

**The Show Will Go On:
An Economic Analysis of Massachusetts S. 2457**

Jennifer Fearing
Director of Economic Research
The Humane Society of the United States

April 11, 2006

**THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES.**

**The Show Will Go On:
An Economic Analysis of Massachusetts S. 2457**

Jennifer Fearing¹
April 11, 2006

During the 2005-06 legislative session, Senator Robert Hedlund introduced Senate Bill 1840 (newly drafted as “S. 2457”), that seeks to prohibit the use of wild and exotic animals² in traveling shows and circuses throughout the state of Massachusetts, with exceptions granted to members of the American Zoo and Aquarium Association, the Southwick Zoo, the Forest Park Zoo, any public or private school or any sanctuary as defined within S. 2457.

The purpose of this report is to provide economic insights that may be useful to determine the economic impact, if any, of S. 2457’s passage. As such, the report will demonstrate the following:

- The state of Massachusetts will experience no economic loss in the absence of amusement events that would be limited by passage of S. 2457.

¹ Jennifer Fearing currently serves as the Director of Economic Research for 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 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. She developed complex damage analyses and market impact studies utilizing significant amounts of data and discovery materials. Ms. Fearing also wrote comprehensive expert reports detailing her work. 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 Throughout this report, the term “wild and exotic animal(s)” is used rather than the term “exotic animal(s).” S. 2457 defines an “exotic animal” as “a non-human primate, cat (excluding domesticated cats), bear, elephant, giraffe, rhinoceros or hippopotamus, or a hybrid of any of these animals, whether bred in the wild or captivity.” This is only a subset of all wild animals (e.g., would permit exhibition of camels, alligators, zebras, wolves, kangaroos, parrots, ostriches, bison, and others). Because the findings in this report hold for all wild animals, not just “exotic animals,” as defined, the term “wild and exotic” is used throughout.

- Massachusetts may experience higher economic activity if family spending shifts from touring events like circuses featuring wild and exotic animals to resident events and activities.
- If, in the absence of the limited events, continued demand exists for circus-type amusement events, the market will respond and other substitute events will come to Massachusetts.

The Economics of Events

The local economic activity generated by an event staged at any one of the arenas or facilities hosting a wild and exotic animal traveling show or circus 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. Another source of economic activity is any jobs created by this spending.³

When evaluating the economic activity of such an event, three important caveats must be considered. 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 in favor of specific events, namely because their consideration – and thus a complete economic picture – will offset any private gains accruing to the event’s owners.

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).

The most relevant economic literature for considering the economic impact of performing events is the literature on the economics of arenas and sports stadiums.⁴ Economists roundly agree that these venues do not generate new economic spending in a region – they only redistribute the discretionary spending of families to different owners of capital.⁵ This finding is based on the conclusion – after dozens, if not hundreds of studies – that venues and 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 for local business owners not operating in the immediate vicinity.

Economists have trouble getting this message through to politicians and sports team owners who have the financial and political resources to push through public subsidies for such venues. Proponents will likely argue that new money is generated, creating jobs and tax revenue. 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 taking the family 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 hasn't generated any new economic impact,

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

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.

it has just transferred it. The only way that the circus leaving the state would have any economic impact whatsoever is if all the economic activity associated with the circus event is never spent in the Massachusetts economy at all.⁶

One way it might be plausible that the economic activity associated with the circus would evaporate from the region is if a significant proportion of circus goers are coming into the state to attend the circus from outside the area. 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 season in both Springfield and Worcester, cities only 50 miles apart, 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 wild and exotic animals. But there are many options for Massachusetts families wishing to entertain their families on a budget comparable to attendance at the animal circus events. Exhibit 2 lists Massachusetts family attractions and a 2005-06 events calendar. There are many venues and events for families in the price range comparable to the circus events.

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 animals remain plentiful. For example, Ringling has three units that travel simultaneously across the country to 44 states and the District of Columbia

⁸ Ringling's "Gold Tour" will be in Springfield from May 10-14 and its "Red Tour" will be in Worcester from May 17-21.

Traveling shows and circuses performing in Massachusetts such as Ringling are traveling events, whose owners or performers do not reside in the state of Massachusetts. When the circus leaves town, it takes its performers and its profits with it, thus limiting the benefits to Massachusetts.⁹ From an economic perspective, family spending at traveling events like Ringling would create more economic impact if spent instead on local attractions. The owners and employees of those attractions reside 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

To date, 28 municipalities across the country have prohibited wild and exotic animals in circuses and traveling shows from performing within their borders; several of these municipalities are located in Massachusetts. For example, Braintree, Provincetown, Quincy, Revere and Weymouth all 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 banned the public display of wild and exotic animals, there is a trend toward introduction of state legislation that would either

⁹ 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>)

prohibit the display of certain species that are commonly utilized in circuses and traveling shows, or state-specific standards for how these animals are trained and treated while performing. States like Connecticut, California and Nebraska are holding hearings to evaluate the appropriateness of wild and exotic animals as performers in traveling entertainment events.¹⁰ And across the Atlantic, the Rural Affairs Minister of Scotland recently announced plans to introduce a ban on the exhibition of wild and exotic animals, following on the heels of similar legislation in England and Wales.¹¹

Circuses featuring only human performers are gaining in popularity across the country. These shows feature acts of human ingenuity, daring and talent. At least 24 wild and exotic animal-free circuses perform throughout the United States, at least three of which perform in Massachusetts – 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...”¹² Cirque du Soleil reaches audiences across the country, with five traveling and five resident shows. More than 42 million people have seen a Cirque du Soleil show and since 1984, the shows have made almost 250 stops in nearly 100 cities around the world. Cirque du Soleil has been

¹⁰ During the 2005 and 2006 legislative sessions several states have introduced and debated legislation addressing the display of wild and exotic animals as well as whether these animals are humanely treated. The following states have introduced bills: California (AB 3027-2006), Connecticut (HB 6413-2005) and HB 5441-2006), Nebraska (LB 1000-2006), New York (A 49-2005), and Rhode Island (HB 5356-2005 and HB 7340-2006).

¹¹ “Scotland plans circus animal ban,” BBC News, March 24, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/4842912.stm>.

¹² <http://www.cirquedusoleil.com/CirqueDuSoleil/en/pressroom/prinfo/backgrds/cdsbackgrds/history/1984.htm>.

performing in Boston since 2001 and according to Mr. Anick Couture, spokesperson for Cirque du Soleil, the Boston audience has been a complete success for the troupe. Each year their arrival is met with a growing number of attendees.¹³

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.”¹⁴ The Big Apple Circus stopped touring with elephants in July 2000 and according to their media spokesperson has continued to be successful in Boston, witnessing no observable decline in attendance.¹⁵

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.¹⁶

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. Some 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.

¹³ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and Mr. Anick Couture.

¹⁴ See <http://www.bigapplecircus.org/AnimalCare/>.

¹⁵ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and media spokesperson.

¹⁶ Notes from telephone conversation between Bob Mackay and Harry Dubsky.

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 recently was “reborn as an animal-free, Latino-themed one-ring circus” that had its first performance in San Diego, California in mid-October of this year.¹⁷ The new 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 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 during its performances, citing the “expense of meeting animal welfare standards... [as] a losing venture.”¹⁸ The current show focuses on acrobats, a high wire motorcycle team and performers dressed up as comic book movie heroes.¹⁹

According to a number of media accounts, Cole Bros. revenue has not suffered for making these changes. A May 2005 article reported that the advanced ticket sales for the four evening performances in Vineland, New Jersey were the highest amount in the last five years.²⁰ 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 is having its “best year... in a long time” and that they “can put on as good or better show without the exotics.”²¹ Cole Bros. observes now that children “no longer care much for exotic animals,” rather that they appreciate “action... fast moving lights, fast moving

¹⁷ “Circus Vargas reborn as Latino-themed entertainment,” *North County Times*, October 7, 2005.

¹⁸ “Circus reflects changing times; gone are tigers, hello kitty,” *The Gazette* (MD), April 27, 2005.

¹⁹ According to its web site, Cole Bros. has re-introduced elephants into its 2006 touring show.

²⁰ “Circus to launch animal-free show,” *The Daily Journal* (NJ), May 17, 2005

²¹ “Send in the clowns, but forget tigers,” *Daily Record* (MO), May 27, 2005.

music.”²² The leader of the 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.”²³

Finally, a recent *Wall Street Journal* article recently 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.”²⁴ 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.²⁵

In response to this cost structure, Ringling and other circuses have reduced the number of animal acts in their shows. In 1965, Ringling employed 65 such acts; by 1995, that had dropped to 22 and today it presents only 16.²⁶

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ “The Power Clown,” *Wall Street Journal*, August 12, 2005.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

Finally, several other circuses have struggled to meet the USDA's minimum care requirements for exhibiting wild and exotic animals. And while violations of the Animal Welfare Act may not be *per se* economic, fundamentally failures to provide care are driven by 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.²⁷

If present trends continue, there is no reason to conclude that wild and exotic animal 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. 2457. Either spending on amusement activities like circuses will be totally unaffected or 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. If the loss of wild and exotic animal events creates more demand for alternative children's entertainment, there is no shortage of shows that would not violate S. 2457 that would find it profitable to tour in

²⁷ 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.

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. 2457's provisions.

EXHIBIT 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARENA/STADIUM 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

Family Activities in Massachusetts

Place	Entry Fees for Family of Four
Capron Park Zoo, Attleboro	\$1.00 - \$3.50
Boston Children's Museum, Boston	\$7.00 - \$9.00
Buttonwood Park Zoo	\$2.50 - \$5.00
Cider Hill Farms, Amesbury	Free
Discovery Museums, Acton	\$8.00
EcoTarium, Worcester	Free - \$8.00
Franklin Park Zoo, Boston	Free - \$7.50
Museum of Science, Boston	\$12.00 - \$15.00
New England Aquarium, Boston	\$8.95 - \$15.95
Salem Willows, Salem	Free
Six Flags New England, Springfield	\$41.99
Southwick's Zoo, Mendon	Free - \$15.00
Walter D. Stone Memorial Zoo, Stoneham	Free - \$7.50

2005-06 Family Entertainment Events in Massachusetts

Performer/Show	Venue	Date(s)	Ticket Price for Family of Four
Cirque du Soleil	Suffolk Downs Boston	7/25/04 – 9/5/04 (plays every 2 years – scheduled to play in 2006 – no specific date posted)	\$140.00
The Moscow State Circus	Throughout MA	Spring 2005	Free - \$80.00
The Big Apple Circus	The Bay Side Expo Center Boston	4/2/05 – 5/8/05	\$52.00 - \$204.00
	City Hall Plaza Boston	4/1/06 – 5/7/06	\$52.00 - \$216.00
Disney on Ice	DCU Center Worcester	2/23/06 – 2/26/06	\$60.00
Sesame Street Live	DCU Center Worcester	9/30/05	\$56.00
World Famous Lipizzaner Stallions	DCU Center Worcester	10/9/05	\$78.00
22 nd Annual Taste of Boston	City Hall Plaza Boston	9/17/05 – 9/18/05	Under \$12.00
Belchertown Fair	Town Common Belchertown	9/23/05 – 9/25/05	Free
Fall Foliage Family Day	Western Gateway Heritage State Park North Adams	9/25/05	Free
3 rd Annual Thanksgiving Harvest Festival	455 Highland St. Phillipston	11/19/05 – 11/20/05	Free
53 rd Quincy Christmas Parade	1305 Hancock St. Quincy	11/27/05	Free
Sesame Street Live	Agganis Arena Boston	4/20/06 – 4/23/06	\$60.00 - \$100.00
John Hancock Champions On Ice 2006 Tour	Banknorth Garden Boston	4/22/06	\$50.00 - \$358.00
Dan Zanes & Friends	Berklee Performance Center Boston	4/29/06	\$82.00 - \$88.00
Care Bears Live : Caring and Sharing Friends	Tsongas Arena Lowell	5/25/06 – 5/28/06	\$48.00 - \$80.00
Cape & Islands Whale Trail	Cape Cod	6/1/06 - 9/23/06	Free
Puppet Showplace Theatre	32 Station Street Brookline	4/1/06 - 4/30/06 and 5/6/2006 - 5/28/2006	Free