

3-6-1989

Feasibility Study: Cost-Benefit Analysis Halloween in Carbondale, Illinois

Donald E. Vaughn

Lynn A. Lindberg

Emily Carter

Bradley McCormick

Stanley Stout

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ua_docs

This analysis was created by faculty and staff in the Business Research Management Services Institute in the College of Business and Administration, Southern Illinois University Carbondale. It analyzes the economic costs and benefits of the Halloween weekend parties in Carbondale, Illinois.

Recommended Citation

Vaughn, Donald E., Lindberg, Lynn A., Carter, Emily, McCormick, Bradley, Stout, Stanley, Carlton, Irene, Bruder, Rachel and Summey, John. "Feasibility Study: Cost-Benefit Analysis Halloween in Carbondale, Illinois." (Mar 1989).

Authors

Donald E. Vaughn, Lynn A. Lindberg, Emily Carter, Bradley McCormick, Stanley Stout, Irene Carlton, Rachel Bruder, and John Summey

UPSA / Halloween



FEASIBILITY STUDY: COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

HALLOWEEN IN CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

Developed by

Donald E. Vaughn, Ph.D., Director, Business Research Center
Ms. Lynn Andersen Lindberg, M.B.A., Asst. Director, SBDC
College of Business and Administration

Questionnaire Surveys Conducted by Research Assistants

Ms. Emily Carter, B.S.

Mr. Bradley McCormick, B.S.

Mr. Stanley Stout, B.S.

MBA Candidates in the College of Business and Administration
Southern Illinois University--Carbondale

With Major Inputs by

Ms. Irene Carlton, Director, BRMSI, SBDC, SIU-C

Ms. Rachel Bruder, M.B.A., Business Coordinator, SBDC

Dr. John Summey, Associate Professor, Marketing, SIU-C

Developed for
Halloween Core Committee
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

March 6, 1989

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

ITEM	PAGE
The Charge	1
Approaches Followed in the Study	1
Aggregate (Macro) Approach	5
Impact to Individual Firms: Micro Analysis	14
Differences by Location	15
Differences for Business Types	23
Cost of Carbondale's Halloween Festival Weekend	31
Summary of Findings	33
Conclusions	35
Appendices	
Questionnaire Survey Document	37
Documents on Cost of Halloween Festival	39
Documents on Arrests during Halloween Festival	44

THE CHARGE

In January, 1989, the Halloween Core Committee of the City of Carbondale, Illinois, authorized the staff of the Business Research Management Services Institute, housed in the College of Business and Administration, SIU-C, to conduct a study that would analyze the economic costs and benefits from the annual weekend Halloween celebration that has been ongoing during the last weekend of October in the city for about sixteen years. It was the intent of the HCC that the study gather and report on economic factors that encompass costs and the apparent economic benefits from the annual celebration rather than to emphasize likes and dislikes for the event from the citizens of the City or from employees of the University.

APPROACHES FOLLOWED IN THE STUDY

The cost-benefit study was developed on a macro and micro basis, insofar as possible. The macro approach consisted of studying the sales taxes earned on sales of merchandise or on revenues from services within the City of Carbondale, on a monthly basis, for the previous five years (60 months) in order to determine the monthly index to sales tax collections and, hopefully, in order to detect shifts during the fall of the year that might be traceable to the Halloween festivities. The primary costs were expenditures for the festivity itself, the cost of additional police protection and cleanup by the City of Carbondale, and the incremental cost of SIU-C police protection

and cleanup during and immediately following the Halloween festivities.

In order to determine whether the pattern of monthly sales of goods and services in Carbondale was typical, similar data were obtained for the cities of Mount Vernon and Marion. For Carbondale, the sales were broken into total sales, revenues at hotels/motels, and revenues for restaurants and taverns. In Carbondale, it was possible to isolate the sales taxes collected on the latter two groups of business establishments due to the collection of a city tax of 4% on hotel/motel revenues and 1% on restaurant/tavern revenues.

Thanks are expressed to Mr. Jim Prowell, of the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce, and to Mr. Chuck Vaught, Finance Officer of the City of Carbondale, for their able assistance in providing useful information. Thanks are also expressed to city officials of Mt. Vernon and Marion for sharing monthly sales tax data from their respective cities.

Costs of the Halloween festivities were obtained, largely, from reports that had been prepared by the City of Carbondale for the weekend festivities for the past several years and by cost of overtime SIU-C police protection and cleanup. A copy of certain select reports is shown in the appendices to this report.

The micro approach to analyzing the costs-benefits from the weekend Halloween festivities to the City of Carbondale was the development of a series of seven questions directed to the business persons in and around the City of Carbondale that would

shed some additional light as to whether the celebration increased, decreased, or had little change on the business activity for that particular business firm. Other questions dealt with the change in pattern of customer traffic, number of incidents of shoplifting, perceived shift in store item breakage, the willingness to collect exact data surrounding such future events, and miscellaneous information. A copy of the questionnaire used in data collection by the three MBA research-assistants appears in the appendix to this report.

In total, roughly 240 business firms in Carbondale were contacted and asked to participate in the survey. Responses for (at least some of) the questions were provided by 228 of the contacted firms. In some instances, it was necessary for the data gatherer to make two or three calls on the businesses in order to contact the correct person, or to find the business owner or manager with the willingness and time to participate in the survey. However, the attained response rate of close to 95 percent is very high, and the merchants in the city are to be commended for their willingness to participate.

Data from the survey were stratified in two ways. First of all, the location of businesses was divided into five groups: the downtown-strip Carbondale area (S), the University Mall (M), Carbondale East (E), Carbondale West (W), and all other locations (O). Secondly, the firms were arranged into about 15 major industries, inasmuch as there is a strong feeling on the part of the research persons that some lines of business probably witness

increased sales during the festivities while other lines of business see falling revenues during that weekend. The following different lines of businesses were included in the survey: auto repair, auto sales, bars, convenience stores, department stores, entertainment stores (music, theatres, videos, etc.), fast food stores, gas stations, grocery stores, health firms, hotels or motels, liquor stores, restaurants, retail stores and travel agencies.

Summary and conclusions sections follow the major portions of the report.

The total sample of 150 businesses listed in the report was selected and asked to participate in the survey. Responses for at least one of the questions were provided by 128 of the contacted firms. In some instances, it was necessary for the data gathered to make two or three calls on the business in order to contact the correct person, or to find the business owner or manager with the willingness and time to participate in the survey. However, the obtained response rate of close to 85 percent is very high, and the merchants in the city are to be commended for their willingness to participate.

Data from the survey were classified in two ways. First of all, the location of businesses was divided into five groups: downtown area (A), the University Mall (M), Corporate East (E), Corporate West (W), and all other locations (O). Secondly, the firms were arranged into about 15 major industries, inasmuch as there is a strong feeling on the part of the research persons that some lines of business probably witness

AGGREGATE (MACRO) IMPACT

In order to determine the overall impact on sales of goods and certain types of services in the City of Carbondale during different months of the year, monthly sales taxes were obtained for (1) the total of the city's portion of sales tax collections, the city sales taxes imposed on restaurants/taverns, and the city taxes imposed on revenues collected by hotels/motels. Similar sales tax data were also obtained for the City of Marion and for the City of Mount Vernon for the last five years. The 60 months of data were then converted to a monthly index of sales tax collections, and the results are shown in Tables 1-4. A study of the sales tax data, in aggregate form, provides some interesting contrasts for the three cities.

While the city of Carbondale's portion of sales taxes vary somewhat from year to year, dependent upon such factors as special events in the City or at the University, unusually heavy marketing of certain types of merchandise (such as automotive products) and the seasonal retailing of clothing during the Easter, back-to-school, and the Christmas gift-giving season, the pattern does not show very much annual growth from calendar year 1984 to 1987. Over this three-year period, sales tax collections for the city (1% of sales) gained 6.8 percent. National inflation rate was running about 3 to 4 percent yearly during that time period so, in terms of real sales of goods on which sales taxes are levied, the gain was slightly less than the inflation factor.

On average, sales tax collections are above average in August and September, likely due to back-to-school sales of merchandise and to the introduction/heavier-than-average sale of new automobiles. December sales tax collection, due to the growing popularity of the University Mall, has been (during 1983-1988) about 28 percent above average monthly sales. April, May, October, and November are about average, while below average sales occur during January, February, March, and June. While weather may account for somewhat below average sales of goods on which sales taxes are collected for the City of Carbondale during these four months, the University holidays that fall in January (first half of the month), March (spring break), and June (interim period until about June 12 or 14) exert some downward pressure on such sales. During such holidays, a small fraction of the employees of the University are out of town, but upward of 75 percent of the student population departs for other locations (home, vacation trips, and the like), thus spending their sales dollars elsewhere. February is a short month of 28 or 29 days, so it is normal for such sales to be about 6 percent less than for a month of 30 or 31 days. Severe weather in February may also contribute to the low sales in that month in Carbondale.

On a comparison basis, above average sales taxes are collected in the City of Marion during the months of March (perhaps attributable to heavy Easter sales of merchandise and heavy advertising of automobiles), in August and September (back to school sales and model introduction of new autos), and much above

average sales in October and November. December sales, in that city, are only average, as judged from sales tax collections.

TABLE 1
SEASONAL INDEX TO SALES TAX COLLECTIONS FOR THE CITIES
OF CARBONDALE, MARION AND MT. VERNON, 1984-1988

Month	Marion	Mt. Vernon	C a r b o n d a l e		
			Total	Hotel/Motel	Rest./Tav.
January	101.30%	81.15%	93.62%	53.30%	85.35%
February	93.00	93.20	84.25	98.06	99.69
March	109.89	94.44	93.29	66.55	93.32
April	87.77	101.40	99.59	117.82	101.34
May	87.20	105.64	98.71	108.56	109.23
June	95.23	104.70	94.92	88.13	95.71
July	101.39	99.05	96.06	124.50	84.12
August	104.27	104.67	104.95	124.39	106.90
September	103.62	104.98	106.18	125.50	107.87
October	108.05	97.52	99.30	104.12	105.93
November	108.06	97.67	100.21	129.23	121.63
December	100.22	115.59	128.93	59.84	88.89

For the City of Mt. Vernon, above-average sales tax collections occurred in May, June, August, September, and December. During these months, of course, travel by vacationers and other motorists along Interstates 57 and 64 are much above

average. Seasonal sales of vacation items, back-to-school merchandise, and Christmas shopping, respectively, are heavy in these months. It is interesting to note that there is a 15 percent (above average) gain in sales tax collections in December in Mt. Vernon, and roughly half the gain in Carbondale, while December is only an average month in Marion. Marion merchants recognize this, of course, and some have been working to develop a shopping mall near the City of Marion and Interstate 57.

On a comparison basis, it is interesting to note that the sales tax figures are roughly the same for October and November in each of the three cities, despite the fact that Carbondale sponsors the Halloween festivities during the last weekend of that month without such a large event occurring in the other two cities. That is, Marion enjoys sales taxes of about 108 percent of the monthly average in both October and November, Mt. Vernon has between 97 and 98 percent average sales tax collections for the two respective months, and such collections in the City of Carbondale are from 99 to 100 percent of monthly average in both October and November. In short, the advent of the Halloween festivities in the city of Carbondale appears to exert very little positive or negative impact on sales tax collections during October or November. Each week of closure of the University (SIU-C), however, does appear to have a negative impact on sales tax collections in Carbondale equivalent to about 4-6 percent. Whether or not this could be made up with special events held on weekends other than Halloween in the City, or by

Table 2
 CARBONDALE HOTEL/MOTEL TAX (4%)
 MONTH EARNED, 1983-1988

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	TOTAL	PERCENT	SEASONAL INDEX
JAN		\$5,325	\$7,059	\$3,991	\$7,631	\$4,426	\$28,432	4.44%	53.30%
FEB		10,697	7,527	11,014	11,687	11,388	52,313	8.17%	98.06%
MAR		8,111	6,410	5,325	10,404	5,253	35,503	5.55%	66.55%
APR		10,971	14,622	13,081	8,702	15,479	62,855	9.82%	117.82%
MAY		9,598	11,754	9,795	12,544	14,225	57,916	9.05%	108.56%
JUNE		8,176	5,683	8,195	15,883	9,079	47,016	7.34%	88.13%
JULY		13,474	12,818	14,615	12,364	13,149	66,420	10.38%	124.50%
AUG		10,484	15,128	15,752	10,839	14,154	66,357	10.37%	124.39%
SEPT		13,752	9,521	12,969	13,612	17,099	66,953	10.46%	125.50%
OCT		10,045	10,347	10,510	12,405	12,240	55,547	8.68%	104.12%
NOV		13,830	12,200	9,013	17,727	16,170	68,940	10.77%	129.23%
DEC	7,028	7,948	8,112	6,886	10,059		31,921	4.99%	59.84%
<hr/>									
	\$7,028	\$122,411	\$121,181	\$121,146	\$143,857	\$132,662	\$640,173	100.00%	1200.00%
						MEAN=	53,348		

CARBONDALE RESTAURANT/TAVERN TAX (1%)
 MONTH EARNED, 1983-1988

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	TOTAL	PERCENT	SEASONAL INDEX
JAN		\$18,399	\$22,171	\$21,879	\$25,596	\$24,354	\$112,399	7.11%	85.35%
FEB		23,809	18,304	26,015	30,064	33,091	131,283	8.31%	99.69%
MAR		23,125	27,134	22,214	25,896	24,525	122,894	7.78%	93.32%
APR		21,498	27,810	27,406	25,593	31,151	133,458	8.45%	101.34%
MAY		26,518	22,827	25,402	36,412	32,688	143,847	9.10%	109.23%
JUNE		22,844	24,969	27,554	23,573	27,102	126,042	7.98%	95.71%
JULY		24,935	17,761	16,398	24,084	27,604	110,782	7.01%	84.12%
AUG		25,262	26,990	33,083	27,348	28,092	140,775	8.91%	106.90%
SEPT		35,737	22,748	31,051	22,944	29,573	142,053	8.99%	107.87%
OCT		24,789	29,501	23,884	29,593	31,731	139,498	8.83%	105.93%
NOV		29,990	25,174	30,824	38,271	35,936	160,195	10.14%	121.65%
DEC	22,799	25,149	24,057	24,013	21,042		117,060	7.41%	88.89%
<hr/>									
	\$22,799	\$302,055	\$289,446	\$309,723	\$330,416	\$325,847	\$1,580,286	100.00%	1200.00%
						MEAN=	131,691		

Table 3
CARBONDALE (SHARE OF) SALES TAX (1%)
MONTH EARNED, 1983-1988

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	TOTAL	PERCENT	SEASONAL INDEX						
JAN		\$166,557	\$175,449	\$180,700	\$220,947	\$194,590	\$938,243	7.80%	93.62%						
FEB		163,030	160,404	168,672	172,359	179,862	844,327	7.02%	84.25%						
MAR		177,080	197,849	172,556	185,337	202,084	934,906	7.77%	93.29%						
APR		184,531	193,440	210,082	190,673	219,377	998,103	8.30%	99.59%						
MAY		186,144	193,406	214,402	203,144	192,196	989,292	8.23%	98.71%						
JUNE		198,603	177,688	186,792	187,532	200,664	951,279	7.91%	94.92%						
JULY		189,066	186,635	187,202	187,624	212,190	962,717	8.00%	96.06%						
AUG		188,967	181,638	225,700	219,819	235,646	1,051,770	8.75%	104.95%						
SEPT		207,134	203,716	220,442	206,090	226,742	1,064,124	8.85%	106.18%						
OCT	177,687	190,292	221,572	183,180	222,462		995,193	8.28%	99.30%						
NOV	205,233	196,996	194,864	210,375	196,873		1,004,341	8.35%	100.21%						
DEC	252,524	268,787	248,562	240,087	282,192		1,292,152	10.74%	128.93%						
							\$635,444	\$2,317,187	\$2,335,223	\$2,400,190	\$2,475,052	\$1,863,351	\$12,026,447	100.00%	1200.00%
													MEAN =	1,002,204	

MT. VERNON SALES TAX

(Note: Sales before the 1.6% reduction withheld by
the Illinois Dept. of Revenue for Administration.)

	FY 83-84	FY 84-85	FY 85-86	FY 86-87	FY 87-88	FY 88-89	TOTAL	SEASONAL INDEX							
APR		\$225,440	\$234,428	\$184,766	\$192,744	\$227,024	\$1,064,402	101.40%							
MAY		216,123	224,483	249,541	209,293	209,413	1,108,853	105.64%							
JUNE		245,375	197,710	213,941	213,108	228,905	1,099,039	104.70%							
JULY		214,820	228,245	186,384	197,796	212,420	1,039,665	99.05%							
AUG		220,307	209,595	259,052	195,431	214,316	1,098,701	104.67%							
SEPT		250,674	245,853	200,467	182,782	222,116	1,101,892	104.98%							
OCT		220,874	209,503	204,955	190,630	197,640	1,023,602	97.52%							
NOV		217,455	216,019	193,220	197,241	201,229	1,025,164	97.67%							
DEC	230,095	283,241	232,507	235,324	232,129		1,213,296	115.59%							
JAN	142,074	179,075	166,862	177,650	186,190		851,851	81.15%							
FEB	221,840	233,708	188,502	157,531	176,666		978,247	93.20%							
MAR	175,267	225,009	205,982	184,323	200,717		991,298	94.44%							
							\$769,276	\$2,732,101	\$2,559,689	\$2,447,154	\$2,374,727	\$1,713,063	\$12,596,010	1200.00%	
													MEAN=	1,049,668	100.00%

extending the semester to earlier start or completion dates, is unknown.

Table 4 provides data for "Carbondale Hotel/Motel Tax (4%)" for the 60 months ended in November, 1988, with similar "Carbondale Restaurant/Tavern Tax (1%)" shown in the bottom section of that table. January, March, and December are the lowest rental months at hotels/motels in the City. October is significantly lower than either September or November, with the four heaviest months of activities being July, August, September, and November. A study made by the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce suggested that about 80 percent of the hotels/motels in or near Carbondale were "sold out" for at least one night of the October 1988 Halloween festivities. Restaurant/tavern tax receipts were much above average in November and somewhat above average in May, August, September and October. Such tax receipts were much below average in January, July, and December. During two of these three months, the University is on holiday for about one-third to one-half of the month. Perhaps the unusually hot weather, planned vacation and the smaller University enrollment in the summer term, combined, account for some reduction in customer spending at restaurants and taverns in July compared to other months. Ironically, sales tax collections at both hotels/motels and restaurants/taverns are better in the City in September and November than for the month of the Halloween celebration, October. Thus one would again conclude that the festivities, on balance, seems to exert little positive impact on sales tax

Table 4
SALES TAX: CITY OF MARION

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	TOTAL	PERCENT	SEASONAL INDEX
JAN	\$148,887	\$168,242	\$167,142	\$166,071	\$222,396	\$872,738	8.44%	101.30%
FEB	155,686	159,128	157,882	172,350	156,182	801,228	7.75%	93.00%
MAR	190,531	184,708	187,003	175,798	208,693	946,733	9.16%	109.89%
APR	134,374	143,584	161,067	152,019	165,143	756,187	7.31%	87.77%
MAY	132,014	133,524	154,685	131,503	199,490	751,216	7.27%	87.20%
JUNE	141,843	178,164	168,214	157,556	174,622	820,399	7.94%	95.23%
JULY	153,762	170,081	191,042	168,944	189,688	873,517	8.45%	101.39%
AUG	145,479	183,480	202,326	174,925	192,108	898,318	8.69%	104.27%
SEPT	178,892	149,649	164,205	186,356	213,610	892,712	8.64%	103.62%
OCT	179,972	189,831	172,081	188,777	200,198	930,859	9.00%	108.05%
NOV	183,914	174,916	201,155	171,810	199,187	930,982	9.01%	108.06%
DEC	174,836	171,388	170,431	160,901	185,850	863,406	8.35%	100.22%

	\$1,920,190	\$2,006,695	\$2,097,233	\$2,007,010	\$2,307,167	\$10,338,295	100.00%	1200.00%
					MEAN=	861,525		

collection for these recreational types of firms.

In the section that follow, responses to the questionnaire survey, made to about 240 different firms selected from some 15 different types of retail and service firms contacted in and near Carbondale in order to determine the perceived (by the store managers or owners) benefits or disadvantages afforded by the Halloween celebration, are discussed.

IMPACT TO INDIVIDUAL FIRMS: MICRO ANALYSIS

About 240 business firms in and around Carbondale were contacted for information bearing upon the economic benefits or disadvantages perceived to be associated with holding the Halloween Festival weekend in Carbondale each year. The firms could roughly be divided into quintiles as to location, with one group being located in the University/downtown-Carbondale area, another being assigned to the University Mall, another to Carbondale-East, another to Carbondale West, and the final group of those located elsewhere. Responses were obtained from some 228 of the firms, although the managers/owners contacted by the three research data gatherers were not always able to provide information on every question asked. Most merchants merely run cash register tapes on daily sales, while their historical financial statements usually reflect sales or revenues by months. Thus it is difficult for a business person, even one willing to participate in such a survey, to provide exact sales information for a past event. In many instances, only the general impressions about the comparative level of customer traffic and sales were obtainable; however, most merchants expressed a willingness to gather such information in future years, if

requested to do so.

A series of seven questions was directed to the merchants, and a copy of the questionnaire survey used by the MBA graduate research assistants in obtaining such information appears in the appendix to this report. The firms were further subdivided into similar types of firms, or into fifteen subindustries, with most of the firms falling into the retail trade and service sectors.

The following two sections shall discuss briefly the perceived differences in level of business by geographic location and, secondly, by line of business for firms participating in the questionnaire survey in Carbondale.

Differences by Location. Some 48 firms from Carbondale-East locations participated in the survey. Some 20 of the respondents felt that their sales would decline during October if the Halloween Festival were cancelled, 5 thought there would be an increase, and some 23 expressed the likelihood that there would be no change in the sales level. About 90 percent of the respondents witnessed no change in shoplifting or store breakage during the holiday compared to other periods, while the other 10 percent believed them to increase. Little change was expressed by the eight respondents that reported on the level of weekly sales during the week of Halloween, the week before Halloween, and the week after Halloween. These figures are shown in Table 5. About half of the respondents expressed a willingness to collect detailed sales figures for weeks surrounding the holiday during 1989, if requested to do so, while the balance was about

Table 5: Questionnaire Results on Halloween Impact

LOCATION	BUSINESS	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
E	AUTO REPAIR	38	0	1	0			N	N	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$3,550								T	
E	AUTO REPAIR	35	0	1	0			N	N											F	
E	AUTO REPAIR	31	0	1	0			N	N	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$7,394	105	78	87	0.50	0	0.25	0	T	
E	AUTO REPAIR	28	0	1	0			N	N											T	
E	AUTO REPAIR	39	1	0	0	\$400		N	N	\$15,000	\$16,500	\$15,000				0.10	1			I	
E	AUTO REPAIR	27	0	1	0			N	N											F	
E	AUTO REPAIR	23	0	0	1		\$1,000			\$4,000	\$3,500	\$4,000	40	27	40					I	
E	AUTO REPAIR	40	0	1	0			N	N												
E	AUTO SALES	3	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	AUTO SALES	13	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	AUTO SALES	9	0	1	0			I	I									0			0
E	AUTO SALES	6	0	1	0			N	N				30	30	30						T
E	AUTO SALES	10						N	N												T
E	BAR	95	0	1	0			N	N												
E	BAR	88						N	N									0.20	1	0.20	1
E	BAR	86						N	N												T
E	DEPT	4	1	0	0			N	N									0.10	1		T
E	ENTERTAINMENT	106	0	0	1		\$2,000	N	N									0			I
E	ENTERTAINMENT	110	0	0	1			N	N	\$1,020	\$1,500	\$1,300									I
E	ENTERTAINMENT	111	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	ENTERTAINMENT	104	0	1	0			N	N												I
E	ENTERTAINMENT	1	0	1	0			N	N	\$868	\$966	\$1,002	449	433	559			1			0
E	FAST FOOD	21						N	N												T
E	FAST FOOD	14	1	0	0	\$10,000		N	I									0.35	1		F
E	FAST FOOD	15	1	0	0			N	I									1.00	1		I
E	FAST FOOD	17	1	0	0			I	N									0.10	0	0.00	N
E	FAST FOOD	2	0	1	0			N	N									0.00			F
E	FAST FOOD	8	0	1	0			N	N												Y
E	FAST FOOD	10	1	0	0			N	N									1.00	1		I
E	FAST FOOD	19						N	I												
E	FAST FOOD	20	1	0	0			N	N									0.30	1		I
E	FAST FOOD	11	0	1	0			N	N												I
E	FAST FOOD	13	1	0	0			N	I									2.00	1		T
E	GAS	51	1	0	0	\$3,000		N	N	\$30,177	\$33,505	\$26,350	1,400	2,000	1,400			0.00			T
E	GAS	50								\$2,950	\$2,850	\$2,200									
E	GAS	44	1	0	0	\$1,000		N	I												F
E	GROCERY	80						N	N												T
E	LIQUOR	5	1	0	0	\$0	\$0	N	N									0.50	1		T
E	RESTAURANT	7	0	0	1			I	N									0.05	0		T
E	RESTAURANT	44	1	0	0			N	N									0.20	1		T
E	RESTAURANT	8	1	0	0	\$3,000		I	N									0.40	1		T
E	RESTAURANT	6	0	0	1			N	N												F
E	RESTAURANT	11	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N									1.00	1		T
E	RESTAURANT	35	1	0	0			N	N									0.44	1		T
E	RESTAURANT	37	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	RESTAURANT	46	0	1	0			N	N												I
E	RETAIL	17	0	1	0			N	N												F
E	RETAIL	44	1	0	0			N	N												F
E	RETAIL																	0.40	1	0.40	1
E	RETAIL	32	1	0	0			N	N									0.10	1	0.10	1
E	RETAIL	29	1	0	0			N	N												I
E	RETAIL	34	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	RETAIL	15	0	1	0			N	N												T
E	RETAIL	22	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N									0.05	1		T
E	RETAIL	24	1	0	0			N	N												T
E	RETAIL	45	0	1	0			N	N												F

TOTALS			20	23	5	\$27,400	\$3,000			\$68,015	\$66,821	\$61,296	2,024	2,568	2,116			17		3	

evenly divided between those that would not do so or wanted more information about the intended usage of the collected data.

For Carbondale Mall participants, some 13 believed that they would suffered sales losses with a Halloween Festival cancellation, another 26 visualized little change, and 9 expected an increase. No dollar figures were provided for weekly sales surrounding the Halloween Festival week. Fourteen of the 48 participants expressed a willingness to collect sales figures, by week, during the 1989 Halloween Festival and the weeks preceding and following the event if requested to do so. About 65 percent of the others were not willing to do so while 35 percent wanted more information about how the data would be used. Details are provided in Table 5.

Some 37 firms that participated in the questionnaire survey were located in "other miscellaneous" parts of the City. Some 19 believed that sales losses would occur due to the Halloween Festival cancellation, 14 believed there would be no change, and four reported anticipated increases. However, of the seven such firms that reported weekly sales surrounding the festival week, sales were substantially (about one-third) larger during the week of Halloween than either the week before or after that activity. Some 15 of the respondents appeared willing to collect weekly sales data for the three weeks surrounding the 1989 Halloween Festival if requested to do so. Fourteen did not wish to collect such data, and the balance said that more information was needed before a decision could be reached. Details of the results of

Table 5--Continued

LOCATION	BUSINESS	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
M	DEPT	2	0	0	1			N	N												
M	DEPT	1	0	0	1	\$0	\$0	I	N							0.39	0				F
M	ENTERTAINMENT	108	0	1	0			I	N							0.15	0				F
M	FAST FOOD	1	0	1	0			N	N												T
M	FAST FOOD	6																			N
M	FAST FOOD	5	0	1	0																I
M	FAST FOOD	7	0	1	0																I
M	RESTAURANT	3	0	1	0			N	N												I
M	RESTAURANT	33	1	0	0											0.20	1				I
M	RETAIL	30	0	1	0																I
M	RETAIL	29	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	28	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N		\$0	\$0	\$0			0.35	1				F
M	RETAIL	25	1	0	0			I	N							0.20	1				F
M	RETAIL	27	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	5	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	33	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	32	1	0	0			I	I							0.70	1				F
M	RETAIL	8																			T
M	RETAIL	31	0	1	0			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	21	1	0	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	35	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	9	0	0	1			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	34	1	0	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	3	1	0	0			I	N												F
M	RETAIL	15	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	12	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	1	0	0	1			N	N												T
M	RETAIL	14	0	1	0			N	N							0.50	0				F
M	RETAIL	18	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	37	1	0	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	17	0	1	0			N	N							0.03	1				F
M	RETAIL	4	0	1	0			N	N							0.12	0				I
M	RETAIL	42	1	0	0			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	38	1	0	0																T
M	RETAIL	26	0	0	1			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	36	0	0	1			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	40	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	10	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	19	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	13	0	1	0			N	N							0.45	1				F
M	RETAIL	41	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	23	1	0	0			N	N							0.30	1				F
M	RETAIL	6	1	0	0			N	N							0.10	1				I
M	RETAIL	39	0	1	0			N	N						0	0.00					I
M	RETAIL	7	0	0	1			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	11	0	1	0			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	20	0	0	1			N	N												I
M	RETAIL	22														0.40	0				T
M	RETAIL	24	0	1	0			N	N												F
M	RETAIL	16	1	0	0			N	N												T
M	RETAIL	2	0	1	0			K	K							0.40	1	0.25			F
TOTALS			13	26	9	\$5,000	\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0		9		1	F	

Table 5--Continued

LOCATION	BUSINESS	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
0	AUTO REPAIR	16	0	1	0			N	N												
0	AUTO REPAIR	22	1	0	0			N	N												I
0	AUTO REPAIR	32	1	0	0	\$1,500		N	N	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$1,000				0.40	1			F	
0	AUTO SALES	1	1	0	0	\$200		N	N												I
0	AUTO SALES	35	1	0	0	\$750		N	I												F
0	BAR	93	1	0	0			N	N												I
0	CONVENIENCE	70	1	0	0	\$15,000		N	N	\$10,872	\$14,150	\$10,254				0.40	0	0.40		O	
0	CONVENIENCE	71	1	0	0																I
0	CONVENIENCE	66																			I
0	ENTERTAINMENT	101	0	1	0			K	N	\$2,650	\$2,095	\$5,041	750	607	1,439	0.20	0	0.20		O	
0	FAST FOOD	25																			I
0	FAST FOOD	4																			
0	GAS	47	0	1	0			N	N												F
0	GAS	49	0	1	0			N	N												F
0	GAS	46	0	1	0			N	I												F
0	GROCERY	79	0	1	0			N	N												F
0	GROCERY	76	0	1	0			N	K												F
0	GROCERY	78	0	1	0			N	M												F
0	GROCERY	83	1	0	0	\$3,000		K	N												F
0	HEALTH	1															0.10	1	0.00		F
0	HOTEL	4	1	0	0			N	N												I
0	HOTEL	10	1	0	0	\$20,000		N	N								1.00	1	1.00		I
0	HOTEL	9	1	0	0	\$6,000			I	\$2,500	\$6,000	\$2,500	120	200	120	5.00	1	5.00		I	
0	HOTEL	8	1	0	0				I							0.50	1	0.50		I	
0	HOTEL	2	0	0	1				I												I
0	HOTEL	1	0	1	0			N	N												I
0	HOTEL	3	1	0	0	\$250		K	N	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	160	160	160					I	
0	HOTEL	7	1	0	0	\$5,600		N	N												F
0	HOTEL	11	1	0	0	\$200			I												I
0	LIQUOR	5	1	0	0			N	N								0.20	1	0.20		I
0	LIQUOR	2	1	0	0	\$10,000		I	N							0.60	1				I
0	RESTAURANT	26	0	0	1			N	N												I
0	RESTAURANT	2															0.15	0			I
0	RESTAURANT	34	1	0	0	\$20,000		N	N	\$10,000	\$30,000	\$10,000				3.00	1			I	
0	RESTAURANT	13	0	1	1		\$1,000	N	N							0.20	0				F
0	RESTAURANT	28	0	1	0			N	N												I
0	RESTAURANT	12																			I
0	RETAIL	30	0	1	0			N	I												F
0	RETAIL	8	0	0	1			N	N												F
0	RETAIL	38	0	1	0			N	N												F
0	RETAIL	37	1	0	0			N	N												F
0	RETAIL	33	0	1	0			N	N												F
0	RETAIL	25	0	1	0			N	N	\$39,633	\$33,431	\$34,120	6,428	7,121	6,297	0.15	0	0.10		I	
0	RETAIL	13	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N								0				O

TOTALS			19	14	4	\$84,500	\$1,000			\$67,655	\$89,176	\$63,915	7,458	8,088	8,016			10		6	

the questionnaire survey from the other stores are provided in Table 5.

Some 38 firms located in the University/downtown-Carbondale area participated in the survey. Of these, 20 reported sales losses would occur if the Halloween Festival were cancelled, 16 reported no change, and only 2 reported sales increases. Only about 5 percent reported an increase in perceived shoplifting, while about 20 percent witnessed an increase in damage to property. Some 13 of the 38 respondents expressed a willingness to collect weekly sales data surrounding the 1989 Halloween event if requested to do so. Another 14 were unwilling to collect such data, while the balance wanted more information about the planned usage of the data. Details of the survey results are provided in Table 5.

Some 36 businesses in the west side of Carbondale participated in the questionnaire survey about the impact of the Halloween Festival on their level of business and related topics. Nine believed that the cancellation of the holiday weekend would cause their sales to decline, some 21 doubted it would make any difference, and another 6 believed it would cause their level of business activity to increase. About 10 percent of the firms witnessed a measurable increase in shoplifting during the recent holiday festival events, although increased property damage during past Halloween events posed little problem to other than one of the firms. Auto sales, especially, appeared to suffer drastically during the week of the Halloween Festival. A quarter

Table 5--Continued

LOCATION	BUSINESS	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
S	BAR	85	0	1	0			N	N											1	I
S	BAR	87	1	0	0			N	K							2.50		1	2.50	1	I
S	ENTERTAINMENT	109	1	0	0			N	N	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$1,500				0.25		1	0.00	1	I
S	FAST FOOD	24	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N							3.00		1		1	T
S	FAST FOOD	16														0.00					
S	FAST FOOD	9	1	0	0			N	I												Y
S	FAST FOOD	3	1	0	0			N	N												F
S	LIQUOR	1	1	0	0	\$17,000		N	D	\$12,700	\$40,000	\$12,400	3,200	5,400	3,100	2.00		1		1	T
S	RESTAURANT	36	0	1	0			N	N												
S	RESTAURANT	33																			
S	RESTAURANT	38	1	0	0	\$8,000		N	N							1.00		1			I
S	RESTAURANT	43	1	0	0			N	N							2.00		1			F
S	RESTAURANT	21	1	0	0			N	N	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$1,000				5.00		1			T
S	RESTAURANT	4	1	0	0	\$700		N	N												T
S	RESTAURANT	30	1	0	0	\$3,000		N	N	\$5,752	\$7,689	\$5,142				0.50		1			T
S	RESTAURANT	25	0	0	1			N	N							0.10		0			T
S	RESTAURANT	1	0	1	0			N	I							0.60		1			T
S	RESTAURANT	14																			
S	RETAIL	2	1	0	0			N	N	\$0											F
S	RETAIL	0	0	1	0			N	N												F
S	RETAIL	47	1	0	0	\$300		D	D									1		1	T
S	RETAIL	20	0	1	0			I	N												T
S	RETAIL	16	1	0	0			N	N							1.25		1			F
S	RETAIL	0	1	0	0			N	N							0.30		0			I
S	RETAIL	8	0	1	0			N	N												I
S	RETAIL	14	0	1	0			N	N												F
S	RETAIL	12	0	1	0			I	K												F
S	RETAIL	18	0	1	0			N	I												F
S	RETAIL	22	0	1	0			K	N												T
S	RETAIL	11	0	1	0			N	N												I
S	RETAIL	17	0	1	0			N	I												F
S	RETAIL	15	0	1	0	\$0	\$0	N	I												T
S	RETAIL	10	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N							0.40		1			T
S	RETAIL	19	1	0	0			N	N												F
S	RETAIL	13	0	0	1			K	I	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0	0.33		0	0.00		F
S	RETAIL	27	0	1	0			N	N												F
S	RETAIL	3	1	0	0			N	N							0.25		1			T
S	TRAVEL	60	1	0	0			N	N											1	F
S	TRAVEL	63	0	1	0			N	N												F
S	TRAVEL	62	0	1	0			N	N												F
S	TRAVEL	58	1	0	0			N	I												T
TOTALS			20	16	2	\$33,000	\$0			\$20,952	\$54,689	\$20,042	3,200	5,400	3,100			16		6	0

Table 5--Continued

LOCATION	BUSINESS	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
W	AUTO REPAIR	36	0	1	0			N													
W	AUTO SALES	11	0	1	0			N													F
W	AUTO SALES	8	1	0	0			I		\$78,000	\$21,000	\$69,000									T
W	ENTERTAINMENT	100	0	1	0			N									0				0
W	ENTERTAINMENT	103	0	1	0			N													
W	FAST FOOD	23	1	0	0	\$10,000		N								0.50	1				I
W	FAST FOOD	22	0	1	0			I													T
W	FAST FOOD	12	0	1	0			N													I
W	FAST FOOD	18	0	1	0			N													I
W	GAS	53	0	1	0			N													I
W	GAS	55	0	0	1		\$400	N								0.10	0				
W	GROCERY	82	1	0	0			K													F
W	GROCERY	81	0	1	0			N													F
W	HEALTH	2	0	1	0																F
W	HOTEL	12	1	0	0	\$12,000										0.60	1	0.60			I
W	LIQUOR	6	1	0	0			I								0.35	1	0.35			I
W	LIQUOR	4	1	0	0	\$4,000		N		\$16,000	\$16,000	\$10,000	1,500	1,800	1,300	0.20	1	0.20		I	
W	RESTAURANT	5	1	0	0			N													I
W	RESTAURANT	24	1	0	0			N													I
W	RESTAURANT	27																			F
W	RESTAURANT	18	0	1	0			N													
W	RESTAURANT	22	0	1	0			N													I
W	RETAIL	9	0	1	0			N													I
W	RETAIL	5	0	1	0			K													I
W	RETAIL	1	0	1	0			N													F
W	RETAIL	14	0	1	0			N													T
W	RETAIL	28	0	1	0			N													T
W	RETAIL	49	1	0	0	\$350		N													F
W	RETAIL	36	0	0	1			N													F
W	RETAIL	14	0	1	1			N													F
W	RETAIL	20	0	1	0			N													F
W	RETAIL	43	0	1	0			N													F
W	RETAIL		0	0	1			N								0.30	0				T
W	RETAIL	21	0	1	0			N													T
W	RETAIL	7	0	0	1		\$200	I								0.02	0	0.02			I
W	RETAIL	6	0	0	1			N								0.25	0				I
TOTALS			9	21	6	\$26,350	\$600			\$94,000	\$37,000	\$79,000	1,500	1,800	1,300		4			3	

of the respondents expressed a willingness to collect weekly sales figures for the weeks surrounding the 1989 Halloween Festival if requested to do so, while a majority of the balance did not wish to participate in such collection. Details of the results of the survey are provided in Table 5.

Differences for Business Types. Major perceived changes in sales should the Halloween Festival be cancelled, along with other related questionnaire-collected information on the respondents, are provided for the firms, arranged by types of businesses, in the statements that follow. In all, the respondents were subdivided into 15 different groups of firms.

1. Of the 12 auto repair firms that participated, eight believed such a cancellation of the festival would not impact on their sales level. Three thought it would reduce their sales. Little change was witnessed in sales during the week before, week of, or week after Halloween by the reporting firms.

2. Some nine auto sales firms provided survey data, with three estimating a sales decline if the Halloween event were cancelled. Five estimated no change.

3. Of the six bar owners who participated in the survey, two believed that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would adversely affect sales, two believed it would have little impact, and the other two did not have an opinion. Sales figures surrounding the event were not provided by the bar owners/managers.

4. Three convenience store managers/owners responded to the

survey questions, although only one believed that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would adversely affect sales.

5. Three department stores provided information on the Halloween impact survey. Two believed that the festival decreased sales while one believed that it increased sales. None of the three firms provided sales data for weeks around the activity, and only one of the three was willing to collect such data in 1989 if requested to do so.

6. Ten entertainment firms replied to questions on the Halloween Festival weekend survey. One believed that the cancellation of the Holiday would adversely affect its sales, seven saw little change from such a cancellation, and two believed that such would increase their sales. For these firms, revenues (or sales) were substantially higher during the week after Halloween than the week of or the week before, but this could be due to factors completely unrelated to Halloween.

7. Twenty fast-food vendors participated in the survey. Half of the respondents felt that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would reduce their sales for that week, while the other half estimated no change would occur.

8. Seven gas station owners/managers participated in the survey. Two believed that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would reduce their sales, one believed that it would increase his sales, and the other four believed it would make little difference in their sales level.

9. Six of the seven grocery store managers asked to

Table 6: Questionnaire Results on Halloween Impact

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
AUTO REPAIR	E	23	0	0	1		\$1,000		\$4,000	\$3,500	\$4,000	40	27	40					T
AUTO REPAIR	E	38	0	1	0			N	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$3,550								T
AUTO REPAIR	E	31	0	1	0			N	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$7,894	105	78	87	0.50	0	0.25	0	F
AUTO REPAIR	E	35	0	1	0			N											F
AUTO REPAIR	E	40	0	1	0			N											F
AUTO REPAIR	E	27	0	1	0			N											F
AUTO REPAIR	E	39	1	0	0	\$400		N	\$15,000	\$16,500	\$15,000				0.10	1		I	
AUTO REPAIR	E	28	0	1	0			N											T
AUTO REPAIR	O	22	1	0	0			N							0.40	1		F	
AUTO REPAIR	O	16	0	1	0			N											T
AUTO REPAIR	O	32	1	0	0	\$1,500		N	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$1,000								T
AUTO REPAIR	W	36	0	1	0			N											F
			3	8	1	\$1,900	\$1,000		\$34,000	\$30,500	\$31,444	145	105	127		2		0	
BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
AUTO SALES	E	10						N											T
AUTO SALES	E	9	0	1	0			I								0			0
AUTO SALES	E	13	0	1	0			N											T
AUTO SALES	E	6	0	1	0			N				30	30	30					T
AUTO SALES	E	3	0	1	0			N											T
AUTO SALES	O	35	1	0	0	\$750		I											I
AUTO SALES	O	1	1	0	0	\$200		N								1			1
AUTO SALES	O	11	0	1	0			N											T
AUTO SALES	W	8	1	0	0			I	\$78,000	\$21,000	\$69,000					0			0
			3	5	0	\$950	\$0		\$78,000	\$21,000	\$69,000	30	30	30		1		1	
BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
BAR	E	95	0	1	0			N											T
BAR	E	88						N							0.20	1	0.20		1
BAR	E	86						N											T
BAR	O	93	1	0	0			N							0.40	0	0.40		0
BAR	S	85	0	1	0			N								1			1
BAR	S	87	1	0	0			N							2.50	1	2.50		1
			2	2	0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0		3		3	
BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
CONVENIENCE	O	71																	T
CONVENIENCE	O	66																	T
CONVENIENCE	O	70	1	0	0	\$15,000		N	\$10,872	\$14,150	\$10,254					1			T
			1	0	0	\$15,000	\$0		\$10,872	\$14,150	\$10,254	0	0	0		1		0	
BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
DEPT	E	4	1	0	0			N							0.10	1			I
DEPT	W	2	0	0	1			N							0.39	0			0
DEPT	W	1	0	0	1	\$0	\$0	I							0.15	0			T
			1	0	2	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0		1		0	
BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
ENTERTAINMENT	O	101	0	1	0			K	\$2,650	\$2,095	\$5,041	750	607	1,439	0.20	0	0.20		0
ENTERTAINMENT	E	110	0	0	1			N	\$1,020	\$1,500	\$1,300								I
ENTERTAINMENT	E	104	0	1	0			N											I
ENTERTAINMENT	E	1	0	1	0			N	\$868	\$966	\$1,002	449	433	559		1			0
ENTERTAINMENT	E	106	0	0	1		\$2,000	N								0			0
ENTERTAINMENT	E	111	0	1	0			K											I
ENTERTAINMENT	W	108	0	1	0			I											F
ENTERTAINMENT	S	109	1	0	0			N	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$1,500				0.25	1	0.00		I
ENTERTAINMENT	W	103	0	1	0			N											I
ENTERTAINMENT	W	100	0	1	0			N											I
			1	7	2	\$0	\$2,000		\$6,038	\$6,561	\$8,843	1,199	1,040	1,998		2		0	

Table 6--Continued

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
FAST FOOD	E	15	1	0	0			N	I							1.00	1			I
FAST FOOD	E	20	1	0	0			N	N							0.30	1			I
FAST FOOD	E	21																		
FAST FOOD	E	11	0	1	0			N	N											I
FAST FOOD	E	19																		
FAST FOOD	E	14	1	0	0	\$10,000		N	N							0.35				F
FAST FOOD	E	10	1	0	0			N	I							1.00	1			I
FAST FOOD	E	2	0	1	0			N	N							0.00				F
FAST FOOD	E	13	1	0	0			N	I							2.00				T
FAST FOOD	E	17	1	0	0			I	N							0.10	1	0.00		N
FAST FOOD	E	8	0	1	0			N	N											N
FAST FOOD	E	1	0	1	0			N	N											N
FAST FOOD	E	7	0	1	0			N	N											N
FAST FOOD	E	6																		I
FAST FOOD	E	5	0	1	0															I
FAST FOOD	O	25																		T
FAST FOOD	O	4																		
FAST FOOD	S	16														0.00				
FAST FOOD	S	9	1	0	0			N	I											Y
FAST FOOD	S	24	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N							3.00	1			T
FAST FOOD	S	3	1	0	0			N	N							2.00	1			F
FAST FOOD	W	18	0	1	0			N	N											I
FAST FOOD	W	23	1	0	0	\$10,000		N	N							0.50	1			T
FAST FOOD	W	12	0	1	0			N	N											T
FAST FOOD	W	22	0	1	0			I	N											I

11 16 2 \$22,000 \$2,000 \$6,038 \$6,561 \$8,843 1,199 1,040 1,998 10 0

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
GAS	E	44	1	0	0	\$1,000		N	I											F	
GAS	E	50								\$2,950	\$2,850	\$2,200									
GAS	E	51	1	0	0	\$3,000		N	N	\$30,177	\$33,505	\$26,350	1,400	2,000	1,400	0.00				T	
GAS	O	49	0	1	0			N	N											F	
GAS	O	47	0	1	0			N	N											F	
GAS	O	46	0	1	0			N	I											F	
GAS	W	53	0	1	0			N	N											F	
GAS	W	55	0	0	1	\$400		N	N							0.10	0			F	

2 4 1 \$4,000 \$400 \$33,127 \$36,355 \$28,550 1,400 2,000 1,400 0 0

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
GROCERY	E	80						N	N												T
GROCERY	O	79	0	1	0			N	N												F
GROCERY	O	76	0	1	0			N	K								0				I
GROCERY	O	78	0	1	0			N	N												F
GROCERY	O	83	1	0	0	\$3,000		K	N							0.10	1	0.00			F
GROCERY	W	82	1	0	0			K	N												F
GROCERY	W	81	0	1	0			N	N												F

2 4 0 \$3,000 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
HEALTH	O	1																			
HEALTH	W	2	0	1	0																I

0 1 0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
HOTEL	O	1	0	1	0			N	N												T
HOTEL	O	2	0	0	1			I													I
HOTEL	O	10	1	0	0	\$20,000		N	N												T
HOTEL	O	4	1	0	0			N	N							1.00	1	1.00			T
HOTEL	O	8	1	0	0			N	I							0.50	1	0.50			T
HOTEL	O	11	1	0	0	\$200		N	I							0.20	1	0.20			T
HOTEL	O	7	1	0	0	\$5,600		N	N												F
HOTEL	O	9	1	0	0	\$6,000		N	I	\$2,500	\$6,000	\$2,500	120	200	120	5.00	1	5.00		T	
HOTEL	O	3	1	0	0	\$250		K	N	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	160	160	160					I	
HOTEL	W	12	1	0	0	\$12,000		N								0.60	1	0.60			T

8 1 1 \$44,050 \$0 \$3,600 \$7,000 \$3,500 280 360 280 5 5

participate in the survey did so. Of these, two felt that a loss in sales would ensue with cancellation of the Halloween Festival. Four believed that such action would have little impact on sales level.

10. One of two health organizations participated in the survey. Little change was estimated from having or not having the Halloween Festival.

11. Some ten hotels/motels participated in the survey. Eight respondents believed that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would reduce their revenues, one saw little change from such cancellation, and one believed that such a change would increase his level of business. One motel in Carbondale closes during the weekend of Halloween due to heavy breakage damage incurred during the event of past years.

12. Six liquor store owners/managers participated in the survey. All believed that the cancellation of the Halloween Festival would adversely affect their sales.

13. Some 26 restaurant owners/managers provided Halloween survey data to the researchers. One half believed that cancellation of the festivities would reduce sales/revenues. Eight believed it would have no effect, and five believed that business would increase without the event. Two restaurants reported more than a 200 percent increase in revenues during the week of Halloween as compared to nearby weeks, while others reported more moderate gains of about 35 percent.

13. Of the other retail firms participating in the survey (the

Table 6--Continued

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
LIQUOR	E	5	1	0	0	\$0	\$0	N	N											
LIQUOR	O	5	1	0	0			N	N							0.50	1			T
LIQUOR	D	2	1	0	0	\$10,000		I	N							0.60	1			T
LIQUOR	S	1	1	0	0	\$17,000		N	D											I
LIQUOR	W	6	1	0	0			I	N	\$12,700	\$40,000	\$12,400	3,200	5,400	3,100					I
LIQUOR	N	4	1	0	0	\$4,000		N	N	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$10,000	1,500	1,800	1,300	0.35	1	0.35		I
																0.20	1	0.20		I
			5	0	0	\$31,000	\$0			\$22,700	\$55,000	\$22,400	4,700	7,200	4,400		5		3	

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
RESTAURANT	E	7	0	0	1			I	N											
RESTAURANT	E	37	0	1	1			N	N							0.05	0			T
RESTAURANT	E	6	0	0	1			N	N											T
RESTAURANT	E	11	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N							1.00	1			T
RESTAURANT	E	44	1	0	0			N	N							0.20	1			T
RESTAURANT	E	8	1	0	0	\$3,000		I	N							0.40	1			T
RESTAURANT	E	35	1	0	0			N	N							0.44	1			T
RESTAURANT	E	46	0	1	0			N	N											T
RESTAURANT	M	33	1	0	0															T
RESTAURANT	M	3	0	1	0			N	N							0.20	1			I
RESTAURANT	O	12																		I
RESTAURANT	O	34	1	0	0	\$20,000		N	N	\$10,000	\$30,000	\$10,000				3.00	1			T
RESTAURANT	O	28	0	1	0			N	N											I
RESTAURANT	O	13	0	0	1		\$1,000	N	N							0.20	0			F
RESTAURANT	O	2																		F
RESTAURANT	O	26	0	0	1			N	N											F
RESTAURANT	S	21	1	0	0			N	N	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$1,000				0.15	0			I
RESTAURANT	S	33														5.00	1			T
RESTAURANT	S	38	1	0	0	\$8,000		N	N							1.00	1			I
RESTAURANT	S	25	0	0	1			N	N							0.10	0			I
RESTAURANT	S	4	1	0	0	\$700		N	N											T
RESTAURANT	S	1	0	1	0			N	I							0.60	1			T
RESTAURANT	S	43	1	0	0			N	N							2.00	1			T
RESTAURANT	S	36	0	1	0			N	N											F
RESTAURANT	S	14																		T
RESTAURANT	S	30	1	0	0	\$3,000		N	N	\$5,752	\$7,689	\$5,142				0.50	1			T
RESTAURANT	W	22	0	1	0			N	N											I
RESTAURANT	W	5	1	0	0			N	N											I
RESTAURANT	W	24	1	0	0			N	N											F
RESTAURANT	W	27																		F
RESTAURANT	W	18	0	1	0			N	N											I
			13	8	5	\$39,700	\$1,000			\$16,752	\$42,689	\$15,142	0	0	0		11		0	

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89
RETAIL	E	32	1	0	0			N	N							0.10	1	0.10		I
RETAIL	E	24	1	0	0			N	N											I
RETAIL	E	17	0	1	0			K	N											F
RETAIL	E															0.40	1	0.40		F
RETAIL	E	34	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	E	22	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N							0.05	1			T
RETAIL	E	15	0	1	0			N	N											T
RETAIL	E	44	1	0	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	E	45	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	E	29	1	0	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	20	0	0	1			N	N							0.40	0			I
RETAIL	M	25	1	0	0			I	N							0.20	1			T
RETAIL	M	26	0	0	1			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	2	0	1	0			R	N											F
RETAIL	M	27	0	1	0			N	K											F
RETAIL	M	4	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	28	1	0	0	\$5,000		N	N	\$0	\$0	\$0				0.35	1			T
RETAIL	M	5	0	1	0			N	N											T
RETAIL	M	29	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	8																		F
RETAIL	M	30	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	10	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	31	0	1	0			N	N											F
RETAIL	M	12	0	1	0			N	N											T
RETAIL	H	32	1	0	0			I	I							0.70	1			T

Table 6--Continued

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
RETAIL	M	14	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	33	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	16	1	0	0			N	N							0.40	1	0.25	1	F	
RETAIL	M	11	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	13	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	19	0	1	0			N	N							0.45	1			F	
RETAIL	M	15	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	21	1	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	17	0	0	0			N	N							0.12	0			F	
RETAIL	M	23	1	0	0			N	N							0.30	1			F	
RETAIL	M	18	0	1	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	M	7	0	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	35	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	34	1	0	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	M	36	0	0	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	M	9	0	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	37	1	0	0			N	N								0.03	1		F	
RETAIL	M	1	0	0	0			N	N							0.50	0			F	
RETAIL	M	38	1	0	0															F	
RETAIL	M	24	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	39	0	1	0			N	N						0	0.00				F	
RETAIL	M	6	1	0	0			N	N							0.10	1			F	
RETAIL	M	40	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	22																		F	
RETAIL	M	41	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	M	3	1	0	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	M	42	1	0	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	O	8	0	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	O	13	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N											F	
RETAIL	O	30	0	1	0			N	N									0	0		F
RETAIL	O	38	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	O	37	1	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	O	25	0	1	0			N	N	\$39,633	\$33,431	\$34,120	6,428	7,121	6,297	0.15	0	0.10	1	F	
RETAIL	O	33	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	O	22	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	17	0	1	0			K	N											F	
RETAIL	S	16	1	0	0			N	N							1.25	1			F	
RETAIL	S	3	1	0	0			N	N							0.25	1			F	
RETAIL	S	18	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	0	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	19	1	0	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	13	0	0	1			K	I	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0	0.33	0	0.00		F	
RETAIL	S	12	0	1	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	S	0	1	0	0			N	N							0.30	0			F	
RETAIL	S	14	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	20	0	1	0			I	N											F	
RETAIL	S	10	1	0	0	\$2,000		N	N							0.40	1			F	
RETAIL	S	2	1	0	0			N	N	\$0										F	
RETAIL	S	11	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	27	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	15	0	1	0	\$0	\$0	N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	8	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	S	47	1	0	0	\$300		D	N											F	
RETAIL	S	22	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	21	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	7	0	0	1		\$200	I	N							0.02	0	0.02	0	F	
RETAIL	W	5	0	0	1			N	N							0.30	0			F	
RETAIL	W	6	0	0	1			N	N							0.25	0			F	
RETAIL	W	43	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	9	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	14	0	1	1			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	36	0	0	1			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	14	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	1	0	1	0			N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	49	1	0	0	\$350		N	N											F	
RETAIL	W	20	0	1	0			N	N											F	

			27	49	14	\$14,650	\$200			\$39,633	\$33,431	\$34,120	6,428	7,121	6,297		15		6		

BUSINESS	LOCATION	SURVEY_NO	SALES_LOSS	NO_CHANGE	SALES_GAIN	LOSS_AMNT	GAIN_AMNT	SHOPLIFT	DAMAGES	PRE_SALES	WEEK_SALES	POST_SALES	PRE_CUST	WEEK_CUST	POST_CUST	PCT_SALES	SALES_INC	PCT_CUST	CUST_INC	DATA_89	
TRAVEL	S	62	0	1	0			N	N												F
TRAVEL	S	63	0	1	0			N	N												F
TRAVEL	S	60	1	0	0			N	N										1	1	F
TRAVEL	S	58	1	0	0			N	I												F

			2	2	0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0		1		1		F

largest group by business line), some 27 respondents believed that a cancellation of the Halloween Festival would decrease sales, 14 believed it would increase sales, and the largest number, 49, thought it would have no impact on sales level.

15. Of the four travel agencies participating in the questionnaire survey, two thought that the cancellation of the Halloween Festival would reduce revenues. The other two doubted such action would change their level of revenues.

COST OF CARBONDALE HALLOWEEN FESTIVAL WEEKEND

Cost of the Halloween Festival weekend can be determined by analyzing three cost reports from the following sources: the City of Carbondale, the Operations Vice President of SIU-C, and the director of the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce.

Over the 1982-1988 period, the Halloween cost to the city of Carbondale rose from \$10,450 to \$17,892 (net of vendor fees for rental of booths). A major portion of this increase was for the cost of public works (or cleanup after the festivities). Details of this cost are shown in an appendix table. According to reports developed by the Campus Security at SIU-C, the cost of overtime wages for the Halloween weekend amounted to \$9,743 in 1988, slightly lower than the \$10,619 figure for 1987. Grounds cleanup and the electrical safety tent cost an additional \$1,070 in 1988. Other costs were borne by the Halloween Core Committee, which can be viewed in the 1988 budget for the activity. While about one half of the total \$22,050 budget was allocated to safety, other major expenditures included the cost of chemical toilets (\$3,000), entertainment (\$2,750), parade (\$1,500); costume contest (\$1,000) and other less expensive endeavors. A portion of the cost of the activities was borne by donations and collections from certain booth rentals and licensing of certain vendors.

Total out-of-pocket costs in 1988 for the Halloween Festival weekend appear to be about the following, net of fee income:

Expenses borne by the city of Carbondale	\$18,000
Expenses borne by the University	11,000
Other expenses: Core Committee, C of C, etc	11,000
Total costs, net of fee collections	\$40,000

Expenses to the Halloween Festival included certain items not included in the above, such as medical care provided with more ambulance runs, increased usage of police and firefighting equipment, and the value of the time committed by the planning committee (Halloween Core Committee). Moreover, substantial costs would have been incurred by the persons arrested during the festivities due to underage possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages, reckless conduct (e.g., throwing of beer cans and other dangerous objects), disorderly conduct, and other less-frequently-occurring reasons for arrest. The number of arrests fell from 248 in 1987 to 191 in 1988, but a portion of this decline may have been due to the usage of somewhat fewer policemen in 1988 than in 1987. In 1986, by contrast, arrests amounted to 251. For these years, about 25 to 35 percent of the arrests were of SIU-C students. The amount of fines collected from such arrested persons is unknown at the writing of this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

On balance, sales tax collections over December 1983 through November 1988 grew but at a lesser rate than did inflation as measured by the changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Carbondale's sales taxes are above average in August, September, and December and below average in January, February, March, and June. Other months show about average sales tax collections, including October and November of most years.

Marion, Illinois, witnesses somewhat different months of high and average sales tax collections than does Carbondale, with March being above average (in Marion) and December being about average. Spring break in Carbondale, with the mass exodus of persons from the city, likely accounts for some shortfall in sales, and thus sales taxes, in Carbondale during March, while the University Mall attracts shopping customers from many nearby communities in December.

The pattern of heavy sales tax collections in Mt. Vernon is biased toward back-to-school months (August and September) and to Christmas shopping in December. Sales-tax collections in Mt. Vernon are virtually identical in October and November, even though it sponsors no Halloween Festival.

In the three respective cities--Carbondale, Marion, and Mt. Vernon--the sales tax indices for collections are virtually the same in October as in November, despite the occurrence of a large Halloween Festival in one of the three cities, Carbondale.

Despite the Halloween Festival weekend in Carbondale in late

October of recent years, the collection of motel/hotel taxes is less than in September and November. Other events, such as musicals, circus visits, or sports events, might be considered on other October weekends in order to attract crowds of visiting participants, and thus stimulate spending of dollars by persons living outside the immediate area, should the Halloween Festival be reduced in scope.

The restaurant/tavern taxes collected in Carbondale decline, on balance, from 108 percent of the monthly average in September to 106 percent of average in October. The taxes collected then rise to 122 percent of monthly average in November. While some fast-food vendors report an increase in sales during Halloween Festival weekend, on balance, the industry suffers in reduced sales during that month.

About 45 percent of the management for responding firms in East Carbondale believed that cancellation of the Halloween Festival would reduce sales, a similar ratio estimated no change from such action and about 10 percent believed that sales would be higher without the event.

More than half of the University Mall business respondents foresaw little impact on sales due to the event's proposed cancellation. About 30 percent believed that sales would decline while 20 percent thought they would increase without the festival.

About 55 percent of the University/downtown-Carbondale merchants believe that the Halloween Festival increases sales.

Except for 5 percent that are adversely affected, the balance foresaw little change in sales with or without the event.

A majority of the business merchants on the West side of the city foresaw little change in the level of business due to the Halloween Festival.

The types of firms that appear to benefit most from a Halloween Festival include: fast-food vendors, hotels/motels, liquor stores (but not bars), restaurants, and travel agencies.

The cost of the Halloween Festival weekend to the City of Carbondale, the University, and to merchants through the Chamber of Commerce appears to be in the vicinity of about \$40,000 yearly. The major costs are for police and fire protection, cleanup after the event, and crowd control. Arrests of SIU-C students are about 27 to 35 percent of the total, running about 250 yearly during recent years in total, with more than half the arrests being for underage drinking or possession of alcoholic beverages. The next highest incidence of arrest has been for reckless behavior, such as the throwing of beer cans or other dangerous objects.

CONCLUSIONS

While certain lines of businesses witness substantial increases in sales attributable to the Halloween Festival in Carbondale (e.g., fast-food vendors, hotels/motels, liquor stores, restaurants, and some travel agencies), the majority of the participants in a questionnaire survey made to about 240

firms (with 228 responses) did not believe that the discontinuance of the Halloween Festival would adversely affect the level of their sales in October.

Gross sales-tax-collection figures for three Southern Illinois cities suggest little change in October and November levels of sales with or without sponsorship of a large event, such as the Halloween Festival weekend in Carbondale.

Closure of the University for a week or two did appear to have an adverse affect on sales tax collections to the City. Thus it appears appropriate to plan some type of fall replacement amusement or recreation activities with regional appeal should the Halloween Festivities weekend be reduced in scope during future years.

Appendix

**An Analysis of the Economic Impact of the Halloween Celebration
on the City of Carbondale**

The Core Committee plans to make a recommendation by the end of February on whether or not Halloween should be continued and the information gathered from this survey will be used to form their recommendation. The Core Committee consists of representatives from the University, the City of Carbondale, and Carbondale business owners. If you have any questions concerning the Halloween Core Committee, please contact Sam McVay at 453-3311 or Jim Prowell at the Carbondale Chamber of Commerce.

**An Analysis of the Economic Impact of the Halloween Celebration
on the City of Carbondale**

The Halloween Core Committee has asked the staff of the Business Research Center at SLUC to assist them by surveying local businesses and determining the true economic impact of Halloween on Carbondale's economy. By participating in the survey you can be sure that any decisions that are made will take into consideration how the cancellation or continuance of the Halloween celebration will affect you. In order for this perspective to be considered, we need your input. Without it, the decisions will be dominated by data received from sources other than businesses in the community.

Line of Business _____ Location _____ Number _____

An Analysis of the Economic Impact of the Halloween Celebration on the City of Carbondale

1. If the Halloween festivities in Carbondale are discontinued, what overall impact do you feel it would have on your business?

- Loss of sales of: \$ _____
No appreciable change
A gain in sales of: \$ _____

2. Did your business witness any perceptible change in shoplifting during the week of the Halloween celebration?

- Decrease No Change
Increase Don't Know

3. Did your business witness any perceptible change in damages during the week of the Halloween celebration?

- Decrease No Change
Increase Don't Know

4. To determine the TOTAL economic impact on Carbondale, it is imperative that we collect sales data for the weeks surrounding the Halloween celebration or for an overall percentage increase/decrease in revenues during the week of Halloween. Please supply this information as accurately as possible. (All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for statistical purposes only.)

Table with 4 columns: Category, Week Before, Week of, Week After. Rows include \$ Sales, # of Buying Customers, and \$ Sales increase/decrease.

6. Would you be willing to keep data on dollar sales and customer traffic for the upcoming Halloween celebration?
yes no need more information

7. Do you have any other information concerning the economic impact of Halloween that you would like to present to the Halloween Core Committee?

Horizontal lines for providing additional information.

Initials _____

CITY OF CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS
 HALLOWEEN COSTS 1982 -1988
 NOVEMBER 22, 1988

DEPT/DIV/ACTIVITY	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984	1983	1982
PUBLIC WORKS	12337	11532	11147	8414	7963	5552	3950
POLICE	6122	7069	7336	8000	6244	6479	5500
FIRE	361	454	372	0	0	0	0
CODE ENFORCEMENT	471	441	577	420	800	1640	1000
GRAND AVE STAGE/ELEC	222	841	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	194	50	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COST	19707	20387	19432	16834	15007	13671	10450
LESS: VENDOR FEES	1815	1365	1090	1900	1500	4100	0
NET COST TO CITY	17892	19022	18342	14934	13507	9571	10450

NOTES:

- (1) The Fire Department did not incur any overtime labor expenses prior to 1986.
- (2) The costs for the Grand Avenue stage construction and electricity as well as the Miscellaneous costs were not reported prior to 1987.
- (3) Miscellaneous includes printing, postage and banner hanging.



Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Security Office

November 01, 1988

TO: Whom It May Concern
FROM: Robert S. Harris *[Signature]*
Director of Security
SUBJECT: Overtime for Halloween, 1988

The following are the overtime hours and wages earned by the non-exempt Security personnel working to preserve safety and security for all people during Halloween-1988 on October 28 and October 29, 1988:

October 28, 1988

32 Police Personnel	184.0 hours	\$3,916.80
18 Saluki Patrolpersons	<u>160.0 hours</u>	<u>\$ 547.50</u>
	344.0 hours	\$4,464.30

October 29, 1988

35 Police Personnel	226.5 hours	\$4,790.74
18 Saluki Patrolpersons	<u>142.5 hours</u>	<u>\$ 487.48</u>
	369.0 hours	\$5,278.22

Totals	713.0 hours	\$9,742.82
--------	-------------	------------

In addition, we several exempt personnel work long hours to keep things under control. Those exempt personnel were Director Harris; Captain Kirk; Lieutenants Smith, Hudson and Pearce; and Administrative assistant Lane.

Rsh:it

cc: Vice President Dougherty
Administrative Assistant Lane




Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Physical Plant Office

February 21, 1989

TO: Clarence G. Dougherty
Vice President for Campus Services

FROM: Duane Schroeder 
Director of Physical Plant

SUBJECT: Physical Plant Charges for Halloween 1988

These charges are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Grounds cleanup, Grand Ave., October 29 & 30 -- | \$ 786.28 |
| 2. Maintenance area on Acct. #30784
electrical safety tent ----- | 284.00 |
| Total Physical Plant charges -- | \$ 786.28 |

hr



Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Security Office

November 07, 1986

*42
referred to
Lomit
Seymour
Sunburn
Hypoxia
Hinder
Dyer*

*File
Halloween
Folder in
Miss.*

TO: Whom It May Concern
FROM: Isabelle Throgmorton *IT*
SUBJECT: Overtime for Halloween, 1986

The following is the overtime for the non-exempt employees, Police Officers and Police Dispatchers, working to preserve safety and security for all people during Halloween-1986 on October 31, and November 01, 1986.

October 31, 1986

48 Police Personnel	294.5 hours	(38 meals)	\$5,336.61
Saluki Patrolpersons	117.0 hours		\$ 409.50

November 01, 1986

48 Police Personnel	258.5 hours	(20 meals)	\$4,614.40
Saluki Patrolpersons	74.0 hours		\$ 259.00

Total	744.0 hours	(58 meals)	\$10,619.51
-------	-------------	------------	-------------

In addition, we had several exempt personnel work long hours to keep things under control. Those exempt personnel were Director Harris, Captain Kirk, Lieutenants Braswell, Covington, and Smith, and Administrative Assistant Lane.

it

Carbondale Chamber of Commerce

MARCH 23, 1988

714 E. Walnut Street
Eastgate Shopping Center
Carbondale, IL 62901
(618) 549-2146

H A L L O W E E N

1 9 8 8 B U D G E T

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
SAFETY - (First Aid) (Tent) (Campaign)	\$10,500	CCTB Liquor Distributors SIU-C	\$4,500 3,500 2,500
HAUNTED HOUSE	800	Chamber/Theater Guild	Fees
COSTUME CONTEST	1,000	Chamber	Donations
PUMPKIN VILLAGE	800		
YOUTH PROGRAMS	500		
SENIOR JUDGING	500		
PARADE	1,500		
SURVEY - (Economic Impact)	500	Chamber	Dr. Parker's Class
ENTERTAINMENT	2,750	Chamber	Budget + Chemical Toilets
CHEMICAL TOILETS	3,000	CC&G, Inc.	SIU-C
TRICKS/TREATS (SIU-C)	<u>200</u>	Students	Donations
TOTAL =	<u>\$22,050</u>		



ARREST SUMMARY

HALLOWEEN 1988

LISTED BELOW IS A BREAKDOWN OF ALL HALLOWEEN RELATED ARRESTS ON FRIDAY NIGHT 10/28/88, AND SATURDAY NIGHT 10/29/88. BREAKDOWN REFLECTS CURRENT SIUC STUDENTS AND ALL OTHERS.

	<u>FRIDAY 10/28/88</u>			<u>SATURDAY 10/29/88</u>			<u>WEEKEND TOTALS</u>		
	<u>SIU STUDENT</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>SIU STUDENT</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>SIU STUDENT</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Underage Poss./Consumption	13	36	49	9	55	64	22	91	113
Reckless Conduct	2	2	4	7	29	36	9	31	40
Disorderly Conduct	0	1	1	3	6	9	3	7	10
Resist/Obstruct Officer	1	2	3	0	3	3	1	5	6
Public Indecency	2	0	2	0	4	4	2	4	6
Possession Cannabis	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	4
Aggravated Battery	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	4
Crim. Damage St. Property	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	2	3
Strongarm Robbery	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Aggravated Assault	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Unlawful Use Weapons	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Unlaw. Delivery Alcohol	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Use of False ID	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL PERSONS ARRESTED	19	46	65	22	104	126	41	150	191

THE ARRESTS SHOWN ABOVE WERE PROCESSED AT EITHER SIU PD, AT THE C'DALE PD MOBILE UNIT, OR AT CPD HEADQUARTERS. THOSE PROCESSED AT SIU PD WERE (GENERALLY) ARRESTED IN THE EAST GRAND AREA OR OTHER LOCATIONS ON OR NEAR CAMPUS. THOSE PROCESSED AT THE MOBILE UNIT OR C'DALE PD WERE (GENERALLY) ARRESTED IN THE AREA OF THE "STRIP".
BREAKDOWN AS FOLLOWS:

	<u>FRIDAY 10/28/88</u>	<u>SATURDAY 10/29/88</u>	<u>WEEKEND TOTALS</u>
AT SIU PD	15	20	35
AT MOBILE UNIT / CPD	50	106	156
TOTAL PERSONS ARRESTED	65	126	191

ARREST SUMMARY

HALLOWEEN 1987

LISTED BELOW IS A BREAKDOWN OF ALL HALLOWEEN RELATED ARRESTS ON FRIDAY NIGHT 10/30/87, AND SATURDAY NIGHT 10/31/87. BREAKDOWN REFLECTS SIU STUDENTS AND ALL OTHERS.

CHARGE (PRIMARY)	FRIDAY 10/30/87			SATURDAY 10/31/87			WEEKEND TOTALS		
	SIU STUDENT	OTHER	TOTAL	STUDENT	OTHER	TOTAL	STUDENT	OTHER	TOTAL
Simple Battery	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	3
Reckless Conduct	2	10	12	1	7	8	3	17	20
Aggravated Assault	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Simple Assault	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Theft Under \$300	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Theft By Possession	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Criminal Damage Property	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Criminal Damage Vehicle	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
Criminal Trespass	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Crim. Dam. St. Property	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2
Unlawful Use Weapons	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Public Indecency	0	3	3	0	8	8	0	11	11
Possession Cannabis	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	4
Transfer Alcohol Minor	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	3
Underage Possess. Alcohol	21	54	75	19	72	91	40	126	166
Underage Consumption	3	10	13	0	4	4	3	14	17
Disorderly Conduct	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	3	3
Resist/Obstruct Officer	0	5	5	0	1	1	0	6	6
Fight by Agreement	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Poss. Glass Container	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Poss. Controlled Substance	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
TOTAL PERSONS ARRESTED	32	91	123	21	104	125	53	195	248

THE ARRESTS SHOWN ABOVE WERE PROCESSED AT EITHER SIU PD, AT THE C'DALE PD MOBILE UNIT, OR AT CPD HEADQUARTERS. THOSE PROCESSED AT SIU PD WERE ARRESTED IN THE EAST GRAND ST. AREA OR OTHER LOCATIONS ON OR NEAR CAMPUS. THOSE PROCESSED AT THE MOBILE UNIT OR C'DALE PD WERE (GENERALLY) ARRESTED IN THE AREA OF THE "STRIP". BREAKDOWN AS FOLLOWS:

	FRIDAY 10/30/87	SATURDAY 10/31/87	WEEKEND TOTALS
AT SIU PD	51	20	71
AT MOBILE UNIT / CPD	72	105	177
TOTAL PERSONS ARRESTED	123	125	248

<u>Friday 10/31/86</u>	<u>SIU Students</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Total Arrests</u>
Arrests at SIU	11	33	44
Arrests - C'dale	<u>14</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>53</u>
Friday 10/31 Totals	25	72	97

<u>Saturday 11/01/86</u>	<u>SIU Students</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Total Arrests</u>
Arrests at SIU	11	37	48
Arrests - C'dale	<u>23</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>106</u>
Saturday 11/01 Totals	34	120	154

<u>WEEKEND TOTALS</u>	<u>SIU STUDENTS</u>	<u>OTHERS</u>	<u>TOTAL ARRESTS</u>
ARRESTS AT SIU	22	70	92
ARRESTS - C'DALE	<u>37</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>159</u>
WEEKEND TOTALS	59	192	251

SIU STUDENTS: 23½ %

Arrests at SIU reflects those persons processed at SIU PD and/or on whom reports were written by SIU Officers. These arrests (generally) occurred in the E. Grand area or elsewhere on the SIU Campus.

Arrests-C'dale reflects those persons processed at C'dale PD or the mobile unit on Illinois Avenue. These arrests (generally) occurred on Illinois Avenue and surrounding areas.

Some of the information above was taken from the Carbondale PD printout to which 13 additional SIU PD arrests were added.

Information regarding SIU Student involvement, location of arrest/processing, and officer involvement had to be researched by SIU PD staff.

D. Lane
SIU PD

<u>CARS TOWED BY SIU PD:</u>	Friday 10/31/86	=	29
	Saturday 11/01/86	=	<u>31</u>
	WEEKEND TOTAL		60 (11 SIU STUDENTS)

