### LIST OF REFERENCES -- MMA

 FA has an archive containing approximately 4,000 pages, produced in response to FA's FOIL requests. An explanatory spreadsheet is available as well.
 Contact <u>info@nyersfreeadmission.org</u> to request and explain your reason[s] for accessing the archive.

#### A. Laws pertaining to the structure of the PPP/PEC

- 1. Chapter 197 of the New York State Laws of 1870.
  - a. Incorporated The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

#### 2. Chapter 419 of the Laws of the State of New York of 1892.

- a. While the MMA's 1878 Lease with the City of New York was the first articulation of the MMA's admission mandates, Chapter 419 was the first legislated articulation of those mandates.
- b. Chapter 419 superseded the 1878 Lease's free access provision which required year-round free admission.
- 3. Chapter 476 of the Laws of the State of New York of 1893.
  - a. Chapter 476 amended the MMA's terms of free admission to give the MMA the choice to charge or not charge a fee two days and five evenings in a week.
- 4. New York City Administrative Code Chapter 4 EXPENSE BUDGET: Section 5-509, Undated.
  - a. Prohibits the payment to the MMA of any amount in excess of \$95,000 annually.
  - b. No evidence the Code was amended.

#### B. New York City documents the PPP/PEC structure

- <u>3/8/1970 to 3/30/1971.</u> A "redacted" series of correspondence during 3/8/1970 through 3/30/1971, between August Heckscher, Commissioner, New York City's Department of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and MMA Director Thomas P. Hoving, detailing the initiation and experimentation of a "suggested" admission fee to the MMA. [These documents were produced by DCA in response to FA's FOIL request.]
  - a. Heckscher supported the adoption of the program subject to New York City's Office of Corporation Counsel [OCC] Amending the 1878 Lease.
  - b. **No evidence** was produced showing that OCC undertook to Amend the City's and MMA's 1878 Lease.
  - c. The MMA has a digitized portal [see detailed in LIST OF REFERENCES MMA below] of its "Charter, Constitution, By-Laws, Lease, Laws." It, too, does not provide evidence of an Amended 1878 Lease.

| <ul> <li>d. The MMA reported in Randy Kennedy's New York Times'"New York City<br/>Amends Fee Policy for a Visit to the Met," [full cite in LIST OF REFERENCES –<br/>MMA below] that despite the MMA's claim that there was a 1970 Agreement<br/>with the City, that the "city gave it the power to charge [a fee], that power was<br/>never written into its Lease." [see b. above]</li> <li>e. State laws supersede local laws and/or contracts, in any case.</li> </ul>  |
|--|
| 6. <u>Settlement Agreement</u> . 2016.<br>a. Part of nearly 3,000 pages of documents produced by DCA in<br>response to FA's FOIL request. [see description in G. 17. Below.]   |
| <ul> <li>7. "Procedures Manual." Department of Cultural Affairs. 2005.</li> <li>a. Describes the prerequisites PPP/PEC institutions, and other New York City institutions, must meet to qualify for City funding [see C.10 and C.11 of LIST OF REFERENCES PPP.]</li> </ul>   |
| C. MMA documents pertaining to the PPP/PEC structure   |
| <ul> <li>8. <u>An Appeal to the Public, 1871</u>. Metropolitan Museum <i>Bulletin</i>, Vol. 15, No 5 (May 1920), pp. 97-101. <ul> <li>a. Articulates The MMA's Founders' pledge to New Yorkers to adhere to the intent of the PPP as the MMA Founders sought funds to build-out the promised PEC, with the MMA and the American Museum of Natural History [AMNH] being its first two projects. [see <u>PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP</u>.]</li> </ul></li></ul>   |
| <ol> <li>Published 1910. The MMA digitized portal containing its "Charter, Constitution, By-<br/>Laws, Lease, Laws."</li> <li>a. Documents the MMA's history.</li> </ol>   |
| 10. <u>"Report of the President and the Director.</u> " Annual Report of the Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. No. 101 (July 1, 1970-June 30,1971), pp. 3-7.   |
| <ul> <li>a. The MMA Board's President and Director, explained the need for a to pay-what-you-wish admission policy, though The Met and City of New York never amended their 1878 Lease: <ul> <li>i. pp. 4: " But [1] for education and for daily operating expenses, [2] only about one-fifth of which are supplied by the City of New York, the Museum is not sufficiently supported The policy of paid admission was instituted on October 13, 1970. As reported at this time last year, we had already made some successful experiments with [3] discretionary admission charges at special exhibitions and at The Cloisters. Now [4] visitors are asked to pay something [a mandatory fee] - the amount each visitor pays is up to him - at both the main building and The Cloisters. No further charge, however, is made; no so-called 'piggybacking' charge is asked, for example, to enter special exhibitions [5] Forty-five percent of the</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

visitors pay an average of sixty-five cents per person. ... Although many pay as little as a dime, a nickel or in some cases a penny the revenues have been essential for the operation of the Museum. The [6] idea of discretionary admission ... Underlying the policy is the principle of putting the Museum's limited financial resources where they can provide the greatest service to the public. ... [7] When admission was free, the generosity of a few was paying for the operation of the Museum. [Does not show appreciation for the hundreds of millions in free rent New York taxpayers uniquely forfeit.] The new policy asks those who visit the Metropolitan – many of whom simply had never thought about the cost of running a museum – also to contribute to its operation, to whatever extent they can afford. ..." [bracketed numbers added, emphasis added]

- b. FA conclusion I: The MMA's pay-what-you-wish [now known as "amount you pay is up to you] admissions policy was and is a mandatory fee since "you must pay something," and violates the New York State law.
- D. <u>One of the 17 PPP/PEC institutions prepares and disseminates in 1917, a report</u> <u>chronicling the ways in which these City-funded institutions were meeting their PPP</u> <u>obligation.</u>
  - 11. <u>Guide to the Nature Treasures of New York City.</u> American Museum of Natural History. 1917.
    - a. American Museum of Natural History [AMNH] is the integral character in this institutional accounting though it includes descriptions of the New York Aquarium, Zoological Park, and Botanical Garden, as well as the Brooklyn Museum, Botanic Garden and Children's Museum.
    - b. While focused on these institutions in 1917, <u>FA identifies this tome as a representative model</u> for New York City's oversight agency, the <u>Department of Cultural Affairs [DCA]</u>, to use to provide evidence to City leaders and New <u>Yorkers that all 17 of the PPP/PEC institutions are meeting</u> the terms of controlling laws, complying contracts and DCA prerequisites to qualify for City funding.
    - c. Illustrating this possibility, <u>FA annotated this guide to show how the</u> <u>publication of a document like this tome would translate well for annual</u> <u>publication on the DCA's and each PPP/PEC institution's website</u>.
- E. <u>City demonstrates that New Yorkers are on our own if we want to challenge the City's</u> <u>and PEC institutions' compliance with New York State and local laws or terms of</u> <u>superseded contracts.</u>
  - 12. "Brief Amicus Curiae for the City of New York." 2014. Supreme Court of New York. Appellate Division: First Department. Saska et al vs. The Metropolitan Museum of Art consolidated with Grunewald/Nicholson vs. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Corporation Counsel of the City of New York.
    - a. An Amicus Brief is filed when one is not a party to the litigation but wants to support one of the parties, known as a "friend of the court" filing. <u>Corporation</u> <u>Counsel wrote in favor of The Metropolitan Museum of Art</u>.
    - b. FA's Founder was a party to the non-class portion of this consolidated action.

c. <u>Corporation Counsel in effect demonstrates that if a New Yorker attempts to</u> <u>bring legal action against a PPP/PEC institution, the City will advocate on</u> <u>behalf of the institution and not the residents and taxpayers of New York City</u>.

#### F. Examples of New York City's failure to comply with the PPP

- 13. Despite unrepealed New York State laws, the DCA and other City agencies entered Amended Lease and/or new or Amended License Agreements with each of the PEC institutions, in contravention of New York State law in some instances and/or the DCA prerequisite to price tickets to "encourage attendance by a broad segment of the population of the City of New York." [see <u>PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP</u> including F. 21. a-m In LIST OF REFERENCES -- PPP, PARK INSTITUTIONS and DCA's "Procedures Manual."] These Agreements were produced in response to FA's FOIL requests. New Yorkers' subsidize PPP/PEC institutions with more than \$1 BILLION annually in direct and indirect subsidies. [see FINANCIAL ANALYSIS.]
- 14. For years, New York Botanical Garden [NYBG] has been <u>actively campaigning to</u> <u>repeal</u> the admission provisions of <u>Chapter 285 of the Laws of 1891 as amended by</u> <u>Chapter 465 of the Laws of 1994 by removing State authority</u> over NYBG's admission provisions. Former Governor Andrew Cuomo's June 2, 2020 <u>VETO MESSAGE - No.</u> <u>148 quashed NYBG's efforts</u> as spelled out in <u>NY State Senate Bill S4449</u>. In the <u>wake of Cuomo's VETO</u>, State Senator Alessandra Biaggi and Assemblywoman Nathalia Fernandez introduced <u>Senate Bill S8038</u> and <u>Assembly Bill A8562</u>, <u>respectively</u>, in an effort to contravene Cuomo's VETO.

Knowing the justification behind Cuomo's VETO cries out for dissemination to New Yorkers, the Adams' Administration, members of the City Council and State Legislators, because it makes even more appalling NYBG's end-run to evade Cuomo's VETO by proposing new legislation.

Former Governor Cuomo's VETO asserted as follows:

"Given the unique conditions on which the [NYBG] was established, particularly the premise that the park should be free and open to the public and a more than 100 year track record of limiting the [NYBG's] authority to charge a fee, it is prudent to veto this bill until the Legislature can provide a finding that the authority to charge a fee in perpetuity is necessary to make the [NYBG] fiscally sound. The current bill lacks any meaningful analysis and therefore provides insufficient grounds to overturn the long-standing preference to keep this public park open and free to the public. Also, concerning is the lack of analysis to whether the [NYBG] has made the grounds free for primary and secondary schools, as is required by the law. Until it can be demonstrated that the NYBG has met its current obligation, it would be unsound to remove the free policy from state oversight." [emphasis added] In July 2022, Governor Hochul signed <u>Senate Bill S8038</u> and <u>Assembly Bill A8562</u>. Read the JUSTIFICATION section in the Bill to learn the reasoning for Hochul's approval while recognizing that <u>the Bill is devoid of the facts</u> of the history of "free access" and instruction as being "consideration" NYBG and the other PPP/PEC institutions is to provide to New Yorkers in exchange for New Yorkers providing NYBG and the other PPP/PEC institutions §1 BILLION in annual "consideration" in the form of free rent, and capital and operating costs. In 2017 and 2018, New Yorkers' consideration to NYBG amounted to \$73.3 MILLION and \$87.3 MILLION, respectively. In addition, because of free rent, NYBG amassed an investment and endowment portfolio \$640.4 MILLION in 2017 to \$678.8 MILLION in 2018. S8303 takes effect in 2025. It should be repealed and free admission provisions for all New Yorkers should revert back to Chapter 285 of the Laws of 1891.

- New Yorkers must act now to STOP elected politicians from parlaying our free rights for votes. [see SIGN FA'S PETITION NOW!]
- 15. New York City's Department of Parks [DPR] owns New York City's four zoos; namely, the Bronx Zoo [BZ], Central Park Zoo [CPZ], Prospect Park Zoo [PPZ] and Queens [Flushing Meadows Park] Zoo [QZ] and the New York Aquarium [NYA]. However, the BZ and NYA are overseen by New York City's Department of Cultural Affairs [DCA]. DPR contracts with the New York Zoological Society [NYZS], doing business as the Wildlife Conservation Society [WCS] to manage and operate PPZ, CPZ and QZ [see HISTORY OF NYZS-WCS.] <u>New York State law provides for New Yorkers' free</u> admission to each of the NYZS-WCS venues three days in a week. Yet the Commissioner of the DPR, an appointed official by an elected official, <u>authorizes the</u> charging of admission fees in each venue in violation of New York State law and to the economic and cultural harm of New Yorkers. [see <u>PARK INSTITUTIONS</u>]

### G. Popular press

- 16. Dena Kleiman. "Behind Inflated Attendance Figures." The New York Times. 2/21/1987.
  - a. <u>Reveals that</u> four of the 17 PPP/PEC institutions, namely, the Bronx Zoo, the New York Botanical Garden, the American Museum of Natural History and <u>The</u> <u>Metropolitan Museum of Art</u>, with the last <u>overestimating attendance by 42%</u>, <u>counted visitors "[t]wice." In the case of The Metropolitan Museum and</u> Museum of Natural History, their <u>figures would plummet from 7,000,000</u> and 5,000,000 to <u>3,500,000</u> and 2,500,000, respectively and their cost per visitor would double. Similarly, the Bronx Zoo and the New York Botanical Garden would fall from 1,820,766 to 910, 383 and from 1,300,000 to 650,000, respectively.
- 17. <u>Grace Glueck.</u> "Metropolitan Museum to Institute Admission Charge." *The New York Times.* 10/09/1970.

- a. Covers the initiation of a pay-what-you-wish-but-you-must-pay-something admission fee for all visitors, including New Yorkers, which opened the floodgates for the other PPP/PEC institutions to do similarly.
- 18. <u>American Museum Asking Admission, But Visitor Sets It</u>. *The New York Times.* 4/25/1971.
- 19. MMA Website. **"The Metropolitan Museum of Art's statement on new 2013 lease."** Metropolitan Museum of Art. 10/24/2013.
  - a. MMA's official statement on the amendment to its 1878 lease with the City of New York, authorizing the museum to consider a range of admission modifications in future years, subject as in the past to review and approval by the City.
  - b. Article reveals that The Metropolitan Museum had been untruthful in reporting to the New York City courts that a 1970 agreement with the City authorized The Met to operate using a pay-what-you-wish-but-you-mustpay-something admissions policy yet the 1878 Lease was not amended.
- 20. Randy Kennedy. "New York City Amends Fee Policy for a Visit to the Met." *The New* York Times. 10/24/2013.
  - a. Article reports on an Amendment to The Metropolitan Museum's, the American Museum of Natural History's and the Museum of the City of New York's Leases, during the Bloomberg administration, where the Mayor, in effect provided these institutions the right to "make an admission fee mandatory," despite no evidence that the Office of Corporation Counsel had read, interpreted, and opined on the provisions of state and local laws, among other things or codified them for enforcement by oversight agencies.
  - b. Article reveals that The Metropolitan Museum had been untruthful in reporting to the New York City courts that a 1970 agreement with the City authorized The Met to operate using a pay-what-you-wish-but-you-mustpay-something admissions policy yet the 1878 Lease was not amended.
- 21. Regarding the Kennedy article above,
  - a. Consider a <u>Settlement</u> reached in a consolidated court case against The Metropolitan Museum of Art regarding its admission policy. [see Justice Kornreich's 6/6/17 Decision and Order.]
  - b. Then, consider <u>Why We Are Opposing The Proposed Metropolitan Museum</u> <u>Settlement</u>, by Michael Hiller, principal, Hiller PC. A negation of the Settlement reported by counsel for FA Founder Pat Nicholson, party to the non-class action portion of this consolidated action.
  - c. In addition, consider a New York City Corporation Counsel <u>Amicus Brief</u> filed in 2014 as part of this litigation and in support of The Metropolitan Museum of Art. [see fuller description above.]

## H. Financial documents

# 22. Consolidated 2017-2018 financial statements.

a. Offers an overview of MMA's financial statements for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2017 and 2018.

# 23. IRS Form 990

a. Details MMA's finances for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2017 and 2018.