

**The Show Will Still Go On:
An Economic Analysis of Massachusetts S. 2002**

**Jennifer Fearing
Chief Economist**



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

www.humanesociety.org

The Show Will Still Go On: An Economic Analysis of Massachusetts S. 2002

Jennifer Fearing¹

Senate Bill 2002 (“S. 2002”) seeks to limit the training and restraint devices used when housing, possessing, or traveling with elephants or at stationary facilities throughout the state of Massachusetts, and grants exemptions to American Zoo and Aquarium Association accredited institutions, the Southwick’s Zoo, the Forest Park Zoo, and the Big E in West Springfield.²

The purpose of this report is to provide insights concerning the economic impact, if any, of S. 2002’s passage. As such, the report will demonstrate the following:

- S. 2002 does not prohibit any amusement event from taking place in the state of Massachusetts.
- If certain events do not take place because parties affected by S. 2002 elect not to tour in the state, and continued demand exists for circus-type amusement events, the market will respond and other events will come to Massachusetts, replacing any lost economic activity.
- Alternatively, local economies within Massachusetts may see improved economic activity if family spending shifts away from touring events owned and operated by non-residents and toward resident events and activities.
- The state will experience no economic loss in the absence of amusements that may choose not to operate in Massachusetts if S. 2002 is enacted.

¹ Jennifer Fearing currently serves as Chief Economist of The Humane Society of the United States. From July 1995 through June 2003, she was employed as a professional economist for a national economic research and consulting firm based in Los Angeles. Ms. Fearing’s primary responsibilities were to provide economic research and complex damage analysis in the framework of expert witness litigation involving government and commercial entities on antitrust, intellectual property and fraud matters. Her principal fields are applied microeconomics and industrial economics – including the study of markets, consumer and price effects and the strategic behavior of firms. Ms. Fearing holds a Bachelor of Arts in Economics with highest honors from the University of California, Davis and a Master of Public Policy with an emphasis on Business and Government policy from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

² State of Massachusetts, Senate No. 2002, “An Act Relating to the Treatment of Elephants,” <http://www.mass.gov/legis/bills/senate/185/st02/st02002.htm>, accessed on October 15, 2007.

The Economics of Events

The local economic activity generated by an event staged at any one of the arenas or facilities hosting a traveling show or circus featuring elephants derives from four sources: (1) spending to attend the event (e.g., tickets and parking); (2) spending on concession items sold during the event such as popcorn and t-shirts; (3) spending before and after the event on other consumable items like meals or gas; and (4) taxes paid to local government on spending for these three categories. An indirect source of economic activity is any jobs created by this spending.³

Three important caveats should govern evaluations of the economic activity of such an event. First, spending generated at or by the event can only be considered a benefit to the local economy if the spending would not have taken place in the absence of the event. Second, only that portion of the spending that stays in the local economy can be counted as providing a local benefit. Finally, all benefits must be weighed against the direct and indirect costs (including the opportunity costs) of holding the event. These caveats are routinely ignored by those who favor specific events, namely because their consideration – and thus a complete economic picture – will offset any private gains accruing to the event’s owners.

The most relevant literature for considering the economic impact of performing events is that which deals with the economics of arenas and sports stadiums.⁴

Economists roundly agree that these venues do not generate new economic spending

³ Job quality/types can vary from permanent full- and part-time jobs for residents, temporary jobs for residents and income paid to the show’s performers (non-resident full- and part-time).

⁴ See Exhibit 1 for a brief bibliography of this literature.

in a region – they only redistribute the discretionary spending of families to different owners of capital.⁵

This finding is based on the conclusion – based on dozens, if not hundreds of studies – that arenas and the events staged there do not tend to attract significant proportions of tourists and visitors (e.g., non-residents). Any new economic activity must be generated by new spenders visiting from outside the local area. Without such spending, no additional tax revenue is generated and oftentimes local business owners who operate complementary or substitute efforts in other parts of the region will lose whatever the new venue gains – making it a wash for the region and specifically deleterious to those local businesses not operating in the venue’s immediate vicinity.

All too often, economists have trouble getting this message across to politicians and team owners with the financial and political resources to push through public subsidies to build large-scale sports venues. Proponents often argue that new money is generated, creating jobs and tax revenue. But this stream of thought is problematic from the outset – how is this “new” money generated? Most families have entertainment budgets, and the \$100 they would spend going together to the circus is \$100 that they don't spend on miniature golf or a zoo visit later in the month. Circus or no circus, that \$100 gets spent in the local economy anyway, so the event does not generate any new economic impact. It has simply transferred it. The only way that the loss of a circus electing to discontinue shows in the state would have any economic impact whatsoever

⁵ “Academic studies of the economic impact of professional sports facilities... have generally found either no evidence of positive economic benefits, or evidence of a negative economic impact.” Coates, Dennis and Brad Humphreys, “Voting on Stadium and Arena Subsidies,” March 7, 2002 (http://www.umbc.edu/economics/seminar_papers/brown_new.pdf). For a succinct discussion, see also Noll, Roger and Andrew Zimbalist, “Are New Stadiums Worth the Cost?” *The Brookings Review*, Summer 1997, Vol. 15 No. 3, Pages 35-39.

is if all the spending associated with the circus event never takes place in the Massachusetts economy at all.⁶

It might be plausible to argue that the economic activity associated with circus events would evaporate from the region if it turns out that a significant proportion of circus goers are coming into the state to attend the circus from elsewhere. If those tourists are not otherwise attracted to Massachusetts, they may stay in their state and spend their money there. Without data, it is difficult to know for certain, but it is highly unlikely that a significant number of Massachusetts circus goers are out-of-state tourists.⁷ Since Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus (“Ringling”) itself has scheduled stops this year in Boston, Worcester, Providence and Manchester, cities located within close proximity, it is reasonable to conclude that the willingness to travel for such events is limited to a short distance, and hence that most audiences are made up of residents, not tourists.⁸

Any finding of economic impact relies on an assumption that there is or would be nothing to fill the void left by the traveling shows or circuses exhibiting elephants, should such exhibitors elect not to tour in Massachusetts. But there are many options for Massachusetts residents wishing to entertain their families on a budget comparable to that needed for attendance at circus events. Exhibit 3 lists Massachusetts family

⁶ How can a handful of nights of the circus create economic impact if most economists agree that the arena in which the circus operates doesn't? (See, e.g., Reich, Brian, “Baseball and the American City: An examination of public financing and stadium construction in American professional sports, April 30, 2001, <http://www.stadiummouse.com>, “There is virtually no evidence to demonstrate that such spending has had anything but a negligible impact on employment, tax revenues, and regional income.”)

⁷ The opportunities to attend circus events including wild and exotic remain plentiful. For example, Ringling has three units that travel simultaneously across the country to 44 states and the District of Columbia.

⁸ See Exhibit 2 for a list of 2007 Ringling performance dates in New England.

attractions and Exhibit 4 provides a 2007-08 family events calendar. There are many venues and events for families in the price range comparable to the circus events.

The owners and performers of traveling shows and circuses performing in Massachusetts do not reside in the state of Massachusetts.⁹ When the circus leaves town, it takes its performers and its profits out of the state, thus limiting the economic benefits of such shows to Massachusetts.¹⁰ From an economic perspective, family spending would create more economic impact if spent on local attractions instead of traveling shows. The owners and employees of local amusement and recreation attractions live in Massachusetts and therefore spend their incomes locally, paying sales tax on their purchases and paying income tax to the State.

The Show Will Go On

S. 2002 does not prohibit any exhibition of or travel with elephants within the state of Massachusetts. The bill bars the possession or use of implements that “may reasonably result in harm to the elephant including, but not limited to, the damage, scarring or breakage of an elephant's skin.”¹¹ The bill limits the use of chains to restrain an elephant, “except if utilized for the shortest amount of time necessary to provide actual medical treatment.”¹² Passage of S. 2002 would have no direct economic

⁹ The main circuses that are known to have toured Massachusetts with elephants include: Ringling (based in Vienna, VA), Carson & Barnes (based in Hugo, OK), Cole Bros (based in Deland, FL) and R W Commerford & Son Inc (based in Goshen, CT).

¹⁰ Economists refer to this as the “leakage” of funds from a local economy. “The money that stays in the community is taxed over and over again as it is exchanged for goods and services, but the money that flees elsewhere is no longer taxed by the local government.” (Marasco, David, PhD, “Leaky Stadiums - Milwaukee's Stadium Experience,” <http://www.thediamondangle.com/marasco/opan/leaky.html>)

¹¹ State of Massachusetts, Senate No. 2002, “An Act Relating to the Treatment of Elephants,” <http://www.mass.gov/legis/bills/senate/185/st02/st02002.htm>, accessed on October 15, 2007.

¹² *Ibid.*

consequences for local economies in Massachusetts that presently host traveling or stationary elephant displays, since all that is limited by the bill are training and restraint methods.

S. 2002 is modest when compared to other policy approaches to elephant displays – approaches which themselves have produced no known adverse economic impacts. To date, 28 municipalities across the country have prohibited the performance or display of wild and exotic animals in circuses and traveling shows within their borders; several of these municipalities are located in Massachusetts.¹³ For example, Braintree, Provincetown, Quincy, Revere and Weymouth have passed ordinances prohibiting the exhibition of wild and exotic animals in traveling acts. None of these towns have reported any economic losses as a result of the prohibition. Concern about the public health, safety and animal welfare issues associated with the public display of wild and exotic animals in traveling shows and circuses is growing across the country, with many cities choosing to address the issue through the ordinance process.

Further, although to date no state has taken the step of banning the public display of wild and exotic animals, there is a trend toward introduction of state legislation that would either prohibit the display of certain species commonly utilized in circuses and traveling shows, or set state-specific standards for how these animals are trained and treated while performing. States like Connecticut, California and Nebraska have held hearings to evaluate the appropriateness of wild and exotic animals as

¹³ Note that S. 2002 is far less restrictive than these municipal ordinances – not prohibiting any animal act, but limiting the use of specific implements or devices used to train or restrain an elephant.

performers in traveling entertainment events.¹⁴ And across the Atlantic, in late 2006, the Rural Affairs Minister of Scotland introduced a ban on the exhibition of wild and exotic animals in circuses, after similar legislation passed in England and Wales.¹⁵

Circuses featuring only human performers are gaining in popularity across the country. These shows feature acts of human ingenuity, physical prowess, daring and talent. Nearly 30 wild and exotic animal-free circuses perform throughout the United States, seven of which perform in Massachusetts – including Cirque du Soleil, the Big Apple Circus and the Moscow State Circus.

The most popular of these shows, Cirque du Soleil, describes itself as “based on a totally new concept: a striking, dramatic mix of the circus arts, street entertainment, featuring wild, outrageous costumes, staged under magical lighting and set to original music. With not a single animal in the ring...”¹⁶ Cirque du Soleil reaches audiences across the country, with six traveling and six resident shows. More than 70 million people (including 10 million expected during 2007 alone) have seen a Cirque du Soleil show and since 1984, the shows have made almost 250 stops in nearly 100 cities around the world.¹⁷ Cirque du Soleil has been performing in Boston since 2001 and according to Mr. Anick Couture, spokesperson for Cirque du Soleil, the Boston market has been a complete success. Each year the arrival of Cirque du Soleil is met with a growing number of attendees.¹⁸

¹⁴ During the 2006 and 2007 legislative sessions the states of California, Connecticut, Nebraska, New York and Rhode Island introduced and debated legislation addressing the display of wild and exotic animals as well as whether these animals are humanely treated.

¹⁵ “Scotland plans circus animal ban,” BBC News, March 24, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/4842912.stm>. See also

<http://edmi.parliament.uk/EDMi/EDMDetails.aspx?EDMID=30065&SESSION=875>.

¹⁶ http://www.cirquedusoleil.com/CirqueDuSoleil/en/Pressroom/cirquedusoleil/factsheets/cds_history.htm

¹⁷ http://www.cirquedusoleil.com/CirqueDuSoleil/en/Pressroom/cirquedusoleil/factsheets/cds_glance.htm

¹⁸ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and Mr. Anick Couture.

The Big Apple Circus was established in 1977 and since 2000 has spent five weeks of each year in Boston. The circus prides itself in only partnering “with animals that have a traditional working relationship with man... We continue to explore and address the needs of our performing animal partners and insist upon sensitivity to quality of life both in and out of the ring for all of our performers.”¹⁹ The Big Apple Circus stopped touring with elephants in July 2000 and according to a company spokesperson has continued to be successful in Boston, witnessing no observable decline in attendance.²⁰

The animal-free Moscow State Circus made its debut in Braintree in 2005 and according to spokesman Harry Dubsky, attendance was outstanding and the Circus was oversold for both days’ performances.²¹

Traditional Circuses Re-think Animal Use

There is also evidence to indicate that even the traditional circuses are recognizing the potentially higher profitability resulting from showcasing interesting human acts rather than animal acts. After all, Cirque du Soleil’s “Ka” show in Las Vegas is reported to have earned a 35 percent profit margin on its 2005 revenues of \$90 million.²² Some traditional circuses have already taken the step of dropping animal acts from their shows, while others, in response both to competition and profitability, have changed their strategies to focus less (or not at all) on animal acts.²³

¹⁹ See <http://theorganization.bigapplecircus.org/AnimalCare/>.

²⁰ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and media spokesperson.

²¹ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and Harry Dubsky.

²² *Brandweek*, May 21, 2007.

²³ Note that all the amusement activities discussed in this section, including Ringling, are privately-held and thus financial information is available only from news accounts.

In 2005, the Moscow State Circus purchased the rights to the name of Circus Vargas, when the traveling show featuring animal acts “folded up its tent.” Circus Vargas was “reborn as an animal-free, Latino-themed one-ring circus” that had its first performance in San Diego, California in mid-October of 2005.²⁴ The show, delivered entirely in Spanish, features an aerial motorcycle act. Acrobats, trapeze artists, contortionists, daredevil stunt performers, aerialists and clowns round out the show’s line up. There are no public reports indicating that the new Circus Vargas is any less popular than when animals were showcased.

In 2004, the Cole Bros. circus, a 121 year-old traveling show, eliminated its use of elephants, lions and tigers, citing the “expense of meeting animal welfare standards... [as] a losing venture.”²⁵ The current show focuses on acrobats, a high wire motorcycle team and performers dressed up as comic book movie heroes.²⁶

According to a number of media accounts, Cole Bros.’ revenue did not suffer for making these changes. A May 2005 article reported that advance ticket sales for the four evening performances in Vineland, New Jersey were the highest amount in the prior five years.²⁷ This trend was also observed when Cole Bros. traveled to St. Louis, Missouri on its 2005 animal-free tour. Cole Bros. reported that the circus had its “best year...in a long time” and “can put on as good or better show without the exotics.”²⁸ Cole Bros. observed that children “no longer care much for exotic animals,” rather that they appreciate “action... fast moving lights, fast moving music.”²⁹ The leader of the

²⁴ “Circus Vargas reborn as Latino-themed entertainment,” *North County Times*, October 7, 2005.

²⁵ “Circus reflects changing times; gone are tigers, hello kitty,” *The Gazette* (MD), April 27, 2005.

²⁶ According to its web site, Cole Bros. has re-introduced elephants into its 2006 touring show.

²⁷ “Circus to launch animal-free show,” *The Daily Journal* (NJ), May 17, 2005

²⁸ “Send in the clowns, but forget tigers,” *Daily Record* (MO), May 27, 2005.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

local Kiwanis club concurred, stating that “advanced sales for the circus have done well,” and that the comic book heroes and other attractions will “appeal to children probably even more than the animals.”³⁰

Finally, a *Wall Street Journal* article from mid-2005 described the trend toward branded clown acts, even among the largest circuses. A “headliner clown strategy” emerged in the early 1990s, when “some of America’s roughly 40 circus companies started worrying about flat sales. At that time, circuses were generally building their shows around traditional acts like lion tamers and trapeze artists.”³¹ The circus was facing strong competition, from new traveling children’s entertainment shows such as The Wiggles, Barney and Rugrats, resulting in a loss of revenue for the traditional circuses. On the cost side of the ledger, even costly clowns are less expensive to maintain than wild and exotic animals. According to the news account:

...a newborn elephant can cost about \$100,000 to buy, plus annual costs of \$11,000 to feed, \$7,500 to care for, \$7,500 to insure and \$20,000 to transport (Ringling has 22 performing elephants among its three troupes.) By contrast, annual salaries for clown-alley clowns generally run from \$15,000 to \$40,000. For most circuses, roughly 20 percent of the overall budget goes to insurance – and rates for exotic animals have more than doubled in the past five years, according to circus insurer Mitchel Kalmanson.³²

In response to this cost structure, Ringling and other circuses have reduced the number of animal acts in their shows. According to the *Journal* article, in 1965, Ringling employed 65 such acts; by 1995, that had dropped to 22 and in 2006 it presented just 16.³³

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ “The Power Clown,” *Wall Street Journal*, August 12, 2005.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

It is also worth noting that several circuses have struggled to meet the USDA's minimum care requirements for exhibiting wild and exotic animals. While violations of the Animal Welfare Act may not be economic *per se*, the fundamental failure to provide appropriate care at issue in such cases is invariably tied to the high costs of doing so. Caring for and treating wild and exotic animals properly is an expensive endeavor and one that is not always profitable for the traveling shows. For example, in 2004, the Walker Bros. Circus was fined \$25,000 and lost its elephant exhibition license for five years after admitting to 18 violations of the Animal Welfare Act, including failure to provide veterinary treatment for ailing elephants on several occasions.³⁴

If present trends continue, there is no reason to conclude that elephant acts are a necessary component for children's entertainment to be a profitable venture.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons discussed herein, Massachusetts will not experience any economic loss associated with passing S. 2002. The bill does not prohibit any amusement vendor from displaying elephants in the state. However, if parties affected by S. 2002 elect not to operate in Massachusetts, spending on similar amusement activities will offset that spending, or else family spending may shift from touring events to resident events and activities – which would lead to a net positive impact as more (or all) of the revenue generated is spent in-state. The departure of any affected parties will create more demand for alternative children's entertainment and there is no shortage of

³⁴ In 2004, the Walker Bros. Circus settled with the U.S. Department of Agriculture on multiple counts of violating the Animal Welfare Act between 2001 and 2002. Among the 18 violations, Walker Bros. was found to have caused physical harm and discomfort to animals and to have failed to provide veterinary care for elephants.

shows that would find it profitable to tour in the state or expand their current offerings.

The fact that the market – driven by both the increasing demand for non-animal entertainment and the higher costs (and therefore reduced profitability) of animal acts – is moving in the same direction, only further insulates the state from any possible negative economic impact of S. 2002's provisions.

EXHIBIT 1: ABRIDGED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SPORTS ECONOMIC LITERATURE

Books

Baade, Robert Allen, *Stadiums, Professional Sports, and Economic Development: Assessing the Reality*, Detroit: Heartland Institute, 1994.

Baim, Dean V., *The Sports Stadium as a Municipal Investment*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Bale, John, *Sport, Space, and the City*, London: Routledge, 1993.

Bale, John and Olof Moen, eds., *The Stadium and the City*, Keele University Press, 1996.

Bast, Joseph L., *Sports Stadium Madness: Why it Started: How to Stop It*, Chicago: Heartland Institute, 1998.

Betzold, Michael and Ethan Casey, *Queen of Diamonds: The Tiger Stadium Story*, Northmont Publishing Company, Inc. West Bloomfield. IL, 1997.

Cagan, Joanna, *Field of Schemes: How the Great Stadium Swindle Turns Public Money into Private Profit*, Monroe, ME.: Common Courage Press, 1998.

Danielson, Michael N., *Home Team: Professional Sports and the American Metropolis*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Euchner, Charles C., *Playing the Field: Why Sports Teams Move and Cities Fight to Keep Them*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Johnson, Arthur T., *Minor League Baseball and Local Economic Development*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Kern, William S., ed., *The Economics of Sports*, Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 2000.

Klobuchar, Amy, *Uncovering the Dome*, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1982.

Noll, Roger G., and Andrew Zimbalist, eds., *Sports, Jobs, and Taxes: The Economic Impact of Sports Teams and Stadiums*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1997.

Quirk, James, and Rodney D. Fort, *Pay Dirt: The Business of Professional Team Sports*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992, 1997 update.

Quirk, James, and Rodney D. Fort, *Hard Ball: The Abuse of Power in Pro Team Sports*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Rafool, Mandy, *Playing the Stadium Game: Financing Professional Sports Facilities in the 90s*, Legislative Finance Paper, Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, 1997.

Rich, Wilbur, ed., *The Economics and Politics of Sports Facilities*, Quorum Books. Westport, Conn. 2000.

Richmond, Peter, *Ballpark: Camden Yards and the Building of an American Dream*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993.

Riess, Stephen, *City Games*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Rosentraub, Mark S., *Major League Losers: The Real Cost of Sports and Who's Paying for It*, New York: Basic Books, 1997.

Scully, Gerald, *The Market Structure of Sports*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Shropshire, Kenneth L., *The Sports Franchise Game: Cities in Pursuit of Sports Franchises, Events, Stadiums, and Arenas*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Weiner, Jay, *Stadium Games: Fifty Years of Big League Greed and Bush League Boondoggles*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Whitford, David, *Playing Hardball: The High-Stakes Battle for Baseball's New Franchises*, New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Zimmerman, Dennis, *Tax-exempt Bonds and the Economics of Professional Sports Stadiums*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 1996.

Zimbalist, Andrew S., *Baseball and Billions: A Probing Look Inside the Big Business of Our National Pastime*, New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Zukin, Sharon, *The Culture of Cities*, Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

Articles

Baade, Robert A., "Professional Sports as Catalysts for Metropolitan Economic Development," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1996, 18 (No. 1): 1-17.

Baade, Robert A. and Richard F. Dye, "Sports Stadiums and Area Development: A Critical Review," *Economic Development Quarterly*, August, 1988, 2 (No. 3): 265-275.

Bagli, Charles V., "Bronx Offers Stadium Plan for Keeping Team," *New York Times*, 28 Sep. 1998.

Barnes, Tom, "Plan B: The Starting Gate; Stadium-Convention Center Projects Offer Tourism Venture," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 10 Mar. 1998: A1.

Bast, Joseph L., "Stop Stadium Madness: Why It Started, How to Stop It." Heartland Policy Study, February 23, 1998, Heartland Institute. Available online at <http://www.heartland.org/pdf/madness.pdf>.

Bernstein, Mark F., "Sports Stadiums Boondoggle; Building hopes in the City," *The Public Interest*, 22 June 1998: 45.

Chema, Thomas V., "When Professional Sports Justify the Subsidy," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1996, 18 (No. 1): 19-22.

Cooper, Matthew Gary Cohen, and Jim Lynn, "If you build it... They might not come. Why big projects don't always yield big benefits," *U.S. News & World Report*, Jun 24, 1991: 26-28.

Horror, Rick, "Public/Private Partnerships and Sports Facilities," *Tennessee's Business*, 1996, 7 (No. 1-2): 25-30.

Horror, Richard, "Sports Stadiums and other Entertainment Investments Are Good Business for Cities and States," Statement Before Senate Judiciary Committee - June 22, 1999.

Johnson, Arthur T. and Allen Sack, "Assessing the Value of Sports Facilities: The Importance of Noneconomic Factors," *Economic Development Quarterly*, November 1996, 10 (No. 4): 369-81.

Lowenstein, Ronnie, et al., "Double Play: The Economics and Financing of Stadiums for the Yankees and Mets," New York Independent Budget Office: Fiscal Brief, April 1998.

Lowenstein, Ronnie, et al., "Home Base for Mets and Yankees Fans," New York Independent Budget Office: Fiscal Brief, September 28, 1998.

Lowenstein, Ronnie, et al., "Public Financing of Professional Baseball Stadiums," New York Independent Budget Office: Testimony, June 11, 1998.

McGraw, Dan, "Playing the Stadium Game," *US News and World Report*, June 3: 46-51.

Noll, Roger, "Are New Stadiums Worth the Cost?" *The Brookings Review* 15 (No. 3): 35-39.

Noll, Roger and Andrew Zimbalist, "Sports, Jobs, and Taxes," *The Brookings Review*, Summer 1997, 15 (No.3): 1-7.

Rosentraub, Mark S., "Does the Emperor Have New Clothes?" *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1996, 18 (No 1): 23-31.

Rosentraub, Mark S., David Swindell, Michael Przybylski, and Daniel R. Mullins, "Sport and Downtown Development Strategy: If You Build It, Will Jobs Come?" *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1994, 16 (No 3): 221-239.

Regan, Thomas H., "A Study of the Economic Impact of the Denver Broncos Football Club on the Denver, Colorado Metropolitan Economy." EED Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado. DAI-A 54/04, page 1451.

Sickman, Phillip. 1995. Sports Pork: *The American Enterprise*. 6:3, 80-82.

EXHIBIT 2: 2007 RINGLING SHOWS IN NEW ENGLAND

City	Performance Dates	Miles from Boston
Boston, MA	October 5-14, 2007	--
Worcester, MA	May 3-6, 2007	47
Providence, RI	May 2-6, 2007	50
Manchester, NH	October 17-21, 2007	53

EXHIBIT 3: FAMILY ACTIVITIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

Place	Entry Fees for Family of Four
Capron Park Zoo, Attleboro	\$11.00 - 22.00
Boston Children's Museum, Boston	Free - \$40.00
Buttonwood Park Zoo	\$16.50 - 24.00
Cider Hill Farms, Amesbury	Free
Discovery Museums, Acton	Free - \$52.00
EcoTarium, Worcester	Free - \$24.00
Franklin Park Zoo, Boston	Free - \$44.00
Museum of Science, Boston	Free - \$100.00
New England Aquarium, Boston	\$43.80 - 75.80
Salem Willows, Salem	Free
Six Flags New England, Springfield	\$199.96
Southwick's Zoo, Mendon	Free - \$60.00
Walter D. Stone Memorial Zoo, Stoneham	Free - \$32.00

EXHIBIT 4: 2006-08 FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Performer/Show	Venue	Date(s)	Ticket Price for Family of Four
Cirque du Soleil	Boston	08/22/08	Unavailable
Cirque du Soleil: Corteo	Suffolk Downs Boston	09/08/06-10/08/06	\$126.00-\$320.00
The Big Apple Circus	Boston City Hall Plaza Boston	03/31/07-05/06/07 03/29/08-05/04/08	\$60.00-240.00 \$60.00-400.00
Disney on Ice: Disney/ Pixar's Finding Nemo	TD BankNorth Garden Boston	12/27/07 – 12/30/07	\$68.00-288.00
Disney on Ice: Princess Classics	DCU Center Worcester	01/23/07-01/27/08	\$64.00-168.00
Disney on Ice: Princess Classics	MassMutual Cener Springfield	01/30/08-02/03/08	\$60.00-200.00
Sesame Street Live: When Elmo Grows Up	MassMutual Center Springfield	10/18/07-10/21/07	\$40.00-100.00
World Famous Lipizzaner Stallions	Agganis Arena Boston	10/06/07	\$140.00-300.00
Taste of Boston	Downtown Crossing	08/04/08-08/05/08	Unavailable
Belchertown Fair	Town Common Belchertown	09/20/07-09/23/07	Free
Fall Foliage Festival	Western Gateway Heritage State Park North Adams	09/24/06-10/01/06 09/22/07-09/30/07	Free
Thanksgiving Harvest Festival	Red Apple Farm Phillipston	11/18/06-11/19/06 11/17/07-11/18/07	2006: Free 2007: \$8
Quincy Christmas Parade	Quincy	11/26/06 & 11/25/07	Free
John Hancock Champions On Ice	TD BankNorth Garden Boston	04/22/07	From \$110.00
Dan Zanes & Friends	Amherst Concert Hall Amherst	02/29/08	\$48.00-140.00
Cape & Islands Whale Trail	Chase Park Cape Cod	08/17/07-09/23/07	Free-\$300.00
Puppet Showplace Theatre: Puppets at Night	Brookline	09/23/06, 11/04/06, 01/20/07, 03/03/07, 03/15/07-03/17/07, 05/19/07	\$30.00-38.00
Dan Zanes & Friends	Somerville Theater Somerville	04/04/08-04/06/08	Unavailable
Puppet Showplace Theatre: Family Shows	Brookline	09/19/07-11/29/07	\$30.00-38.00
Wicked: The Untold Story of the Witches of Oz	The Opera House Boston	09/12/07-11/11/07	\$130.00-520.00
Blue Man Group	Charles Playhouse Boston	10/17/07-12/02/07	\$192.00-232.00
To Kill a Mockingbird	Wheelock Family Theatre Boston	10/26/07	\$76.00-92.00

Boston Philharmonic	Sanders Theatre and Jordan Hall Cambridge & Boston	10/18/07, 10/20/07-10/21/07	\$64.00-304.00
Boston Lyric Opera: La boheme	Citi Shubert Theatre Boston	11/02/07-11/13/07	\$136.00-724.00
New England Fine Arts & Antiques Fair	Bunker Hill Community College Charlestown	3 rd Sunday of every month between 05/20/07 & 12/31/07	Free
Nests & Eggs Exhibit	Harvard Museum of Natural History Cambridge	06/17/07-03/31/08	\$24.00-36.00
Looking at Animals: Photographs by Henry Horenstein	Harvard Museum of Natural History Cambridge	09/28/07-06/30/08	Free- \$36.00
Veteran's Day Parade	Boston Common Boston	11/11/07	Free
Sparklefest	Harvard Square Cambridge	December 2007	Free
Holiday Tree Lighting	Boston Common Boston	12/01/07 12/01/08	Free
The Wiggles	Tsongas Arena Lowell	10/25/07	\$92.00-140.00
Boston Ballet's The Nutcracker	Opera House Boston	11/29/07-12/29/07	\$130.00-520.00
Hannah Montana & Miley Cyrus: Best of Both Worlds Tour	DCU Center Worcester	12/21/07-12/22/07	\$99.00-259.00
Doodlebops Live	Lowell Memorial Auditorium Lowell	11/24/07	\$76.00-220.00
Disney's High School Musical: The Ice Tour	TD BankNorth Garden Boston	2/16/08-2/24/08	\$80.00-300.00