call for a second. You noted that will-call was, from your perspective, where tickets are only available for pick up and entry at will-call are particularly difficult, certainly for brokers, but it's difficult in some cases for consumers. Just to push you on that a little bit because, obviously, some artists decide to employ will-call only for the purpose of making sure that brokers are not involved and that fans are able to
buy their ticket, show up, walk in the door, and there's no complication or confusion there, and less resale on the open market--and that is fully deliberate and intended by the artists to be a protective mechanism for their fans. Is the problem with will-call only just the fact that you can never transfer your ticket? Is that the problem from your perspective?

GARY ADLER: Well it's the same with paperless ticketing, there's nothing wrong with paperless ticketing, it's when you use it to restrict the transferability of the ticket that the problems arise. If you use will-call only to restrict the transferability of a ticket, you're going to have problems. Now, in most instances that I've seen, there is a way to get around it if you pay a fee or you join a VIP. I've seen a few rare instances where the artists were wellmeaning, genuinely intended to try to somehow keep the resale of their tickets from happening and I think it's something that is very dangerous, it's not going to help consumers, it's not going to work, and all of these efforts are--well even if they're well intended, they're going to raise
prices for consumers and it's impossible to--it's going to create nightmares at the box office--
[Crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Well I'm sorry, just to take a step back, why does that raise prices for consumers, the will-call only scenario?

GARY ADLER: Because what we've seen in every attempt to try to limit the restrictive--to restrict the transferability of tickets or to restrict the free and open secondary market results in that. There are--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Well results in any tickets that are able to be transferred end up being much more expensive because there are fewer of them.

GARY ADLER: There are fewer of them.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Right, but there are many more people who buy their tickets themselves and walk directly into the venue presumably. Is that correct?

GARY ADLER: Presumably, presumably.
right, so it sounds like there are others who want to address the issue, and, you know, obviously that was what happened at, you know, the recent example at Roseland, although it was not just that, it was not just the lack of transferability, it was the fact that tickets suddenly were available on the secondary market, just contemporaneous with the primary market, but go ahead.

JOHN BREYAULT: Sure, Mr. Chairman, in will-call only, $I$ mean, certainly as a consumer group, we are in favor of artists trying to make sure that their fans get to see the show at an affordable price. That said, will-call only, it poses a problem. For example, at the Radiohead show, I believe, was a prompt for this hearing, we know of numerous instances where, for example, a parent bought a ticket as a gift for their child and they had to go down to the Roseland Ballroom, stand in line, present the credit card and an I.D. in order for their child to get the ticket and then go in. So in that sense, will-call only is, on face, it sounds like it's a pro-consumer thing
for an artist to do, to want to have. That said, we think there are significant consumer inconveniences that come along with the will-call only scenario. So I think that needs to be taken into account before we start depending on willcall.

Second, frankly, the reason that my organization became involved in ticketing issues is because our executive director went to buy a ticket at a box office and was outraged at the incredible service fee that she was charged on top of the face value of the ticket--buying it at the box office. And I think that's what many consumers think that they can do when they buy a ticket at a box office: It's a way to save money, versus having to pay for things like printing your own ticket at home, which is one thing that Ticketmaster charges, or paying inflated prices on the secondary market potentially. So depending on will-call is not necessarily, I think, a panacea for fixing the consumer frustrations that $I$ describe in my testimony. CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: On the
subject of paperless ticketing, there appear to be
a few different categories today of types of tickets that are out there--paperless tickets; etickets; and tickets, regular, old paper tickets. Am I missing any category of tickets that are out there that anybody knows about today? No. Okay. So as I understand them--well we all understand what a regular paper ticket is--an e-ticket is the ticket that you can actually download, print, whether it's for a fee by Ticketmaster or if a friend has a season ticket and they say, okay, I'm going to e-mail you your ticket, meet me at the seats, that's an e-ticket. Paperless ticket, this is where it gets a little more confusing for this committee, and perhaps even for the city and state. Is the Radiohead example an example of a paperless ticket?

JOHN BREYAULT: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, the Radiohead show was not an example of a paperless show. In a paperless show, the consumer does not actually present a paper ticket, whether it be a ticket that they received in the mail directly from the primary seller or one that they printed off at home. Instead, they are
required to present some form of token at the venue, usually it's a credit card, sometimes it's combined with some sort of I.D. The problem with that, from our point of view, is number one, that it restricts transferability of the ticket; and number two, you also run into the inconvenience factor that $I$ described before where, for example, the parent or a grandparent in California, let's say, wants to buy a ticket for their grandchild in New York and the child cannot pick up the ticket because--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

JOHN BREYAULT: --they don't have
the right--
[Crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] So New York State law allows for a paperless ticket, provided that it can be transferred at any time, at any place, anywhere, something like that, without any additional fees, etc.

JOHN BREYAULT: As I understand the law, in New York there is a paperless option, so an artist may sell a paperless ticket, but the
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consumer must be given the option to--
[Crosstalk]
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Correct, if you decide to go with the paperless ticket, then the consumer has to have the ability to transfer it.

JOHN BREYAULT: Well I think that it being--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: In New York, in New York.

JOHN BREYAULT: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So I guess my question for you is this: How does one do that?

JOHN BREYAULT: Typically, as I
understand the transferability of a paperless ticket, one of the ways that consumers are forced, frankly, to do that is by using only the resale ticket network that is provided by the primary ticketer. So for example, Ticketmaster is the major primary ticketer in the ticketing market today. They also operate a number of [off mic] their own resale marketplaces. I don't have direct experience with trying to transfer a
paperless ticket via one of their networks, but $I$ understand that that is an option. That said, we still believe that that is not a pro-consumer business practice. We believe consumers deserve choice as to where they wish to resell their ticket and how they transfer it, they should not be forced onto the monopoly primary ticketer's resale market where Ticketmaster sets the prices and the fees.

We think the history of
Ticketmaster's business practices and the increasing service fees that consumers have historically experienced is proof that it's not a company that has the consumer interest in mind. And in fact, if you ask Ticketmaster who their customers are, they will typically tell you that it's not consumers, it's venues that they sign up to be the exclusive ticketing agent for. So I would not submit that the consumer interest is number one in Ticketmaster's mind. CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. So it sounds like in those examples where paperless tickets were employed and transferability was included it was only able to be done through the
site from which it initiated.
JOHN BREYAULT: If a consumer within a show that has a paperless option, the consumer can still download the paper ticket and transfer it normally--and we think that's a good thing. If they wished to transfer the paperless ticket later on, I believe they would have to go through Ticketmaster's own resale network. But if they chose to get the paper option, they would have the ability to transfer that to whomever they wish or resell it on the resale market of their choice.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Got it. I mean, obviously we want to keep up with the technology here, right? I mean, we may end up all with paperless tickets someday and they may, you know, you may think about entry and somebody will be able to scan your brain and you'll know whether you paid for it. We want to be able to keep up, but $I$ think that your point is that, so long as you have the ability to transfer it or gift it or whatever, then there's nothing inherently wrong with paperless; but it's the fact that today there's no real mechanism for ease of transfer, is
that fair?

JOHN BREYAULT: Yes, that's true.
To be clear, NCL does not oppose a paperless system as long as there is the option. So we would oppose a restrictive paperless where consumers must go with paperless only, but if they are given the option, as they are in New York, to get a paper ticket, we do not oppose that.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you. I'm going to go to Council Member Comrie, and I have a number of questions in addition, but want to give the Council Member a chance.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Great.

Just to be clear, the paperless ticket, if there is an option for a person to gift it at purchase, wouldn't that make sense? The paperless ticket, if there's an option--if you're going online to purchase a paperless ticket and you're Grandma Smith buying for your cousin, for your nephew, John, doesn't it make sense in that option there be a field to say that John could pick up the ticket, and shouldn't that be something that these companies should want to do for people since they're trying to encourage ticket sales to an
event? I'll ask all three of you that question. Whoever want to go first.

JOHN BREYAULT: Yeah, well it certainly would, $I$ think, be a consumer benefit, if that was possible. Unfortunately, as we understand paperless ticketing today, the consumer who purchases the ticket has to arrive at the venue with, typically, their credit card.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Is the paperless ticket market dominated by just Ticketmaster? 'Cause the three of you seem to keep bringing up Ticketmaster as the only paperless ticket broker.

JOHN BREYAULT: Well Ticketmaster is the number one by a large percentage a primary ticketer, and, yes, they are the company that is at the forefront of trying to push this restrictive paperless ticketing.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. So well, again, we're clear, $I$ think all of us agree we don't want restrictive paperless ticketing, and that's not a part of the New York Law so we would want to move past that. Is ticketing--I'm sorry, what is the basics of membership to be a member of
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the National Association of Ticket Brokers?

GARY ADLER: Thank you, sir. You have to have the brokering of tickets to be your primary business, you can't be a mom-and-pop, it can't be a part-time business; you have to have been in the business for over a year; you have to have a permanent business address, business telephone; you also have to have the sponsorship, not just recommendation, of two NATB members.

The ticket brokering community is, you know, ticket brokers that are the permanent-this is their full-time business, it's a pretty small community.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So these are all individuals, this is not Live Nation or Ticketmaster or MSG or--

GARY ADLER: No--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --the

Broadway League or--
GARY ADLER: --this is ticket brokers.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: They're all individual ticket brokers.

GARY ADLER: Well companies, sir,
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yes, but individual ticket broker firms.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But none of them are the large, New York City \& Company is not a member or--
[Crosstalk]
GARY ADLER: [Interposing] No, a
company called Broadway.com is a member--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.
GARY ADLER: --which is a secondary site to buy Broadway tickets.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But that's a secondary site.

GARY ADLER: Correct, all of our members are secondary sites.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And you said that you don't know how they obtain their tickets in your testimony?

GARY ADLER: I don't get too--I don't get--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:
[Interposing] There's no code of conduct or there's no regulation on how they should obtain their tickets?

GARY ADLER: Well as I mentioned,
the code explicitly states that you can't use automated--you know, the use of automated devices is not consistent with our code of ethics. An automated device is defined of, you know, inundating a site so that the consumers can't purchase tickets and it gives you an unfair advantage. There's also, you know, we've never-the code doesn't allow the bribery of box office people.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.
GARY ADLER: So it does have, you know--but when I'm asked how my members specifically buy tickets, $I$ do not as an--or the association does not delve into that too much, unless there's some inquiry about it or--and I just have this kind of, having done it since 1995 and having sold tickets to brokers for events that I have tickets, you know, I do have some knowledge of how they purchase tickets, I just I don't want to speak for them, for each individual broker of how they buy tickets. But I will say I know that they make large investments and take the risk for purchasing inventory for a lot of things that turn out not so well.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And then you were talking about the issue of resale and the cost of tickets for the public for a particular venue. I think one of the primary reasons why I wanted to do a 15\% ticket hold back for customers is that so many tickets are sold on secondary market at higher prices. One of the things that $I$ was grappling with is that, if the higher price is the standard price for an event, why isn't that price initially charged for the ticket? Because it seems like they're deliberately under-pricing the tickets, then they're holding the tickets, creating a demand for actually a real price that they allow to get to. Why don't they just charge the real price up front, as opposed to creating an artificial demand by holding $90 \%$ of the tickets away from the consumer?

GARY ADLER: Well I think that's an excellent question and it's been studied by economists, smarter people than me, about, you know, why that is and there's all sorts of reasons for it and there's all sorts of efforts to maybe try--you know, the great example is the San

Francisco Giants who have sold out their stadium for, I think, for a couple of years now. They were revolutionary in the ticket industry by creating ways to try to remedy that. For example, they recognized that a game against the Los Angeles Dodgers on a Saturday night is not the same value as a game against the Washington Nationals on a Tuesday night, so they started something called variable pricing and we hear efforts about dynamic pricing, where it's going to be more like airline tickets. So, you know, I think that how $I$ answer that is that's what makes what my members do such a difficult job.

And let's be clear, there are a significant number of tickets that are not sold above face value. Last data I saw was $40 \%$ in my experience, $I$ think it's more now, although that's just my--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:
[Interposing] That were sold under face value?
GARY ADLER: Under face value.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Forty
percent.
GARY ADLER: Like tremendously
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under face value. I have--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: For most--

GARY ADLER: --brokers in
Washington invested in sports teams like the Wizards or the Nationals, and you could, you know-
[Crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:
[Interposing] But you're talking about sports events now, as opposed to--
[Crosstalk]
GARY ADLER: [Interposing] And concert events.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --special-and concert events?

GARY ADLER: Oh, tremendous number of concert tickets. 'Cause part of our sales have tried to adjust and have to tried to capture that through various--some means we don't countenance, you know, competition is competition, some not so good means, but they've tried their prices--prices for tickets have gone up tremendously and I think one of the things they're seeing is that, when they try to capture the secondary market 'cause
they don't want someone else making money on their product, they're losing out on their primary bread and butter of selling tickets.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But don't you think that it would drive the prices down if we were able to have a determined percentage that were held for the consumers, at either the 15\% that was set aside direct for consumer sales until, you know, an hour before the concert, before it's open to the market, wouldn't that hold prices down as well? And it actually would create less of a way between, you know, the original price, the secondary market price 'cause a consumer would know that the price is $\$ 100$ for a ticket to get to an event if they can purchase it on a direct buy, and then the secondary market would still have the opportunity after that. But wouldn't it drive the--or at least keep the prices consistent?

GARY ADLER: You're talking, sir, on the primary market or on the secondary market? I don't know what it would affect, how it could affect the primary market. It may or may not.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Well the
primary market first, but it would also drive the prices, or at least keep the prices consistent on the secondary market if there's a certain amount of tickets that are set aside and for the public directly.

GARY ADLER: Well, you know, I can see instances where that may not be the case, and then just thinking about it right now, let me give you, you know, one is the consumer thinks they're going to get this ticket at the box office and they don't, and there's a lot of those consumers that don't get the ticket, and now all of a sudden you have a market that's been artificially created that's much more intense than it would be in the normal course of an open and free market. In other words, you're having all these people who had the expectation of getting a ticket, they're going to the show, they're thinking they're going to get it, turns out, even with this hold back, there's not enough tickets to meet their demand, and you've got all these consumers now who are going to flood that market buying the secondary market, and it creates, I think, an artificially high price.

So you know, I think it's maybe well intended and, quite frankly, other than the legislative intent sections, we don't really have a position on box office--reserving some tickets for the box office. Although, we think it's a bad idea to do anything that limits a free and open market 'cause it works. And we had economists who were talking just about this in 2007 when New York State had restrictions and she's famous for saying just let it--I know people don't believe in a free market and the ticket, for some reason it's different than anything else, but it works, it works every time.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: No, I'm not against the free market for ticket. I think that if you set an event at 10,000 seats and $15 \%$, or 3,500, seats go to the general public, and that's held at the venue to be sold either at the window or through their electronics system, you know, the other percentage go to the promoters, the artists, but there's transparency so that the public will know that, out of a 15,000 seat venue, you can either choose to try to get the 3,500 at the window--let's just say the window for now, but the
window could actually be online--you know, do direct purchase with the consumer or that person can go to their American Express, if they have a Black card--which I've never seen--if they can, you know, order--they go to promoter or they go to the artist 'cause the fan club, but at least there's transparency and there's truth in marketing. So, you know, that way the individuals can have an opportunity to make that choice upfront. And you know, that's what $I$ think what we're trying drill down to.

So, you know, I'm not trying to, you know, change the opportunity for a secondary market to be free and open, $I$ just want the consumer to have an understanding what their options are, where they can go from 12:01 a.m. to try to purchase a ticket: Should they go straight to the secondary market, should they go...because they have a better chance because they know there's going to be 3,500 tickets at the venue for purchase at, you know... We want to give truth in advertising or they go to, you know Ticketmaster to try to buy the ticket, that's really what we're trying to work on here.

The other issues of whether or not the secondary market is, you know, creating blocks for people to have the opportunity for transferability, I think that can be easily resolved if we push those folks to have a transfer option within their purchase or within their timeline before the event to create a transfer option online for people.

And also, you know the other issue that has been brought to me is the restriction of some, even the secondary market people, to allow for the sale of the tickets have to be controlled only through them, which $I$ think is unfair also, and charging percentages and fees to allow that to happen, you know, is something that's over exorbitant to the normal consumer as well.

But I want to thank all of you for being here. George, I want to just let you know I'm not trying, again, I'm not trying to limit profit, this is not about restricting profit. If you set a price, that's your price; if you know you need to make, you know, whatever that price is to make a profit. This is not about limiting profit or limiting opportunities of venues to make
money or to be able to sell, but the issue of certain venues totally controlling their tickets to the point that it's a restriction for consumers is problematic.

But as you know, I'm a big supporter of increasing tourism and, you know, New York City is only going to stay strong if our entertainment center stays strong and if we can continue to have, you know, the best Broadway shows in the world and the best concerts in the world, that's what's going to keep business here in New York. But to keep consumers to have a real opportunity to understand what they're purchasing is really what $I ' m$ after. I'm truly not trying to limit the opportunity to make sure that we have the best concerts in the world or the best special events and not looking to limit the opportunity for the venues to make money because we want those venues to stay in New York and we want more venues to come 'cause that's how we keep the city's economy growing.

So I just want to assure you that
was not the intent. This is the first hearing for the bill, $I$ hope to work with everyone in the room
to come up with something that makes sense. Thank you.

GEORGE FERTITTA: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Before you go, a couple more from me, and, Mr. Fertitta, I want to just focus on you for a moment on your testimony. We noted that in your testimony you said it's the right of venues to make a profit at fair market value on the major events that they're able to procure and produce. Any issue with transparency regulations?

GEORGE FERTITTA: My only issue is really about the holding back of the $15 \%$, that's the only issue, everything else that you've--
[Crosstalk]
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] So NYC \& Company has no particular issue about requiring venues to state how many tickets are available to the public.

GEORGE FERTITTA: Oh, we would prefer it to be as transparent as possible--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

GEORGE FERTITTA: $--s o$ we're for
all of those.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. And also in your testimony you noted that, in your view, the real issue is illegal black market scalping. Can you explain how you're defining illegal black market scalping in this context? Because, obviously, New York State law changed, most secondary market resales are now legal. So what are you referring to when you say illegal black market scalping?

GEORGE FERTITTA: What we're referring to is that literally when you're going to an event and somebody's got 4 tickets or 10 tickets in their hand and they're charging you $\$ 500$ and we don't know the mechanism in which they received those tickets, and those are the kind of issues that we're referring to.
[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay.

Thank you. We have a number of different folks who are looking to testify today so we will free you all. But thank you very much for your testimony. We're now going to call Jon Potter of the Fan Freedom Project; Marissa Greenberg of the same; oh, and Dustin Brighton from eBay and

StubHub .
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Welcome. Whenever you're ready, you can go ahead and get started.
[Pause]

JON POTTER: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you, Mr. Comrie, for inviting me to testify. I'm Jon Potter, I'm the Founder and President of the Fan Freedom Project. We launched in February of this year, we now have more than 40,000 supporters nationwide, including more than 3,000 here in New York.

We are very appreciative of this hearing, we're very appreciative of, Mr. Comrie, your bill. I can't tell you that I've spent a lot of time in the nitty gritty details as some of the testifiers have been, but we're certainly happy to work with everybody on the New York City Council to ensure that fans have fair access to face value tickets, full transparency in knowing who they're competing with, how many tickets are actually being made available for their purchase, and that, once fans have paid full value, once the provider
of tickets, the seller of tickets has gotten their money, it's my ticket and if $I$ want to give it to my friend or my cousin or my neighbor or if $I$ want to resell it, it's my ticket.

And the next time you go to a car lot and the person who sells you a car tells you that they still require you to come back to their car lot five years later when you want to resell that car and they're going to tell you what the price is of that car resale, my guess is that 311 number will start ringing with regard to cars.

What we're saying is there should be a right of consumers to have the same rights with regard to cars. When a car dealer advertises that they have a car for only $\$ 8,000$ and it's a brand new Rolls-Royce, they have to tell you what the VIN number is and they have to say well we really only have one and it really doesn't drive very well.

But we have deceptive marketing and deceptive advertising laws here in New York City, we just need to make sure that they actually apply to ticket sales. We have consumer rights laws and some transparency laws in New York City, we have
to make sure they apply to consumers.

Mr. Breyault of the Consumers
League made a very good point, which is that, we in the consumer arena are very opposed to illegal use of ticket buying bots, ticket buying software that essentially jumps the line ahead of regular consumers who are standing there doing the click, click, click at Ticketmaster.com to try to get their tickets. There are ways to attack illegal use of software. The music industry, and the movie industry, the $F B I$ who goes after pedophiles, you know, kiddie porn purveyors, we know how to track people down on the Internet and how to arrest them. If there are people who are using illegal software to buy huge blocks of tickets and screw the rest of New York City consumers, and apparently there are, we should be able to find a way to get them.

And it's just as New York's music industry and New York's movie industry worked very hard and hired very talented software people to help the FBI and to help law enforcement go after those folks, I think it's incumbent on the ticket sellers, Ticketmaster, and the event providers to
help the district attorney and help the Attorney General go after those bad guys and get them. And the idea that you would instead impose restrictive tickets and paperless tickets and will-call only on everybody because of a few bad apples is a ruse. And there are some well intended artists, there are some well intended venues who are trying to do the right thing by consumers, but if you're looking at Ticketmaster, this is called making lemonades out of lemon-yeah, making lemonades out of lemons, right? You're sitting here saying, oh, we have a way now, we have an excuse of these bad guys with bots to make all tickets restrictive, and, by the way, we'll make all the tickets restricted to our secondary market resale site. So Ticketmaster, already being the second largest reseller of tickets, is now going to quickly become the first largest reseller of tickets and the only reseller of tickets because they will lock your ticket and everybody else's to their digital platform. And once that happens, there will be no more competition, prices will go up, customer service will go down. It's pretty standard monopoly
economics.

So in closing, we can talk through
all the great stories on our website or all the terrible stories on our website of fans literally having great frustration buying tickets, using tickets, selling tickets, we can go through all the technology issues of how to catch these bot guys, but the most important thing is that you're holding this hearing and that you're committed to legislating in support of New York City's consumers. And I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you. DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Mr. Chairman,
members of the committee, my name is Dustin Brighton and I'm Director of Government Relations for eBay and StubHub. As most know, eBay is the World's Online Marketplace with over 99 million active users worldwide who choose from a variety of categories for goods. Tickets, one such category on eBay, and constitutes one of the most popular and dynamic categories in our marketplace. In 2007, eBay acquired StubHub because it fit in well with our mission.
People from all across the country
visit eBay and StubHub to buy and sell tickets that are in high demand. We have a very open and transparent marketplace where buyers can see all the available inventory, ensure that buyers have the wisest choices and sellers to get the best price, it's what we do. We are not a ticket broker as we do not position inventory on the open market.

We believe that the majority of tickets on eBay and StubHub have been sold at or below face value, and our research shows that eBay and StubHub ticket sellers in large part are individuals who end up with more tickets than they can use and want to try and recoup at least some of their costs.

The overwhelming majority of these transactions on our marketplaces occur without any problems--the seller receives payment, the buyer receives the tickets he or she purchased in a timely fashion. For those very few transactions that don't go well, if there's a problem with the transaction, we back our transactions with a 100\% fan protect guarantee. So the purchaser gets into the event, we supply them with a ticket, or, if
that's not successful, we guarantee that that buyer will get $100 \%$ of his or her money back. Recognizing the significant consumer benefits of open and competitive marketplaces where consumer protections are intact, the state of New York in 2010 passed what is considered by many in the ticketing industry, the most competition and consumer friendly resale statute in the nation. The law seeks to protect consumers by ensuring that they can purchase a ticket in a transferable form.

> Specifically, it mandates that at the time of purchase of the ticket on a primary market, the customer must be given an option to buy a ticket that can be transferred or resold on any resale marketplace, independent of the operator or operator's agent.

Unfortunately, a trend has been developing that we've seen here in New York City and other places. The trend is that a lot of acts, as we've already talked about today, implement a will-call only system where consumers are forced to pick up tickets at a will-call only window on the day of the show, effectively
preventing them from reselling or transferring tickets that they can no longer use. With willcall only distribution to an event, the ticket is acquired and it's actually tied to one's I.D. and the only method to gain entry to the event is to pick up your tickets at that location on the date of the event at that will-call window. In that manner, the ticket issuer is able to control or eliminate the ability of the purchaser to resell that ticket on the open secondary market.

There have already been multiple concerts in the New York City, as I stated, that have used will-call only distribution. When the secondary market is eliminated, consumer benefits, such as choice and competition, are eradicated as well.

In addition, we fully endorse a transparency as far as ticket distribution in the primary market. We feel an informed consumer is an empowered consumer. An open and transparent primary ticket market would allow consumers to make educated decisions when it comes to purchasing tickets and for how much. Consumers shouldn't be shocked when tickets sell-out in
minutes if they understood that only a small fraction of tickets were actually available to the general public after hold backs and insider sales, as you've heard from many today.

I would like to highlight that Barry Diller is the former Chairman of Live Nation Entertainment, seems to think it a good idea too, based upon a quote from a USA Today article published in the April of 2009, and I quote, "The problem with the ticketing business is: It's the essence of non-transparency. And the reason is that everybody has an axe to grind. Artists do not want consumers to know that they have a take of different parts of the ticketing package. People who own venues want to put in service charges. So I think there's going to be legislation which is going to force transparency, and I think that would be great for everybody." While StubHub and eBay also support transparency, the transparency requirement should not be imposed on neutral marketplaces like StubHub and eBay that don't have access to primary ticket distribution data. They don't share that with us. StubHub and eBay have no knowledge,
example, for what type and number of tickets are made available at the on sale date, and primary ticketing companies and venues are very unlikely to provide us with that data.

It would be very difficult for online exchanges unaffiliated with primary ticketing companies to comply with some of the mandates that are currently in the bill; however, we look forward to working through these issues and further on these issues with Councilman Comrie and the committee.

So on behalf of the over 3 million users located in New York, I appreciate the opportunity to have a voice here today.

Thank You.
[Pause]
MARISSA GREENBERG: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Marissa Greenberg and I'm a very active concert goer. I work in radio so $I$ very rarely have to buy my own concert ticket, but when $I$ do, $I$ dread having to use major ticketing sites such as Ticketmaster.

Over the past two years these sites have increased their various fees almost to the
point where a reasonably priced ticket becomes a ticket that is completely out of my price range. This not only hurts the consumer, but the artist as well. I try to avoid these sites and purchase tickets directly from the artists or venues whenever possible. However, these major sites have agreements with so many venues that it is making it increasingly harder for smaller ticketing agencies to offer tickets to mainstream events. It has almost become monopolistic.

The fees that come along with ticket purchases is hardly the only issue that consumers face when dealing with major ticketing agencies. These major ticketing sites are unfair in the way they share information with their consumers. Many times $I$ will go to buy a ticket to a highly sought after event and, within minutes, the event will sell out, leaving the consumer frustrated and confused as to how the event sold out so quickly. Consumers should be told, the number of tickets that are available to the public so we know what to expect.

Once the tickets are available to the public are gone, there is nothing more
frustrating than having to go to a secondary market ticketing site to buy your ticket. Something that is more frustrating, though, is knowing that some of those tickets that $I$ see on the secondary market ticketing sites are posted there at a new, much higher price by the ticketing agencies themselves.

I work in the music industry so I do understand that tickets have to be put aside for the venue, the artist, and the press, but every single ticket that is left over should be made available to the public at the same price on the actual ticketing agency site--not at an increased price on the secondary market site.

The last issue that $I$ wanted to bring up is the issue of paperless ticketing. This has become increasingly popular over the past few years and it worries me that one day this will be our only option, which wouldn't be so bad, but only if drastic changes were made to the system. The idea of not being able to transfer a paperless ticket to a friend or to sell it if $I$ cannot go to the event is something that keeps me from buying so many tickets. If $I$ see that an event only
allows me to have a paperless ticket, $I$ will really think if $I$ truly want to buy this ticket and be stuck with it if $I$ cannot go. In most cases, I end up not buying the ticket simply because I am a college student and money is tight, I don't want to be stuck with a ticket to an event that $I$ cannot attend and $I$ can't get out of using the ticket. I bought the ticket $I$ own and $I$ should be able to do with it as I please.

The large ticketing sites, such as Ticketmaster, have become very controlling and, unless something is done about them, they will continue to make the ticket buying environment less and less consumer friendly.

Thank you for listening.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you
very much for your testimony, for all of your testimonies today. Let me ask a couple questions about that paperless ticket situation to start off. Because New York State law, it's not explicit about how exactly you define a paperless ticket, but it does say that if you employ a paperless option, you must give an opportunity or an opportunity to transfer it or a means to
transfer it on whatever site, whatever venue, whatever means you wish. As we took through the last panel on the definitions between e-ticket, paperless ticket, regular old ticket, it's still not completely clear to me how one would freely and openly transfer a paperless ticket if such a thing is employed today. Can you help us with that?

JON POTTER: I think it's a fair point, and we probably should start our definitional challenge with what's the ticket, then we can get to what's a paperless ticket. But if we generically define a ticket as the right of admission, and then, regardless of whether it's paper, paperless, a barcode, a chip in my head, you know, or an ink stamp on my hand, it is the right to enter venue for a given time. Or it is essentially a right to--it is a license to enter the venue, but the license is transferable. So it's my right, I've acquired it, I've purchased it, I've licensed it, but I've paid full price. So however they want to manifest that, right, I should be able to do it.

In one sense, it is harder to get
into a venue for a concert than it is to get on an airplane today, if you have to show, not only your photo I.D., but also your purchasing credit card. United Airlines doesn't ask me for my purchasing credit card 'cause they think the photo I.D. is good enough to stop hijackers and terrorists; but, you know, the local concert hall wants my purchasing credit card also. That's just screwy, and, you know, it imposes all sorts of burdens that, frankly, we should be paying attention to and we appreciate you are.

I think definitionally, if you just go back to basics, it's the right of admission, whether it's paper, paperless, a barcode on my phone, or something else, I should have the right to transfer that to somebody else.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So then
let's just take an example. A paperless option is employed, $I$ want to buy a ticket to a concert next week and I go ahead and I put down my--let's say I buy it on Ticketmaster--I put down my credit card and I go ahead and buy it. Under New York law, I have the right to transfer that ticket, but I don't really want to go back on Ticketmaster for
whatever reason, you know, maybe I've had a problem on their site and it frustrated me or whatever reason, and $I$ want to just actually give that ticket to, you know, my wife. Or maybe make it and, you know, and even use your example, just give it to somebody $I$ meet on the street. And let's say that $I$ want to do that, but $I$ don't want to use the same system that $I$ actually bought it on, how do $I$ do that?

JON POTTER: I think that's one of the challenges that the provider of the paperless ticket is going to have to figure out if the law requires transferability.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Got it, so the law does require it, but today we don't really have an answer to that question, it seems to me, at least in a way that makes it truly transferable, the paperless ticket, if employed, except through perhaps the same means from which you got it, is that correct?

JON POTTER: When Congress
regulates automobile mileage standards, it doesn't tell them how to do it, it just says you have to get 30 miles to the gallon and then the automobile
manufacturers figure out how to sell cars that go 30 miles to the gallon.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. So Ticketmaster is not testifying here today, so this is--and to the extent that I would have had some questions for them specifically, they're really questions that are for advocates and others, so I'm going to throw some of those at you guys. But you noted that Ticketmaster is making certain tickets only available on their digital resale platform, and that's TicketsNow, so tickets, which people are buying through Ticketmaster are only available for--we're finding that they're only available on TicketsNow. Can you just explain that a little more?

JON POTTER: Ticketmaster has two resale platforms--

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Yeah. JON POTTER: --two transfer platforms. One is the TicketsNow platform, which is very similar to StubHub, it's a consumer to consumer exchange. There have been allegations that those who are in business with Ticketmaster often use it to surreptitiously turn it into a
primary sales tool while making it appear to be a secondary sale in order to raise prices, as others have identified here. The artist hold backs, for example, they will take those and put them on through TicketsNow.
But it's essentially a consumer to
consumer tool, that's what it's promoted as and marketed as. TicketExchange is Ticketmaster's sort of partnering tool with a team. So they will have, for example, yankees.ticketmaster.com and yankees.ticketexchange.ticketmaster.com and that's the preferred resale partner, and, in some cases, it becomes with paperless tickets the mandatory resale partner and that becomes the challenge. Once you have a mandatory resale partner, it's not like that resale is devoid of any fees, but there's no competition on fees. It's not like there's any pressure to improve your software to improve your user experience once you've locked the ticket--the buyer into your partner resale site. So that is oftentimes, it's the TicketExchange site when it's through a sporting event, for example.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: What is the
difference on fees? I mean, as I see it, there is really TicketsNow, which is the arm of Ticketmaster; you have StubHub. I mean, then those are the official ticket exchanges that are out there. Obviously, there are marketplace, I know where you could, you know, anybody could exchange a ticket, but those are the, at least the most predominant symbols of this that exist today, is that correct?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: I think, so, I mean, those are the two that those online exchanges or what's normally talked about in the media, people are aware of them, and I know our marketing team does a good job in marketing StubHub.

StubHub, we don't set the prices on the secondary market. The way that we make our money, we make a commission on the resale of a ticket, as well as charging a buyer fee. We're very up front and open with that on our website, it's a 15\% commission on the sale, 10\% buyer fee, that's how we make our money. And that percentage is based upon what the ticket is sold--at the price the ticket is sold, it's not on face value.

Quite frankly, we have no way of knowing what the face value is of a ticket when it's being sold on our exchange.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: So 15\% on the sale. Is there also a fee for an electronic download?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Yes, sir, we do charge a little bit for that, and I'll be honest with you, I don't know what that is off the top-[Crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Well, you know, I went and took a look at the StubHub website yesterday and I saw that there was an electronic download fee of $\$ 4.95$, even for a $\$ 15$ ticket; and for a $\$ 200$ ticket there was an electronic download fee of \$5.20, which, you know, $I$ don't know exactly how those fees are calculated. Obviously, for a $\$ 15$ ticket, that seemed way out of whack to me, but also I don't know how you're calculating electronic download fees in that context. Could you help us understand that?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: I can get back to you on that, $I$ honestly don't know that off the
top of my head.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: To post and purchase, this $15 \%$ on the sale that you guys take, that is paid for by the--how exactly is that paid for? Let's say, you know, I have a Yankees ticket that $I$ want to put up for sale for $\$ 100$, I determine the price, not you guys, I put it on StubHub, and I have a buyer who is perfectly willing to pay that $\$ 100$. The $15 \%$ is coming from whom?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: That $15 \%$ would come from the seller. On our website we say, if you want--an example is, if you wanted to make on a $\$ 10$ ticket, that you wanted to make $\$ 10$ on the sale of your ticket, you would need--we recommend that you put in the $15 \%$ 'cause that is what we would hold.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Got it. And the electronic--what other fees are there, other than electronic download fee? Are there other fees that StubHub would charge in a situation like that?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: There are other
fees that we would impose or possibly impose.

I'll be glad to get you a list of those.
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. A member of my staff purchased tickets for an event on StubHub and, when he got to the box office, he was told that the tickets were fake. Now StubHub was apparently great about refunding the money, but the question for you is how often does a fake ticket scenario play out and how do you guys-DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --address
that?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: It's very rare.
As a matter of fact, out of all of our
transactions, as far as counterfeit tickets go, that type of scenario is less than 1\% of the number of transactions on our web
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: It may be a small number, but what do you do to ensure that--I mean, can you do anything to ensure that the tickets are not bogus?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Well I would say
that number one, $I$ mean, if it's, as you said, there different categories of tickets--you've got
electronic tickets, physical tickets, etc.--one thing that we do when there's a physical ticket involved, we use Federal Express to ensure that that ticket reaches the buyer. The seller posts the ticket on the website; a buyer comes, buys that ticket; we notify the seller that the ticket's been purchased; the buyer submits payment, we hold that actually in escrow; we send to the seller a FedEx envelope with an address label that they can slap on the FedEx envelope, put the tickets in and then send it to the buyer, that's how we're able to track it to make sure it gets there. If the ticket doesn't reach them in time, we obviously will contact the seller and say, hey, there's a problem and we go after them, as well as make the buyer whole in whatever way we can--again, by refunding the money or trying--if we find out about this soon enough, finding them other tickets on the open market.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: What's the most common scam that you all have encountered? Is that it or what is the most common?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: I wouldn't know
what the most common is, but there are all
different types of scams that you see utilized. As a matter of fact, there was press yesterday, evidently we were the victim of a phishing attack, somebody was going out and saying you've bought tickets on StubHub, congratulations, now just send us all your credit card information and your personal--so, I mean, obviously, we put out a release immediately saying don't--to our users saying don't answer this, etc. So there are lots of creative ways.

As far as what's the most prominent, $I$ wouldn't know off the top of my head. JON POTTER: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the important points you're making is, how do we prevent fraud in this business and still-and then we also talk about, you mention the download fee. With Major League Baseball, StubHub has a business arrangement where, when $I$ go to sell my baseball tickets on StubHub, I don't have to wait for that FedEx envelope to ship it to somebody, there's a barcode on that ticket, I enter the barcode, their system integrates with Major League Baseball's system, they confirm the barcode is right, they terminate digitally my
ticket and then create a new digital ticket, you know, in the cloud essentially, on their servers, so that when the buyer comes along, it's an automatic download.

There's no reason that system won't work for Ticketmaster and won't work for Ticketmaster's paperless tickets. In fact, Ticketmaster is a provider of Major League Baseball tickets for some teams in some stadiums and the system works brilliantly when they want it to work brilliantly. With paperless tickets, they've chosen not to allow easy integration for independent competitors in the resale market; they've chosen using the ruse of consumer protection to lock all the digital transfers to their platform only.

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: If I may--
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Go ahead. DUSTIN BRIGHTON: --Mr. Potter's correct, we are integrated with Major League Baseball, Major League Baseball is a major partner of ours and vice ver--[pause] so being integrated with their system, if, say you print off an electronic ticket, you're issued a barcode. If
you resell that ticket, we're integrated with the system so Major League Baseball is going to know that that ticket's been resold, they can cancel the old barcode and reissue a new one to the consumer to ensure that the other ticket isn't used by someone else, because that, aga--[pause] is no longer valid.

So where we're integrated and we're able to work with those in the primary market or sports teams, the chances of fraud go down significantly.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: There was an article in March of 2009 in the Wall Street Journal that indicated that the vast majority of premium priced tickets that were listed on TicketExchange were sold by artists and their promoters, but that they were essentially presented as resales offered by fans with fans quote unquote rarely listing tickets on that site. So question for you is, do you know if that practice continues today; and also if there is a way or whether there could be a way for consumers to confirm that tickets that are posted on TicketExchange, or perhaps even on StubHub, are
actually being posted by fans?
DUSTIN BRIGHTON: It's very hard, excuse me, it's very hard for us to know exactly if a ticket's posted, if it came from a fan, if it came from a ticket broker, if it came from an artist, etc. We wouldn't have that knowledge readily available, we just wouldn't know.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: You
wouldn't know, but Ticketmaster, presumably, would know to the extent that artists with whom that they are working are actually posting things immediately on their secondary marketplace, is that right?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: I would think so, yes, but you know, I'm not familiar with Ticketmaster's business practices--
[Crosstalk]
CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK:
[Interposing] Okay. Are you guys familiar with the Radiohead situation from several weeks ago? One of the surprising allegations, at least, that came out of that was that tickets appeared on the secondary market, $I$ guess, that is, again, it's TicketExchange, before they were available in the
primary marketplace. Were you able to suss out the accuracy of that, number one? And two, how that would even be possible?

JON POTTER: I think we can probably start by, hopefully, giving somebody the benefit of the doubt and saying that that was a speculative reseller who, before they even had access to tickets, before they purchased tickets, were posting them for sale, assuming they would find a way to fill that order once. And speculative reselling has been an issue in the industry as, if you will, whether it's a broker or a hobbyist saying, I'm going to post these tickets for sale, $I$ really don't have them yet, but $I$ think $I$ can get them and so I'll post them for a really high price.

And you know, and look, we do puts and calls and all sorts of things on wall street and this is sort of a ticketing, you know, parallel. Whether it's right or wrong and whether it should be disclosed, $I$ think you could say in fairness, it should be disclosed. If I can't get tickets to the Super Bowl, but somebody else thinks they can and, you know, there's an escrow
account somewhere, I'm willing to put my money in escrow while they go and chase them down and try to fill the bill.

But so that's one issue is it might have been an individual speculative seller. To the extent it goes back to your earlier question, which is, if Ticketmaster is doing the show, and Ticketmaster has a relationship with TicketsNow and with TicketExchange and with the venue and often with the artist--because they're affiliates, they own venues, operate venues, and also are artist managers, one would think they have the best access to information about, A, the distribution of tickets, and, $B$, whether one of their affiliated entities or their contractually associated entities is posting those tickets on the secondary website pretending to be a consumer. CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: One of the concepts that we have talked about a little bit today, in addition to Council Member Comrie's bill, is the requirement of transparency for venues that are selling tickets to give people more of an understanding or, in fact, a precise understanding of the number of tickets that are
actually being made available for the public. I'd like you to weigh in on that as an idea and tell us what you think.

JON POTTER: We think it's pretty simple, we're not asking people to decide in advance, whether it's a 9,000 seat show or 12,000 seat show, but once you make that decision and put the tickets up on sale, you know with great certainty precisely how many tickets you've made available for sale. What we're asking for is a number and if you can't produce that, then you probably have audit problems and need to talk to your accountants.

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Yes, obviously, we support transparency. We feel like that Ticketmaster, after the merger with Live Nation Entertainment, it's estimated that they may control $80 \%$ of the domestic entertainment market here in the U.S., the major acts; they also own the contracts with the venues. They're bound to know where those tickets are going and how they're being distributed. We're not saying that they can't do it, obviously, we would state that they just need to disclose to the public. 'Cause many
times, the secondary market and, StubHub specifically, take a black eye when tickets aren't available, because, like you said, they go online, they see their available on our website, and we have no knowledge of how those tickets are distributed, they don't share that data with us. CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Couple more questions for me then I'm going to go to Council Member Comrie. On the question of preemption, legality, whether a municipality, such as ours here in New York state, humble old New York City, can actually pass laws of this nature to be able to protect consumers, such as Council Member Comrie's, or laws that would require transparency particularly if there's any public nexus to any of the venues. Do you have any opinion on whether we are within our jurisdictional rights to be able to do that?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: I am not an
attorney, I'm not licensed to practice law in New York, so it would be hard for me to make that determination. I will tell you that it would seem to me that there might be the opportunity there for the City to pass something, based upon what I
know about the New York statute, but again, it would take somebody with the proper training to make that call.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Last thing for me, $I$ just want to point out one issue, which is, I think, a consumer issue which $I$ found on the eBay site myself. If you were to go today, right now, to look for tickets to the Giants/Dolphins game on Sunday, it will say tickets priced from $\$ 40$, and you say to yourself, wow, that's amazing, $\$ 40$ for a ticket to the Giants/Dolphins--yes, of course, the Dolphins are a disaster this year, but still, it's a particularly good price. So you go and you click and you say, okay, well let me see what a $\$ 40$ ticket to this game looks like--\$40 is a ticket for a parking pass to that game. So I want you to be aware of that because $I$ think it actually is something that probably can be addressed within the StubHub system, and one that probably should be because, obviously, parking passes you can actually categorize differently. So I just wanted to point that out to you.

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: No, I'm glad you pointed that out because we actually--our trust
and safety department would absolutely want to know if somebody is falsely advertising in their listings. As you know, consumers type up their own listings on eBay and we just mandate that it be accurate. So I'm glad you brought that to my attention.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Great.

Council Member Comrie.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Council Member Garodnick has been pretty thorough with this panel, so $I$ don't have a lot of questions for you, I'll just thank you for coming down and sharing your concerns with us. And just to review, you're in favor of on the transparency, correct?

DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Yes, sir.
COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And just making sure that whatever the event is, that the consumer would know what tickets are available in what location, the direct buy or to go through whatever the promoter or VIP club or.... You know, I think that the idea of transparency seems to have been pretty much agreed by everyone this morning. how we get there to make that work to make sure that the consumers are safe and make sure that that is not also the new opportunity for illegal ticket brokers, I think is achievable.

Also, if we could work together making sure that they have the conditions of four tickets per person and the ability to do a paperless or wireless transfer, correct? You're in favor of the $15 \%$ set aside as well?

JON POTTER: I don't think we have an opinion at this point on the $15 \%$ set aside, it's not something we've, frankly, studied and there's been some interesting challenges raised about. I'm not sure, frankly, I heard something about they would be set aside for walk-up or they would be set aside for any walk-up only in the last day before the show or the last hour walk up--
[Crosstalk]

JON POTTER: --that time or--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:
[Interposing] I think we need to work on that from--you know, I don't disagree with Consumer

Affairs to prevent, you know, lines or to prevent anybody that would want to try to create an opportunity from that, $I$ think we need to look at that. But to have a percentage of tickets for general direct purchase by the consumer from the venue, I think would be, I think, a possibility to actually stabilize ticket prices as well. So at least they would know that there are one set of tickets that they would have an even shot at getting for the face value of the ticket for the venue.

So how we work on that, I would hope that with all of the lawyers in the room, we could figure out a way to make that happen. So well the lawyers and the other folks that are working on it. But and trying to protect the consumer enhance and also to enhance the ability of the consumer to buy and transfer tickets, so we'll see.

> With that, Councilman Garodnick has been pretty detailed in asking you about the fraud in the industry and the reselling in the industry, and if there are any recourse for victims, so he's gone through that pretty detailed, so I'll just
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thank you for coming and appreciate your time. JON POTTER: Thank you. DUSTIN BRIGHTON: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you all very much for being here. I'm going to call our next and last panel, and as they come up I'm going to just note that we have some testimony that's been submitted for the record. So Daniel Zenkel, season ticket holder, come on up; Lawrence White; Noah Budnick, welcome and--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Noah

Budnick, he's related?
[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: We've got testimony that has been submitted by Live Nation; the Broadway League; Leor Zahavi of Admit One, LLC; Madison Square Garden--
[Off mic]

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: --Alan Zwirn of Rockaway Beach, Queens; Brendan Walsh of North Shore, New York; Mario Asaro from

Douglaston, Queens; Mindy Bockstein, Chair and Executive Director of the New York State Consumer Protection Board from 2007 to 2011; and Jules

Polonetsky, who was the Commissioner of DCA from 1998 to 2000, have a joint letter; Lori Lerner of New York, New York. We have all of those folks who have submitted testimony for the record, but they are not here in person today to testify.

So with that, why don't we go right
ahead, and the floor is yours.
DANIEL ZENKEL: Okay. My name is Daniel Zenkel. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for providing me this opportunity to speak to you today about my experience as a long-time season ticket holder and attendee of numerous lives sports and entertainment events in New York City.

I've been a New York Knicks season ticket holder since 1983. I've always had two tickets in the Loge section, two rows above the beer sign--I don't want to promote any particular beer company--and slightly behind the baseline. They are good seats, but not great; they are just one section away from club seats, which have always cost much more. I don't recall the exact price that I paid for my tickets in 1983, but it was approximately $\$ 20$ per ticket, about $\$ 900$ for
the season, plus exhibition games. I don't know how much the CPI has changed since then, but I'm guessing the 1983 cost translates to about $\$ 2,500$ in current dollars. Over the years, the price of tickets increase, sometimes gradually, sometimes steeply. For the $2011-12$ season, if in fact there is a season, each of my tickets will cost \$165 per game. For an entire season, that would be approximately $\$ 7,000$ per ticket--\$14,000 in total for my two tickets. This is simply too much money for me or for most New Yorkers to pay. The only way that $I$ can afford my tickets is to resell most of them. I do this online through StubHub.com, it is easy and makes my tickets affordable. It enables me--a lifelong Knicks fan who witnessed firsthand Willis Reed's inspirational performance in game seven of the 1970 playoffs--to hold onto the dream of someday taking my own son to a game where he can watch the Knicks win another championship.

## [Pause]

That wasn't even supposed to be funny.
[Laughter]
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COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: How old is your son, that's the question.
[Laughter]

MALE VOICE: And what's his life expectancy.

DANIEL ZENKEL: Is Mr. Dolan here? I do not purport to understand the motives of those who seek to limit the transferability of tickets, but $I$ do understand the effect that this limitation would have. Long-time season ticket holders, passionate fans like myself, who can only afford their tickets because they are easily resold, will be forced to give up their tickets. I don't know who will take my place, but I'm pretty sure it won't be someone as passionate as me--or perhaps as stupid.

I'm not here today at the behest of StubHub or any other interested party; I did not take four hours, now five, out of my day for myself. I'm here today for my children and for the children of all New York season ticket holders, whether they be Yankees, Mets, Knicks, Giants, Rangers, or Jets, whose parents, like me, dream of one day experiencing side-by-side with
their kids live a Stanley Cup, an NBA Championship, a World Series, or an NFC Championship. Please do not deprive us of this dream.

> Thank you again for this
opportunity to share my story.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you
very much for your testimony. If only the championships were within our jurisdiction, we would be certain to deliver on that, but we appreciate what you said. Go ahead.

LAWRENCE WHITE: All right.

Chairman Garodnick and members of the Committee, my name is Lawrence J. White, I am a Professor of Economics at the NYU Stern School of Business. I have formerly served as the chief economist at the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, and served on the President's Council of Economic Advisors as Senior Staff Member responsible for regulatory matters. I am also on the Advisory Board of the American Antitrust Institute, which is a non-profit consumer advocacy group that is devoted to promoting marketplace competition and the strong enforcement of
competition laws. I am appearing today solely on my own behalf, without compensation. I have provided to the committee a more extensive written statement that includes a brief biographical summary. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on this important issue.

My testimony primarily concerns the issue of restricted paperless ticketing for sports events, concerts, and similar venues. Paperless ticketing represents a relatively new technological innovation for ticketing. It may carry some advantages for ticket buyers, but it also clearly carries inconveniences because of the restricted nature of the format. And it also carries substantial risks of inhibiting the beneficial competition in the secondary markets that have developed for tickets.

Further, there are alternative means of providing the benefits that could do so in a much less restrictive and manner, and a manner that is less of a threat to competition.

Consequently, the approach that is currently embodied in New York State law that--the Arts and Cultural Affairs Law, Section 25.30
essentially, to allow venues or their ticketing agents to sell non-transferable paperless tickets, but only if buyers have the option of a less restrictive transferable alternative. This appears to be a sensible approach and should be continued, unless significant new developments arise in technology or other circumstances that surround ticket sales.

This is an area that is definitely worthy of continued monitoring at all levels of government--city, state, and federal--to ensure that competitive issues and consumer protection issues are adequately addressed. On the one hand, policy should not be discouraging worthwhile innovations in the ticketing area. But on the other hand, there are important competition and consumer protection issues that are potentially at stake.

Again, my written statement expands on these ideas. I thank you again for the opportunity to appear today to testify on this important matter, and I would welcome the opportunity to address questions from the committee.
very much. And, Mr. Budnick, go right ahead.
NOAH BUDNICK: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Garodnick and Council Member Comrie, thank you for having me here today and having this hearing. I'm just going to share my experience that I think follows these policy recommendations well.

I'm a Brooklynite, avid music fan, concert-goer, when $I$ can make it, and $I$ probably spend a couple hundred dollars a year on concerts, and I like to support local bands. I like that there's venues and, you know, employs probably thousands of people around the borough, so it's part of our small business network in the city, I think that's really important to support.

So my quick stories about how restricted ticketing have took the joy of concert going and $\$ 50$ away from me.

On April 1st $I$ got an e-mail from one of my favorite bands, Yo La Tengo, about two shows they were doing at the Bell House in Gowanus, Brooklyn in mid-May. And $I$ was about to go into a meeting so I e-mailed my wife and I said
can you please get two tickets for each of those shows, and she did that at TicketWeb.com and they were $\$ 25$ a piece, plus about $\$ 13$ in service fees. And I was really excited to go to both their concerts.

So on May 3rd, about two weeks
before the shows, I found out that I could only go to one and I quickly e-mailed a bunch of friends and I said does anybody want to pick up these tickets from me, here they are, and, you know, \$50 is no small amount of money, so can you just pay me back at face value. And a couple people were interested, and we didn't exchange any money 'cause I didn't have the tickets.

So I went to the show on May 10th, and I went to the will-call window, I went to pick up my tickets and was asked for my credit card and my I.D. Fortunately, my wife and I have a joint credit card account so it has the same number so I was able to get the cards. And I don't know what would have happened if we did not have a joint credit card account, but fortunately we do, so that wasn't a problem. And the person crossed the tickets off the list, stamped my wrist and my
friend's wrist that $I$ went to the show with, and said we could go in. And I asked, well can I get the tickets for tomorrow night and they said, well there are no paper tickets, you have to go through the same procedure.

So at that point $I$ was, you know, kind of hard up because I knew I wasn't going to be able to go, I had a couple people who would pay me back for the tickets that $I$ can't use the next night but, because there were no paper tickets, there's nothing that $I$ could do. So I did enjoy the concert, it was a great show, but $I$ was out $\$ 50$; two Yo La Tengo fans were out the experience; the band was out connecting with their friends; the Bell House, which it's a nice venue, was out whatever money those people have spent, the experience that they would have had on the show.

So, you know, because of the restricted ticketing, there's all this [off mic]. And as a music fan of the city, I hope that the Council can weigh in on this and, you know, prevent things like this from happening in the future.
for your testimony. I think what you have described is precisely the frustration that Council Member Comrie and I have tried to reflect in our comments today. And certainly the practice of the paperless or will-call only, and even if it's designed to be a fan-friendly measure, it does create problems and inconveniences in that, and that's lost on us. When $I$ have an invitation or a listing here for the Arctic Monkeys, which has the same parameters that you just described for Yo La Tengo and they were the same that were described and used for Radiohead.
So we're certainly sensitive to
that and we appreciate your being here and we'll take a look at ways that we can impact that.

Let me just ask one question about the transparency point, and this is really sort of a practical question. Transparency, and you've heard about this from other folks who testified, and if you were at the beginning from in my opening and Council Member Comrie's as well. Transparency gives you an answer as to the number of tickets you are going after, that's all it
does. And as a practical matter it may or may not help a consumer, but I'm going to pose this to you to know whether you're going after 200 or 2,000 tickets at the end of the line. What do you think of that as an option, and would it be valuable to you as somebody who buys tickets to various venues in New York?

## [Pause]

NOAH BUDNICK: My concert attending philosophy is that as soon as $I$ see a show that I want to attend, if my calendar is clear, I buy tickets, and, hopefully, nothing will come up to get in the way of that happening. And because things sell out quickly in New York, there's a lot of people interested in everything, you know, when it's my favorite band, or one of my favorite bands, I don't like to risk it.

LAWRENCE WHITE: Please understand,

Mr. Chairman, generally in favor of transparency, I'm a markets-oriented guy. I think in this instance, there's just not a lot that's really gained here. Is 200 or 2,000 , a big number, a small number? How does it really help the consumer? There may be some costs imposed on the
venue or the ticketing agent. I tend to approach these things from a benefit-cost approach, I'm an economist, you know, that's the way I've been trained. And so again, I generally like transparency, generally makes markets work better, but this instance, I'm not so sure.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Okay. Well
I appreciate that. I will say from my own perspective, before $I$ or anybody else would want to stay home from work and click refresh on a website to be able to go after tickets for an event in a seemingly large venue, while surprisingly few tickets are actually available, I would want to know exactly how many were available for my pursuit. And so, you know, it seems to me to be a very low, if not no cost, to the venue. They know the answer, they know what they're putting up, it's all electronic, they know exactly the number that's out there; and if they don't, I think they've got, you know, far bigger problems. And the benefit to the consumer, while perhaps it does not answer all of the issues of the day, certainly does help them know how much of their heart and soul to put into the pursuit of those
tickets. Go ahead.

DANIEL ZENKEL: As one of those people who has gone on sites, like we all have, to try to get tickets, and, at this point, after having probably done it 10 or 20 times and never gotten close to a ticket, I would certainly appreciate knowing how many tickets were going to be on sale.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Council Member Comrie.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Professor, you talked about what you thought would be the best type of ticket, but you didn't go into it. Would you mind just being specific on that?

LAWRENCE WHITE: Absolutely. I think the development of the secondary market has just been a wonderful pro-consumer event. What it's allowed is greater flexibility, you've been hearing it all morning, on the part of the first instance buyer, who either plans change or they want to buy a season set of tickets, but can't use them all, having that flexibility of the secondary market is just wonderful.
And of course, markets are two-
sided events. It also provides value to the later instance purchaser who couldn't figure out earlier whether her or she wanted to attend, but now has the opportunity.

The secondary market works well with either paper tickets, you heard this morning how paper tickets can be transferred, or works well with e-tickets, they can be electronically transferred. It clearly doesn't work well with paperless tickets.

Now there may be some advantages to paperless tickets. The issue of lost tickets is less of an issue, and arguably the problem of the mass purchase by bots of tickets that are underpriced for some reason--perhaps the artist wants to favor their loyal fans. But the mass purchase by bots is a problem, and paperless restricted resale tickets are a solution to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But don't you believe that there can be a paperless resale or a paperless redistribution of a ticket with just a few tweaks to a computer program?

LAWRENCE WHITE: Well it's clear that it can happen through the favored venue, but
then you're at the mercy of whatever benevolence that restricted process holds. I'm not in favor of paperless tickets as a sole opportunity that, as I stated in my testimony--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Right.
LAWRENCE WHITE: --I think the
current approach of New York State law, which is, yeah, if you want to provide paperless tickets, you can do so, but you must also provide--

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Make the
transfer--
LAWRENCE WHITE: --a less restrictive alternative.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And then just one other thing. When you talked about the concern for restricting a set aside for tickets, don't you think that the opportunity to create transparency across the board so that consumers would know where their best opportunity to purchase a ticket would be from makes sense for whatever entity that their performance or concert is happening?

LAWRENCE WHITE: Sure, I mean, again, $I$ said I'm generally in favor of
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transparency, I'm just not convinced it's going to add that much here. Maybe, as Chairman Garodnick indicated a few minutes ago, maybe it helps, but again, $I$ 'm not sure $200,2,000$, is that a big number, is that a small number? I'm just not sure it helps all that much.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I
appreciate that.
LAWRENCE WHITE: I'm happy to be educated on this, but $I$ think caution is the right approach here.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I think we all learned a little bit today at the hearing. I want to thank, before $I$ forget, my staff, my interns, Dia Barne [phonetic] and Ronnie for doing the research on this issue. Reggie Thomas was my legislative director who is gone now, and I want to introduce my new legislative person, Richard Lee is here today, I'm sure all of you will get a chance to talk to him as we develop and work on this legislation.

I think the idea of transparency is important to consumers, New York City consumers, and all of the consumers that want to come to the
city to purchase tickets for events. I think in order to keep everything open and create opportunity, we need to figure out a way not to have sole source ticketing or one company holding on to all of the ticketing for a particular event, and so I think we have some work to do.

I want to thank the chairmanship for his interest in this issue--the Chairman for his interests in this issue. And, hopefully, again, working together with all of the parties in the room, we can come up with a bill that will enhance opportunities for consumers to really know what they're doing when they're purchasing tickets for events. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GARODNICK: Thank you, Council Member Comrie. I want to also thank you for the introduction of your bill, and, certainly, we heard a lot of constructive comments on that subject, on all subjects today.

I will note in closing, before a couple of thank yous myself, that this committee will be watching very closely the practices of the venues, the artists, the sales, the secondary marketplaces, and how they are interacting with
one another, and we want to make sure that the consumers in New York are getting a fair deal. We know that there is not an absolute right for anybody to be able to buy a ticket to anything. That said, the practices have to be fair, they have to be clear, they have to be open, and that is what we are after.

So I want to thank Rachel Cordero, Damien Butvick, of this committee, as well as Theresa Boemio, Justine Almada, Dan Pasquini, and David Kimball-Stanley from my office; as well as to all of you who were here today to participate and to listen to this important hearing, and it's certainly not going to be the last that we will be hearing from this committee on this subject. And with that, we are adjourned, so thank you very much.

LAWRENCE WHITE: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.
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