ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF LEGALIZING MARRIAGE OF SAME-GENDER COUPLES IN OHIO

Bill LaFayette, Ph.D.
Owner, Regionomics™ LLC
July 30, 2012

Regionomics™ LLC
from Trends to Insight to Action
1293 S. Fourth St., Columbus, OH 43206
www.regionomicsllc.com

Economic Impacts of Legalizing Marriage of Same-Gender Couples in Ohio

Bill LaFayette, Ph.D.
Owner, Regionomics™ LLC
July 30, 2012

Summary

This report is an analysis of the economic impacts of legalizing same-gender marriage in Ohio. It is shown that doing so would have a variety of positive impacts on Ohio's output, household and business earnings, and employment. One specific impact can be quantified: the impact on Ohio's economy (output, business earnings and payroll, and employment) of the wedding ceremonies that would occur in the first three years after approval of this measure. Other benefits are discussed in less formal terms.

Ohio is home to 19,700 same-gender couples, according to corrected totals from the 2010 Census. Based on the experience of Massachusetts, it is assumed that half of these (more than 9,800) would marry in the first three years. It is likely that Ohio would also attract couples from other states that have not legalized same-gender marriage. More than 31,000 same-gender couples live in the portions of surrounding states convenient to Ohio. It is unclear how many of these would travel to Ohio to marry, however, so they are not included in the formal analysis. Data from Massachusetts imply an average same-gender wedding expenditure of $8,800, which may be considerably less than that for opposite-gender weddings. This average implies wedding spending of $56.6 million statewide in the first year of legal same-gender marriage and $88.5 million in the first three years. Although these totals represent the revenue to industries supplying wedding-related goods and services, **they overstate the direct impact on the Ohio economy of same-gender weddings**.

These expenditure totals overstate the impact because in order to have an economic impact, spending must come from accumulated savings or out-of-state contributions. Spending that is diverted to weddings from other current in-state purchases is simply a reallocation of spending that would have occurred in any case and so provides no incremental benefit. However, the spending that is new to the economy gives rise to indirect impacts elsewhere in the economy as businesses providing wedding-related goods and services increase their own purchases from suppliers and workers use their increased earnings to make household purchases of all types. Because this second-order – or indirect –spending would not have occurred had the weddings not occurred in the first place, it is as much a part of the economic impact as are the impacts of the weddings themselves. These indirect impacts are measured by applying an economic impact model: the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II) of the United States Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Because no information is available regarding the typical proportion of spending on weddings that comes from savings, assumptions are required. It is assumed that 50 percent of weddings are partly paid for from savings and thus generate an impact. Forty percent of the impact-generating weddings (i.e., 20 percent of all weddings) are assumed to cost approximately $22,000; the other 60 percent of these weddings cost $7,500. Two alternative assumptions are made regarding the share of spending on these weddings that comes from savings – generating two alternative sets of impacts. The low-impact

assumption is that savings pay for 40 percent of expenses; the high-impact assumption is that savings satisfy two-thirds of expenses.

Another category of impacts comes from out-of-state guests at these weddings. Because these guests bring new spending into the state, all of them generate an impact whether the wedding itself does or not. Although Massachusetts weddings draw an average of 16 out-of-state guests, a lower average (10) is assumed for Ohio. Ohio tourist spending data are used to estimate the spending of these out-of-state guests.

The resulting impact estimates, including both wedding and visitor spending, are presented in Table S-1. Legalizing same-gender marriage would increase Ohio output (gross domestic product) by $101.3 million to $126.6 million in the first three years. Household and business earnings increase $30.4 million to $38 million. Employment impacts cannot be totaled across years, but 740 to 930 jobs are sustained in the first year and 170 to 210 jobs in the third year.

Table S-1
Economic Impacts of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio During the First Three Years

	Direct	Indirect	Total
Output (GDP)	$47,137,000 - 58,985,000	$54,193,000 - 67,640,000	$101,329,000 - 126,624,000
Earnings	$14,968,000 - 18,695,000	$15,456,000 - 19,291,000	$30,422,000 - 37,984,000
Employment			
Year 1	460 - 570 jobs	280 - 360 jobs	740 - 930 jobs
Year 2	150 - 190 jobs	100 - 120 jobs	250 - 310 jobs
Year 3	110 - 140 jobs	70 - 80 jobs	170 - 210 jobs

Three other economic impacts of legalizing same-gender weddings in Ohio cannot be easily quantified but are no less real than those estimated above. The first is the spending on same-gender weddings that would occur annually in a steady state once the existing couples who wish to marry have done so – the ongoing impact of weddings and visitors on the Ohio economy that continues indefinitely.

The second impact arises from the fact that same-gender couples who are denied marriage rights in their own state will frequently travel to a state where legal status is conferred in order to marry legally. In doing so, Ohio couples transfer spending and tourist dollars from Ohio to the other state. Legalizing same-gender marriage in Ohio would thus block further leakage of these dollars from the state's economy.

The third impact is that legalizing same-gender marriage may reduce the number of talented college graduates and others who depart Ohio for other states, and would make Ohio more competitive in attracting top talent, jobs, and investment. Currently, one-third of Ohio college graduates leave the state to take jobs elsewhere, which reduces the impact that these graduates might have on Ohio's below-average percentage of residents with college degrees. The urban development scholar Richard Florida has demonstrated that creative knowledge workers in all fields are more likely to be found in regions that embrace diversity and are more open to different styles of creating and living. If this is correct, the 2004 passage of the Defense of Marriage Act in Ohio undermined the efforts to retain creative individuals by communicating a lack of tolerance; conversely, the repeal of this measure and the legalization of same-gender marriage would communicate a more positive, attractive message.

Table of Contents

Economic Impacts of Legalizing Marriage of Same-Gender Couples in Ohio

Bill LaFayette, Ph.D.
Owner, Regionomics™ LLC
July 30, 2012

Introduction

Twenty states and the District of Columbia offer some level of legal relationship recognition to same-gender couples. Individuals may currently marry in six of these states and the District of Columbia. Two other states recognize marriages performed elsewhere. Two additional state legislatures have ratified same-gender marriage, with referenda on the issue in November 2012. A campaign is currently underway to place a measure on the Ohio ballot that would overturn the state's Defense of Marriage Act and extend full marriage rights to same-gender couples. This would have a variety of positive impacts on Ohio's output (Gross Domestic Product, or GDP), household and business earnings, and employment. Because of the lack of data, most of these benefits cannot be reliably quantified. However, it is possible to conduct a careful assessment of one specific impact: the impact on Ohio's economy of the wedding ceremonies that would initially follow approval of this measure.

The approach used here follows closely that of a study done of the impact of same-gender marriage in Washington State by Kastanis, Badgett, and Herman of the UCLA School of Law's Williams Institute. The current study, though, includes a significant extension of the earlier study's approach: estimation of both the impacts themselves and the increases in output, earnings, and employment that would arise elsewhere in the Ohio economy as a direct result of the wedding spending.

The report begins with a discussion of the number of same-gender couples in Ohio and the implied number of weddings that these couples might generate in the initial three years after the new law becomes effective. The expenditures incurred for these weddings are then discussed. The following section contains an explanation of the importance of indirect impacts, methods used to estimate these impacts, and the assumptions underlying the estimation. Impacts resulting from the spending of out-of-state wedding guests are discussed in the following section. The direct and indirect impacts of legal same-gender marriage on Ohio output, earnings, and employment are then presented. The report concludes with a discussion of non-quantifiable benefits that would accrue to the Ohio economy as a result of passing the measure.

The Number of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio

There are two different ways to view the economic impact of legal same-gender marriage in Ohio. The first is the initial impact based on the large number of weddings that would occur in the first years after enactment of the new law as existing couples exercise the previously-unavailable right of marriage. This does not address the second impact, however: that from the same-gender weddings that would occur annually in a steady state based on the formation of new couples after this initial backlog is resolved.

In order to estimate the number of same-gender marriages and weddings in the first years after the passage of a law making same-gender marriage legal, it is necessary to know the number of same-gender couples. Complete counts of same-gender couples sharing a residence are reported in the 2010

Census (Table PCT15).[1] However, as discussed by O'Connell and Feliz of the Census Bureau, there was likely miscoding of this item, especially in the door-to-door enumerator survey of households who failed to return their paper survey. This miscoding likely resulted in overestimation of same-gender households because a number of opposite-gender couples were incorrectly classified as same-gender. Taking this into account, O'Connell and Feliz present "preferred estimates" of same-gender households for the U.S. and states. The U.S. total was reduced from 902,000 to 646,500, a reduction of 28 percent. The total in Ohio was reduced from 28,600 to 19,700, or 31 percent. These preferred estimates are the totals used in the economic impact calculations. Elements of the estimation also require counts of households by county, which are not supplied by O'Connell and Feliz. However, Gates and Cooke provide a procedure to generate sub-state estimates of same-gender households from the totals reported by the Census Bureau. This procedure is used to generate estimates of the number of same-gender couple households by county in Ohio; these are shown in Appendix Table A-1. These couples are present in each of Ohio's 88 counties, implying that the economic impacts of same-gender marriage will not be focused solely in the big cities, but will extend throughout the state.

Not all of these couples will marry, at least initially. Some may have already had a legal marriage performed in another state; presumably, Ohio would extend recognition to marriages performed elsewhere, as is the case with legal marriages currently. Other couples may need to save for a large ceremony, may not be ready to make the legal commitment, or may not wish to do so initially for a variety of other reasons. Kastanis *et al.* note that half of the same-gender couples in Massachusetts married in the first three years after marriage became legal in 2004. Of the half who did marry, 64 percent did so in the first year, 21 percent did so in the second year, and 15 percent did so in the third year. One factor that may make Ohio's experience different from that of Massachusetts is the presence of children in these households. The 2010 Census reports that 25.6 percent of Ohio same-gender couples had at least one child younger than age 18 present in the household; the comparable rate in Massachusetts was 22.1 percent. Couples with children may be more likely to marry in order to improve the legal status of the children. However, because the impact of children in the household on the propensity to marry seems not to have been measured elsewhere, this factor is ignored here. It is worth bearing in mind, though, that a larger percentage of Ohio couples might marry, and marry sooner, than was the case in Massachusetts. Applying the Massachusetts percentages to the preferred estimates in Table A-1 generates projections of marriages by county in the first three years of legal marriage. This is shown in Appendix Table A-2.

These estimates do not include the marriages of couples from other states traveling to Ohio to marry. This could potentially be a significant factor: Badgett and Herman report that in states where same-gender marriage is legal, 60 percent of all marriages are of couples from other states. These couples tend to come from nearby states as well as states with large populations such as Texas and Florida[2] (9-11). Ohio law is relatively friendly to out-of-state couples wishing to marry in Ohio, so this would be a straightforward process for these couples. Ohio counties may issue a marriage license to out-of-state couples as long as the ceremony is to be held in the same county. There is no waiting period and the license is valid for 60 days. The five surrounding states (Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and

[1] Although these totals are now more than two years old, the slow growth of Ohio's population suggests that the counts are likely representative of the current total – at least at the state level.

[2] This research was conducted prior to the 2011 legalization of same-sex marriage in New York, which was the residence for 22 percent of all those entering into same-sex marriages in Massachusetts and 28 percent of those doing so in Connecticut. However, the point remains that there is a willingness of same-sex couples to travel to other states to obtain legal recognition of their unions, regardless of the status of that recognition in their home state.

West Virginia) accounted for half of all out-of-state visitors in 2010 according to statistics from the Ohio Department of Tourism, so these are the most likely source for out-of-state couples.[3] None of these states currently recognizes same-gender marriage. New York does, however; this provides a convenient alternative for Pennsylvania residents. Marriage is also legal in Canada, which is a nearby alternative for residents of Michigan. As Table 1 reveals, there are more than 58,000 same-gender couples in the states surrounding Ohio according to the preferred estimates from the Census Bureau. Omitting the regions of Michigan and Pennsylvania that are convenient to Ontario and New York, respectively, leaves more than 31,000 couples. Although some of these couples would doubtless come to Ohio to marry in the years following legalization of same-gender marriage, it is not clear how many would do so.

Table 1
Same-Gender Couples in the States Surrounding Ohio

State	Preferred estimate
Indiana	11,074
Kentucky	7,195
Michigan	
Total	14,598
Southwest quadrant	4,582
Pennsylvania	
Total	22,336
Southwest quadrant	5,500
West Virginia	2,848
Total, all states	**58,051**
Total including only southwest quadrants of Michigan and Pennsylvania	**31,199**

Source: Census 2010, Table PCT15; author's calculations for Michigan and Pennsylvania counties based on Gates and Cooke.

Marriage and Wedding Expenditures

The next step in assessing the economic impact of same-gender marriage is estimating the total that would be spent in solemnizing and celebrating these unions. The one standard expense for all marriages is the cost of the marriage license, which is $50 in all counties in Ohio and represents a source of county revenue. This revenue can be directly calculated from the projected number of marriages – assuming that couples obtain a license in their county of residence. The results of these calculations are shown in Appendix Table A-3. Statewide, marriage license revenue in the first three years would total more than $490,000; of this, more than $314,000 would be earned in the first year.

The results of one survey suggest that same-gender couples spend less on their weddings than do their opposite-gender counterparts. The Health and Marriage Equality in Massachusetts survey was conducted in 2008 by the Massachusetts Department of Health and surveyed couples marrying in Massachusetts during the first five years of legal marriage. The results are analyzed by Goldberg,

[3] Illinois, Florida, and California rank as the seventh, eighth, and ninth most-common residence of out-of-state tourists in the Department of Tourism ranking, but these states together account for only about 10 percent of out-of-state visitors.

Steinberger, and Badgett; among these results are the total amount spent on same-gender weddings. These were as follows (2):

$ 0 - $ 100	10%
$ 101 - $ 1,000	21%
$ 1,001 - $ 5,000	24%
$ 5,001 - $10,000	21%
$ 10,001 - $ 20,000	14%
$ 20,001 - $ 30,000	6%
More than $30,000	4%

These results imply an average expenditure of just under $7,500 – using the midpoints of the ranges to calculate a weighted average with $40,000 as the "midpoint" of the maximum range. This average must be adjusted for inflation, which requires the proportion of weddings in each of the five years covered by the survey. The findings of Kastanis *et al.* discussed above provide the first three years; this is expanded with declining percentages in years four and five.[4] Using these weights to derive a weighted average Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) value implies an average expenditure of $8,800 in May 2012 dollars.

As noted above, same-gender couples may spend substantially less on their weddings than do opposite-gender couples: the Wedding Report finds that opposite-gender couples spent an average of $25,630 on their weddings in 2011. Goldberg *et al.* speculate that the lower spending by same-gender couples may be because some of them have had large commitment ceremonies prior to legalization, and some may not have the financial support of family available to opposite-gender couples (2). However, a counterargument is that same-gender couples may be older on average than opposite-gender couples – with more accumulated savings – because marriage was not available to these couples before 2004. This would imply that same-gender couples' spending should be higher, all else equal. Another possible explanation for the disparity is that even though the Wedding Report survey reaches couples as well as service providers, it may not capture an adequate number of low-cost weddings. These are less formal and use a smaller array of commercial providers, and may remain statistically "under the radar" as a result.

In any case, if it is assumed that spending on weddings in Ohio is comparable to the inflation-adjusted Massachusetts average, spending on same-gender weddings by county can be estimated given the number of weddings in Table A-2. The site Costofwedding.com (owned by the Wedding Report) gives average wedding spending by city. These are collected for the seat of each county.[5] The ratio of the county's average to the (unweighted) state average is used to adjust the county total, excluding the marriage license fee. Appendix Table A-4 presents estimates of the implied total spending generated by the same-gender couples in each county. Spending on same-gender weddings would total $56.6 million statewide in the first year of legal same-gender marriage and $88.5 million in the first three years. It is important to keep in mind, though, that the county-level totals are not necessarily received by businesses in that county. A couple living in Lancaster (Fairfield County) may hire a caterer based in Columbus (Franklin County). Thus, businesses in a given county should look at the spending both in their own county and nearby counties to determine the potential business opportunities.

[4] The weights are as follows: 2004: 0.525; 2005: 0.172; 2006: 0.123; 2007: 0.098; and 2008: 0.082.

[5] Costs were not available for 15 of the 88 counties because the county seat was too small to be included. The statewide average was used for these counties.

A critical point is that although the totals in Table A-4 represent the revenue to industries supplying wedding-related goods and services, **they overstate the direct impact on the Ohio economy of same-gender weddings**. The explanation of this point and measurement of the actual economic impacts will be discussed in the next four sections.

The Concept of Economic Impact

The key focus of an economic impact assessment is the increase in **output** of the economy of a specific geographical area that results from a specific economic activity – in this case, the impact on the Ohio economy of spending by same-gender couples on weddings in the state. Output is measured by the value of goods and services produced in the specified area over a given period of time; this is often referred to as Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The production of output requires labor, thereby generating earnings to business owners and workers. The economic impact assessment also estimates these earnings and the jobs that are created or sustained as a result of the target activity.

Spending on weddings creates output and increases GDP through the purchase or rental of tuxedos or dresses, the purchase of flowers and other decorations, and the purchase of the services of an organist for the ceremony and a caterer and DJ for the reception. These activities are referred to as **direct** impacts. But direct impacts are only part of the total impact. The providers of goods and services to same-gender couples will increase their own purchases of supplies (e.g., food purchased by the caterer) to accommodate the increased activity. Business owners and their employees will use their salaries, wages, and tips to purchase household goods of all kinds. To the extent that these payments for purchases and wages and salaries are made to suppliers and employees within Ohio, the state's economic activity and output is increased further. The sales and purchases of in-state suppliers increase, increasing output, and their employment may increase as well. Employees of the suppliers use their increased wages to make household purchases. This supplier and employee spending creates further rounds of spending and output growth. It is important to emphasize that the direct activities cause this additional spending, and it would not have occurred had the weddings not occurred in the first place. For this reason, these **indirect** impacts are as much a part of the economic impact as are the direct impacts.

A crucial qualification to this argument is that in order to have an impact on Ohio output, the direct spending must be **new** spending. It cannot displace spending that would have occurred otherwise. Consider a couple who decides to have a $7,500 wedding as a result of the recognition by Ohio of same-gender marriages. In order to pay for the wedding, they decide to cancel their weekly $50 dinners out for a year and eat at home instead, and to access their savings for the rest of the cost. The $7,500 is an increase in Ohio output directly resulting from the legalization of same-gender marriage, but the $2,600 decrease in restaurant spending reduces output while the additional grocery spending increases it. Thus, the impact of the legalization of same-gender marriage on Ohio output in this case is the spending on the wedding less the reduced spending on restaurant meals plus the increased spending on groceries. Some couples also receive contributions from other family members. If the family members are Ohio residents, the contributions represent reallocated Ohio spending and do not create net economic impacts; however, contributions coming in from other states do create impacts. No information is available regarding how much of couples' spending on weddings comes from reallocating current spending versus withdrawing savings or receiving out-of-state contributions, so two alternative sets of output estimates are calculated assuming a low level of current spending reallocation and a high level.

The indirect output and employment impacts can be estimated by applying an economic impact model to the direct spending increase. Several generally-accepted models are available for this purpose; this analysis uses the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II) developed by the United States Bureau of Economic Analysis. As is the case for the other impact models, RIMS II is based on a framework called an input-output table. For a given industry in a given geographic area, the input-output table shows the increase in purchases from other local firms by industry and the sales to other local firms by industry resulting from a one dollar increase in the given industry's output. Thus, the input-output table can be used to derive the impact on other local firms of an increase in production within a specific industry.

These impacts are specific both to a given industry and to a given region. The array of suppliers that benefit from increased spending on weddings is generally the same regardless of location. But if the structure of the Ohio economy is such that the wedding service providers are forced to make most of their purchases from vendors outside the state, then most of the impact will leak from the Ohio economy. Conversely, a broad economy with many in-state suppliers will keep more of the impact of the output increase circulating within the economy, and the indirect impacts will be much greater. Thus, the values within the input-output table are unique to Ohio.

RIMS II summarizes the information in the regional input-output table by calculating a set of unique impact factors (multipliers) for each of 490 detailed industries within Ohio. Because of their origin in the input-output table, the factors implicitly reflect the structure of the state's economy and the presence or absence of local suppliers. One of these factors represents the total increase in regional output resulting from a one-dollar increase in output within a given industry. When this factor is multiplied by the increase in direct output, the result is the total regional increase in output; the indirect output impact is simply the difference between the total and direct impacts. Other factors measure impacts on employment. One of these represents the total number of regional jobs sustained as a result of each $1 million of output within the specific industry.[6] Again, the indirect employment impact is the difference between total employment and direct employment (i.e., the employment of the wedding service providers themselves).

One modification to expenditures must be made before they are used in an economic impact model: they must be restated from purchaser prices to producer prices. This is because GDP is always valued in producer-price terms and multipliers are calculated accordingly. Generally speaking, this change affects only prices for goods, not prices for services. But it does mean that the resulting output impacts, both direct and indirect, are also in producer-price terms.

[6] Referring to these jobs as "sustained" rather than "created" brings up an important point. The implication of the economic impact analysis is that the activity exists to support a given number of jobs in other industries. In some cases (such as when economic growth is slow) output can be increased significantly by underemployed existing workers increasing their effort. The model cannot determine whether actual jobs are created or existing employees are increasing their output. Even if new jobs are not created, however, the higher demand makes existing workers' jobs more secure.

Assumptions Underlying the Economic Impact Calculations

This section discusses assumptions that are made in calculating the economic impact of the weddings that would occur as a result of the legalization of same-gender marriage in Ohio. As the above discussion implies, it is important to know both the total amount of new spending and its allocation – the value of goods and services supplied by each industry. The Costofwedding.com website gives location-specific prices for individual goods and services. From these are selected the most likely services, and the assumption is made that all these except postage are purchased from Ohio-based providers. Purchases are categorized in terms of their taxability and the state and local sales tax are calculated. The statewide sales tax rate is 5.5 percent. The local sales tax rate varies from county to county, so a statewide average is calculated from Ohio Department of Taxation data. The implied total sales generating each county's tax revenue is calculated by dividing the revenue by the county tax rate. The statewide average county rate is the weighted average of the 88 county rates, where the weights are the taxable sales in each county. The resulting average county sales tax rate is 1.12 percent.

It is assumed that only 50 percent of weddings generate any impact at all. These are partially paid for out of savings; the other 50 percent are assumed to be paid for entirely by reallocating current purchases and thus generate no impact. For ease of calculation, only two categories of weddings are assumed. Major weddings cost around $22,000 (the average for opposite-gender weddings in Ohio implied by the Costofwedding.com data). These are assumed to comprise 20 percent of all weddings. The other 30 percent of impact-generating weddings are moderate-cost weddings costing $7,500. Purchases for these moderate-cost weddings are likely to exhibit a different pattern than that of the major weddings. The wedding cost data are examined line by line, with the lower end of the average range as the cost of some items, other items reduced by 25 to 50 percent, and still other items omitted altogether – a process much as a couple would follow in budgeting for a wedding.

Table 2 gives the percentage breakdown by industry of pretax purchases.

Table 2
Percentage Allocation of Pretax Wedding Expenditures

Industry	Percentage	
	Major	Moderate
Bread and bakery product manufacturing	2.02%	4.94%
Printing	1.09%	2.13%
Transit and ground passenger transportation	2.24%	0.00%
Retail trade	12.17%	21.38%
Real estate	5.63%	0.00%
Consumer goods rental	9.05%	2.19%
Photographic services	15.43%	17.31%
Independent artists, writers, and performers	5.86%	9.50%
Food services and drinking places	37.16%	34.91%
Personal care services	0.73%	1.32%
Other personal services	6.04%	0.00%
Private households (officiant and tips)	2.58%	6.31%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**

Because of the uncertainty surrounding the share of costs that do not replace current consumption, two alternative assumptions are made – generating two alternative sets of impacts. The low-impact assumption is that savings pay for 40 percent of expenses; the high-impact assumption is that savings satisfy two-thirds of expenses.

Wedding Guest Impacts

Another category of the economic impact is the spending of wedding guests. As the above discussion of impact-generating spending implies, not all of this spending generates an impact. The only relevant spending is that of guests who live outside of Ohio and bring their dollars into the state. A guest traveling from Dayton for a wedding in Mansfield would reallocate spending from Dayton to Mansfield, benefiting the Mansfield economy at the expense of Dayton, but the impact to the state's economy would be a wash. However, **all** spending of out-of-state guests generates an impact – including the guest spending that comes out of current consumption and the spending of guests at smaller weddings – because all of this spending is new to Ohio and would not occur if the weddings themselves did not occur.

We thus need an estimate of the number of out-of-state guests who would attend these weddings and the amount and type of their spending while they are in Ohio. The survey of same-gender couples in Massachusetts analyzed by Goldberg *et al.* and discussed above included information on wedding guests from outside Massachusetts. The number of these guests was distributed as follows (3):

1 - 5	43%
6 - 20	30%
21 - 40	17%
41 - 60	6%
61 - 80	2%
81 - 100	1%
More than 100	0%

Goldberg *et al.* use the midpoint of these ranges to calculate an average of 16 out-of-state guests at these same-gender-weddings (3). But the number of out-of-state guests at Ohio weddings is likely to be smaller because Ohio is a larger and more populous state than Massachusetts. The relative size of the two states implies that the typical city in Ohio is further from other states than is the typical city in Massachusetts, and may thus not attract as many out-of-state guests. Consequently, it is assumed that the average same-gender wedding in Ohio will attract 10 out-of-state guests.

The next question is how much these visitors will spend. The Ohio Bureau of Tourism tracks both the residence of Ohio tourists and their spending in total and by category. According to a July 2, 2012, personal communication from Eric P. Herzog, research director of the Bureau, 20 percent of tourists stay overnight and spend an average of $305; the remaining 80 percent are day visitors spending an average of $104. The communication also provided a detailed breakdown of spending by category (but not by day versus overnight stay or in-state versus out-of-state). These data points were used to generate weighted average spending levels per category in total and then for the day versus overnight visitors. (It is assumed that wedding gifts are purchased in the guests' home state.)

The results of these calculations are shown in Table 3. From the scale of the overnight versus day tourist totals, it is apparent that most overnight tourists spend two days with one night in a hotel. This is likewise assumed for the overnight wedding guests. Because all the individuals considered here live outside of Ohio, it is assumed that the percentage of overnight guests is higher than average – four of the ten guests rather than two. It is assumed that guests' spending otherwise parallels that of day tourists with the exception of lodging for the overnight guests and food and beverages for all guests. Because most weddings include a reception at which food is provided, it is assumed that the guests' own spending on food is 60 percent of average on the day of the wedding. Sales and lodging taxes are extracted from the totals both to show the impact of these items and because the economic impact of sales tax payments is different from that of the items on which the tax is paid because they go to a different industry (government).

Table 3
Estimation of Per-Person Spending by Out-of-State Wedding Guests

		Ohio tourists			Wedding guests*	
Spending category	**Percentage**	**Day**	**Overnight**	**Total**	**Day**	**Overnight**
Food and beverages	27%	$ 31.20	$ 69.87	$ 38.93	$ 17.56	$ 46.82
Retail	15%	17.33	38.82	21.63	16.26	32.51
Gasoline	17%	19.64	43.99	24.51	19.64	39.29
Other transportation	16%	18.49	41.40	23.07	17.34	34.68
Recreation	15%	17.33	38.82	21.63	16.26	32.51
Lodging	10%		72.10	14.42	0.00	63.32
State sales tax	---				3.71	11.54
County sales and lodging tax	---				0.76	6.94
Total	100%	$ 104.00	$ 305.00	$ 144.20	$ 91.52	$ 267.62

*Amounts are net of sales and lodging tax.
Source: Eric Herzog, Ohio Bureau of Tourism (shaded cells); author's calculations from given data.

A brief comment is in order regarding the estimation of the lodging tax rate. As is true of the sales tax rate, local lodging tax rates vary across the state. However, lodging taxes in Ohio can be assessed not only by counties, but also by convention authorities, municipalities, and townships, with the rates frequently layered on top of one another. The result is 385 separate lodging tax jurisdictions statewide. The calculation of the statewide average rate makes use of Ohio Department of Taxation data. Each jurisdiction's implied hotel revenue is calculated by dividing total tax collections by the tax rate. Each county's sub-jurisdiction rates together with that of the county itself are used to calculate the weighted average county rate with each jurisdiction's share of countywide hotel revenue as the weight. These county rates are then used to calculate the statewide average as the weighted average of the county rates. The result is a statewide average lodging tax rate of 7.16 percent.

The Economic Impact of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio

Applying RIMS II multipliers to the wedding and visitor spending discussed above – 14 distinct multipliers for the wedding impacts and six for the visitor impacts – yields estimates of the economic impact of same-gender weddings. The output, earnings, and employment impacts under high and low-impact assumptions are shown in Table 4 on pages 10 and 11. The impacts are rounded to emphasize

the fact that these estimates – as is true of all economic impact estimates – are not precise, but indicate only the order of magnitude of the true economic impacts.

Legalizing same-gender marriage would increase Ohio GDP by $64.8 million to $81 million in the first year and $101.3 million to $126.6 million in the first three years. (Note that at most only about half of the projected $88 million spending on weddings generates a direct economic impact. About 15 percent represents the conversion from consumer to producer prices; the remainder displaces other current spending.) Business earnings and payroll increase between $30.4 million and $38 million over the three-year period.

The employment impacts are not totaled across the three years. The same job could theoretically be included in all three totals, so totaling the impacts could count the same job multiple times. However, between 740 and 930 jobs are sustained in the first year, and 170 to 210 jobs in the third year.

The point was made earlier that the economic impacts are not limited to the industries directly benefiting from the wedding spending, but reach throughout the economy as a result of the spending of suppliers and households. Examples of the widespread distribution of economic impacts are shown in Tables 5 and 6 on pages 12 and 13. Table 5 gives the distribution of the total three-year output impacts across industry sectors, while Table 6 gives the first-year employment impacts. (These sector-specific impacts are also outputs of the RIMS II model.)[7] Note that the totals in Tables 5 and 6 agree with the corresponding amounts in Table 4. However, the employment estimates in Table 6 are not rounded because some of these are small. This makes those impacts seem more precise than they are.

Table 4
Economic Impacts of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio During the First Three Years

	High-impact			Low-impact		
	Direct	**Indirect**	**Total**	**Direct**	**Indirect**	**Total**
	Output (GDP)					
Year 1						
Wedding	28,879,000	32,808,000	61,687,000	21,304,000	24,211,000	45,515,000
Visitor	8,834,000	10,437,000	19,271,000	8,834,000	10,437,000	19,271,000
Total	**37,713,000**	**43,245,000**	**80,958,000**	**30,138,000**	**34,648,000**	**64,786,000**
Year 2						
Wedding	9,495,000	10,787,000	20,281,000	7,004,000	7,960,000	14,964,000
Visitor	2,904,000	3,432,000	6,336,000	2,904,000	3,432,000	6,336,000
Total	**12,399,000**	**14,219,000**	**26,617,000**	**9,908,000**	**11,392,000**	**21,300,000**
Year 3						
Wedding	6,795,000	7,720,000	14,515,000	5,013,000	5,697,000	10,709,000
Visitor	2,078,000	2,456,000	4,534,000	2,078,000	2,456,000	4,534,000
Total	**8,873,000**	**10,176,000**	**19,049,000**	**7,091,000**	**8,153,000**	**15,243,000**
3-year total						
Wedding	45,169,000	51,315,000	96,483,000	33,321,000	37,868,000	71,188,000
Visitor	13,816,000	16,325,000	30,141,000	13,816,000	16,325,000	30,141,000
Total	**58,985,000**	**67,640,000**	**126,624,000**	**47,137,000**	**54,193,000**	**101,329,000**

[7] Remaining detailed impact estimates are available from the author upon request.

Table 4 (continued)

	High-impact			Low-impact		
	Direct	**Indirect**	**Total**	**Direct**	**Indirect**	**Total**
	Business earnings and payroll					
Year 1						
Wedding	9,154,000	9,430,000	18,585,000	6,770,000	6,980,000	13,750,000
Visitor	2,807,000	2,895,000	5,701,000	2,807,000	2,895,000	5,701,000
Total	**11,961,000**	**12,325,000**	**24,286,000**	**9,577,000**	**9,875,000**	**19,451,000**
Year 2						
Wedding	2,968,000	3,143,000	6,110,000	2,186,000	2,335,000	4,521,000
Visitor	952,000	923,000	1,874,000	952,000	923,000	1,874,000
Total	**3,920,000**	**4,066,000**	**7,984,000**	**3,138,000**	**3,258,000**	**6,395,000**
Year 3						
Wedding	2,154,000	2,219,000	4,373,000	1,593,000	1,642,000	3,235,000
Visitor	660,000	681,000	1,341,000	660,000	681,000	1,341,000
Total	**2,814,000**	**2,900,000**	**5,714,000**	**2,253,000**	**2,323,000**	**4,576,000**
3-year total						
Wedding	14,276,000	14,792,000	29,068,000	10,549,000	10,957,000	21,506,000
Visitor	4,419,000	4,499,000	8,916,000	4,419,000	4,499,000	8,916,000
Total	**18,695,000**	**19,291,000**	**37,984,000**	**14,968,000**	**15,456,000**	**30,422,000**
	Employment					
Year 1						
Wedding	420	280	700	310	200	510
Visitor	150	80	230	150	80	230
Total	**570**	**360**	**930**	**460**	**280**	**740**
Year 2						
Wedding	140	90	230	100	70	170
Visitor	50	30	80	50	30	80
Total	**190**	**120**	**310**	**150**	**100**	**250**
Year 3						
Wedding	100	60	160	70	50	120
Visitor	40	20	50	40	20	50
Total	**140**	**80**	**210**	**110**	**70**	**170**

Note: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.
Source: Calculations from the RIMS II model for Ohio.

Table 5
Total Three-Year Output Impacts by Sector of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio

Sector	High-impact ($000)			Low-impact ($000)		
	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting	$ 0	$ 655	$ 655	$ 0	$ 521	$ 521
Mining	0	287	287	0	236	236
Utilities	0	2,252	2,252	0	1,821	1,821
Construction	0	703	703	0	578	578
Manufacturing	1,937	12,847	14,784	1,578	10,342	11,920
Wholesale trade	0	3,935	3,935	0	3,137	3,137
Retail trade	9,489	4,451	13,940	8,083	3,568	11,651
Transportation and warehousing	3,035	3,336	6,371	2,777	2,685	5,462
Information	0	3,452	3,452	0	2,751	2,751
Finance and insurance	0	6,417	6,417	0	5,157	5,157
Real estate and rental & leasing	4,565	8,698	13,263	2,868	6,954	9,822
Professional and technical svcs.	7,002	3,945	10,947	5,218	3,176	8,394
Mgt. of companies & enterprises	0	3,330	3,330	0	2,627	2,627
Administrative and waste services	0	3,037	3,037	0	2,427	2,427
Educational services	0	535	535	0	430	430
Health care and social assistance	0	5,098	5,098	0	4,087	4,087
Arts, entertainment & recreation	5,327	993	6,319	4,650	787	5,438
Accommodation	2,493	289	2,782	2,493	230	2,723
Food services and drinking places	18,743	2,096	20,838	14,449	1,677	16,125
Other services & public admin.	6,394	1,285	7,678	5,022	1,001	6,023
Total	**$ 58,985**	**$ 67,640**	**$126,624**	**$ 47,137**	**$ 54,193**	**$101,329**

Note: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.
Source: Calculations from the RIMS II model for Ohio.

Table 6
First-Year Employment Impacts by Sector of Same-Gender Weddings in Ohio

Sector	High-impact			Low-impact		
	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting	0	4	4	0	3	3
Mining	0	1	1	0	1	1
Utilities	0	3	3	0	3	3
Construction	0	4	4	0	4	4
Manufacturing	9	30	39	8	24	32
Wholesale trade	0	13	13	0	11	11
Retail trade	89	42	131	76	34	110
Transportation and warehousing	34	18	52	32	14	46
Information	0	10	10	0	8	8
Finance and insurance	0	22	22	0	18	18
Real estate and rental & leasing	30	34	63	18	27	45
Professional and technical svcs.	73	22	95	54	18	72
Mgt. of companies & enterprises	0	9	9	0	7	7
Administrative and waste services	0	38	38	0	30	30
Educational services	0	6	6	0	5	5
Health care and social assistance	0	38	38	0	31	31
Arts, entertainment & recreation	45	12	57	42	9	52
Accommodation	21	2	23	21	2	23
Food services and drinking places	256	29	285	197	23	220
Other services & public admin.	15	17	31	11	13	25
Households	0	4	4	0	3	3
Total	**572**	**358**	**930**	**460**	**286**	**746**

Note: Components may not add to totals because of rounding.
Source: Calculations from the RIMS II model for Ohio.

Other Impacts of Same-Gender Marriage on the Ohio Economy

The preceding analysis has featured one relatively easily-quantifiable impact of the legalization of same-gender marriage in Ohio. But a variety of other impacts would also accrue to the state's economy were legalization to occur. While these are less easily quantified, they are no less real.

The first of these is the spending on same-gender weddings that would occur annually in a steady state once the existing couples who wish to marry have done so. This is an important question because it represents the ongoing impact of weddings and visitors on the Ohio economy that continues indefinitely. The estimates presented above essentially represent a backlog of a number of years' worth of weddings that will occur when marriage becomes legal. Couples will continue to form, however, and these new couples will also marry. This implies that even if the Massachusetts-based experience parallels Ohio's experience, it may underestimate the true impact given the formation of new couples immediately before and during the three-year period. The annual number of same-gender weddings cannot be estimated because it is ultimately a function of the formation rate of same-gender couples

and their propensity to marry, neither of which is available.[8] With same-gender marriage now in its ninth year of legality in Massachusetts, it might be possible to determine a steady-state rate of marriage. This rate could be applied to Ohio and ongoing impacts estimated using the same process as above.

A second non-quantifiable but very specific impact draws from the Badgett and Herman finding discussed earlier: same-gender couples who are denied marriage rights in their own state will frequently travel to a state where legal status is conferred to marry. The Ohio couples doing so currently take their wedding spending and tourist dollars out of the state, which provides a benefit to the economy of the other state and imposes a cost on the economy of Ohio. This is very probably already happening; in fact, one reason why the marriage impact measured above is not larger than it is may be that couples have already married elsewhere. Legalizing same-gender marriage in Ohio would thus block further leakage of dollars from the state's economy.

A third impact is the potential that the legalization of same-gender marriage has to reduce Ohio's "brain drain," increase the population growth rate, and make the state more attractive for economic development. Ohio is host to nearly 870,000 college students, according to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS). These individuals come to the state from around the world to attend Ohio's public and private universities. Columbus and other regions around the state have active initiatives in place to retain these students when they graduate. The reason for these initiatives is that as work becomes more technically demanding, a larger percentage of jobs require a college degree. The availability of a skilled workforce is thus one of the most critical needs in attracting, retaining, and expanding jobs. Workers with a college degree also earn significantly more than those without – giving them more purchasing power and boosting Ohio's personal income and economic activity as a result.

However, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* reported last November the results of an Ohio Board of Regents analysis concluding that one-third of Ohio's college and university graduates leave the state to find employment – the same rate that a 2008 Regents study found. Meanwhile, only 32.4 percent of Ohio adults hold a college degree, significantly lower than the 35.7 percent U.S. rate, according to the ACS. If Ohio is to succeed economically and attract and retain jobs, it needs to retain more of these college students.

The urban development scholar Richard Florida of the University of Toronto focuses in his in his book *The Rise of the Creative Class* on creative workers. He defines these as workers who use knowledge, information, and creativity to advance ideas and create value for businesses and economies. These include not only artists and writers, but also scientists, technologists, and business leaders – a total of 40 million workers nationwide. Florida demonstrates that members of the creative class are more likely to be found in regions that embrace diversity and are more open to different styles of creating and living. He summarizes the attributes that make an attractive region for the creative class as "the three T's" – Talent, Technology, and Tolerance. If Florida is correct, the 2004 passage of the Defense of Marriage Act in Ohio undermined the efforts to retain creative individuals by communicating a lack of tolerance; conversely, the repeal of this measure and the legalization of same-gender marriage would communicate a more positive, attractive message.

[8] Recall also that the data used in this study included only couples sharing a dwelling as of April 1, 2010. It did not include couples who had not yet combined households.

Consider also the fact that the six states in which same-gender marriage is currently legal[9] (plus the District of Columbia) are home to 16.1 million jobs, according to May 2012 statistics from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and cities such as New York, Boston, and Washington that are attractive to Ohio college graduates. This advantage provides one more reason for Ohio graduates to leave – not only those who are gay or lesbian, but if Florida is correct, creative individuals who place a premium on diversity and tolerance as a way of spurring their own creativity and evidence that their creativity will be embraced even if it is unconventional.

A corollary to this argument is that legalizing same-gender marriage would make it easier for corporations in Ohio to attract the top talent they need to operate successfully. Ohio is home to 28 corporations in the Fortune 500 and 56 in the Fortune 1000, according to a list compiled by the Ohio Office of Policy Research and Strategic Planning. These companies, with revenues of $1.8 billion to $102.6 billion, must recruit nationally and internationally to find the talent that they need. Again drawing on the Richard Florida argument, legalizing same-gender marriage would make this recruitment job easier, thereby making these companies more competitive and successful.

[9] Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont.

Appendix Tables

Table A-1
Number of Same-Gender Couples by Ohio County in Total and with Children: Originally Reported and "Preferred" Estimates

County	Originally reported		Preferred estimates	
	Total	With children	Total	With children
Ohio total	**28,602**	**7,316**	**19,684**	**5,035**
Adams	45	13	29	9
Allen	209	49	120	29
Ashland	85	23	45	11
Ashtabula	215	70	126	49
Athens	159	30	115	20
Auglaize	65	20	36	16
Belmont	159	46	94	26
Brown	92	23	47	7
Butler	801	266	488	182
Carroll	40	12	18	4
Champaign	78	16	39	7
Clark	310	89	189	62
Clermont	447	126	264	71
Clinton	68	18	44	10
Columbiana	202	48	98	21
Coshocton	72	21	38	12
Crawford	62	13	26	5
Cuyahoga	3,444	807	2,545	568
Darke	74	23	37	9
Defiance	56	18	32	16
Delaware	420	115	263	81
Erie	164	42	93	28
Fairfield	349	130	217	97
Fayette	65	22	38	13
Franklin	5,132	1,063	4,471	804
Fulton	70	23	39	20
Gallia	53	17	26	11
Geauga	165	56	98	40
Greene	365	100	226	79
Guernsey	63	28	33	18
Hamilton	2,328	503	1,798	353
Hancock	169	48	101	41
Hardin	46	14	31	10
Harrison	30	9	14	6
Henry	39	11	22	6
Highland	84	33	42	24
Hocking	54	17	35	10

Table A-1 (continued)

County	Originally reported		Preferred estimates	
	Total	With children	Total	With children
Holmes	48	24	25	14
Huron	102	40	57	28
Jackson	71	18	40	8
Jefferson	138	45	73	27
Knox	118	30	60	29
Lake	415	121	205	60
Lawrence	155	47	96	33
Licking	405	117	250	80
Logan	88	28	50	16
Lorain	594	148	334	94
Lucas	1,219	317	907	232
Madison	98	39	64	30
Mahoning	440	119	245	81
Marion	125	47	69	31
Medina	304	82	157	51
Meigs	44	14	22	10
Mercer	54	17	29	12
Miami	230	77	133	53
Monroe	16	4	8	4
Montgomery	1,533	371	1,148	262
Morgan	18	4	6	0
Morrow	60	20	33	12
Muskingum	183	52	106	28
Noble	19	4	9	0
Ottawa	80	17	45	12
Paulding	22	9	6	1
Perry	64	29	36	22
Pickaway	138	44	91	33
Pike	42	11	22	2
Portage	359	85	220	56
Preble	65	18	38	13
Putnam	46	18	28	16
Richland	250	76	150	60
Ross	181	52	114	38
Sandusky	89	30	38	20
Scioto	179	64	108	48
Seneca	98	26	63	17
Shelby	86	35	47	22
Stark	810	217	492	164
Summit	1,460	307	1,049	198
Trumbull	406	112	229	68
Tuscarawas	169	38	81	18

Table A-1 (continued)

County	Originally reported		Preferred estimates	
	Total	With children	Total	With children
Union	114	36	71	31
Van Wert	51	15	24	9
Vinton	33	16	20	13
Warren	425	125	231	87
Washington	142	41	74	24
Wayne	173	52	77	28
Williams	52	12	33	9
Wood	284	73	180	46
Wyandot	28	11	15	8

Source: Census 2010, Table PCT15; author's calculations based on Gates and Cooke.

Table A-2
Number of Same-Gender Marriages by County of Residence in the First Three Years

County	Total couples*	Total to marry	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3**
Ohio total	**19,684**	**9,842**	**6,293**	**2,069**	**1,480**
Adams	29	15	9	3	3
Allen	120	60	38	13	9
Ashland	45	23	14	5	4
Ashtabula	126	63	40	13	10
Athens	115	58	37	12	9
Auglaize	36	18	12	4	2
Belmont	94	47	30	10	7
Brown	47	24	15	5	4
Butler	488	244	156	51	37
Carroll	18	9	6	2	1
Champaign	39	20	12	4	4
Clark	189	95	60	20	15
Clermont	264	132	84	28	20
Clinton	44	22	14	5	3
Columbiana	98	49	31	10	8
Coshocton	38	19	12	4	3
Crawford	26	13	8	3	2
Cuyahoga	2,545	1,273	814	267	192
Darke	37	19	12	4	3
Defiance	32	16	10	3	3
Delaware	263	132	84	28	20
Erie	93	47	30	10	7
Fairfield	217	109	69	23	17
Fayette	38	19	12	4	3
Franklin	4,471	2,236	1,431	469	336

Table A-2 (continued)

County	Total couples*	Total to marry	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3**
Fulton	39	20	12	4	4
Gallia	26	13	8	3	2
Geauga	98	49	31	10	8
Greene	226	113	72	24	17
Guernsey	33	17	11	3	3
Hamilton	1,798	899	575	189	135
Hancock	101	51	32	11	8
Hardin	31	16	10	3	3
Harrison	14	7	4	1	2
Henry	22	11	7	2	2
Highland	42	21	13	4	4
Hocking	35	18	11	4	3
Holmes	25	13	8	3	2
Huron	102	29	18	6	5
Jackson	71	20	13	4	3
Jefferson	57	37	23	8	6
Knox	40	30	19	6	5
Lake	73	103	66	22	15
Lawrence	60	48	31	10	7
Licking	205	125	80	26	19
Logan	96	25	16	5	4
Lorain	250	167	107	35	25
Lucas	50	454	290	95	69
Madison	334	32	20	7	5
Mahoning	907	123	78	26	19
Marion	64	35	22	7	6
Medina	245	79	50	16	13
Meigs	69	11	7	2	2
Mercer	157	15	9	3	3
Miami	22	67	43	14	10
Monroe	29	4	3	1	0
Montgomery	133	574	367	121	86
Morgan	8	3	2	1	0
Morrow	1,148	17	11	3	3
Muskingum	6	53	34	11	8
Noble	33	5	3	1	1
Ottawa	106	23	14	5	4
Paulding	9	3	2	1	0
Perry	45	18	12	4	2
Pickaway	6	46	29	10	7
Pike	36	11	7	2	2
Portage	91	110	70	23	17
Preble	22	19	12	4	3

Table A-2 (continued)

County	Total couples*	Total to marry	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3**
Putnam	220	14	9	3	2
Richland	38	75	48	16	11
Ross	28	57	36	12	9
Sandusky	150	19	12	4	3
Scioto	114	54	35	11	8
Seneca	38	32	20	7	5
Shelby	108	24	15	5	4
Stark	63	246	157	52	37
Summit	47	525	336	110	79
Trumbull	492	115	73	24	18
Tuscarawas	1,049	41	26	9	6
Union	71	36	23	7	6
Van Wert	24	12	8	3	1
Vinton	20	10	6	2	2
Warren	231	116	74	24	18
Washington	74	37	24	8	5
Wayne	77	39	25	8	6
Williams	33	17	11	3	3
Wood	180	90	58	19	13
Wyandot	15	8	5	2	1

*From Table A-1. **Computed as Total to marry less Year 1 less Year 2.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Table PCT15; author's calculations based on Kastanis, *et al*.

Table A-3
County Marriage License Revenue from Same-Gender Couples

County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Ohio total	**$ 314,650**	**$ 103,450**	**$ 74,025**	Coshocton	600	200	150
Adams	450	150	125	Crawford	400	150	100
Allen	1,900	650	450	Cuyahoga	40,700	13,350	9,575
Ashland	700	250	175	Darke	600	200	125
Ashtabula	2,000	650	500	Defiance	500	150	150
Athens	1,850	600	425	Delaware	4,200	1,400	975
Auglaize	600	200	100	Erie	1,500	500	325
Belmont	1,500	500	350	Fairfield	3,450	1,150	825
Brown	750	250	175	Fayette	600	200	150
Butler	7,800	2,550	1,850	Franklin	71,550	23,450	16,775
Carroll	300	100	50	Fulton	600	200	175
Champaign	600	200	175	Gallia	400	150	100
Clark	3,000	1,000	725	Geauga	1,550	500	400
Clermont	4,200	1,400	1,000	Greene	3,600	1,200	850
Clinton	700	250	150	Guernsey	550	150	125
Columbiana	1,550	500	400	Hamilton	28,750	9,450	6,750

Table A-3 (continued)

County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Hancock	1,600	550	375	Noble	150	50	25
Hardin	500	150	125	Ottawa	700	250	175
Harrison	200	50	100	Paulding	100	50	0
Henry	350	100	100	Perry	600	200	100
Highland	650	200	200	Pickaway	1,450	500	325
Hocking	550	200	125	Pike	350	100	100
Holmes	400	150	75	Portage	3,500	1,150	850
Huron	900	300	225	Preble	600	200	150
Jackson	650	200	150	Putnam	450	150	100
Jefferson	$ 1,150	$ 400	$ 275	Richland	2,400	800	550
Knox	950	300	250	Ross	1,800	600	450
Lake	3,300	1,100	725	Sandusky	600	200	150
Lawrence	1,550	500	350	Scioto	1,750	550	400
Licking	4,000	1,300	950	Seneca	1,000	350	225
Logan	800	250	200	Shelby	750	250	175
Lorain	5,350	1,750	1,250	Stark	7,850	2,600	1,850
Lucas	14,500	4,750	3,425	Summit	16,800	5,500	3,925
Madison	1,000	350	250	Trumbull	3,650	1,200	875
Mahoning	3,900	1,300	925	Tuscarawas	1,300	450	275
Marion	1,100	350	275	Union	1,150	350	275
Medina	2,500	800	625	Van Wert	400	150	50
Meigs	350	100	100	Vinton	$ 300	$ 100	$ 100
Mercer	450	150	125	Warren	3,700	1,200	875
Miami	2,150	700	475	Washington	1,200	400	250
Monroe	150	50	0	Wayne	1,250	400	275
Montgomery	18,350	6,050	4,300	Williams	$ 550	$ 150	$ 125
Morgan	100	50	0	Wood	2,900	950	650
Morrow	550	150	125	Wyandot	250	100	25
Muskingum	1,700	550	400				

Source: Calculated from Table A-2 totals.

Table A-4
Total Same-Gender Wedding Spending by County in the First Three Years

County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Ohio total	**$ 56,550,487**	**$ 18,592,570**	**$ 13,306,025**	**$ 88,449,082**
Adams	79,627	26,542	22,119	128,287
Allen	333,575	114,118	79,005	526,698
Ashland	122,541	43,765	30,635	196,941
Ashtabula	340,987	110,821	85,247	537,055
Athens	319,164	103,513	73,321	495,998
Auglaize	105,644	35,215	17,607	158,465

Table A-4 (continued)

County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Belmont	$ 274,004	$ 91,335	$ 63,934	$ 429,273
Brown	132,711	44,237	30,966	207,914
Butler	1,369,414	447,693	324,797	2,141,904
Carroll	53,084	17,695	8,847	79,627
Champaign	104,731	34,910	30,547	170,188
Clark	513,001	171,000	123,975	807,977
Clermont	794,919	264,973	189,266	1,249,158
Clinton	123,864	44,237	26,542	194,643
Columbiana	261,123	84,233	67,386	412,742
Coshocton	105,035	35,012	26,259	166,306
Crawford	70,779	26,542	17,695	115,016
Cuyahoga	6,835,464	2,242,099	1,608,098	10,685,661
Darke	102,296	34,099	21,312	157,707
Defiance	87,021	26,106	26,106	139,233
Delaware	769,341	256,447	178,597	1,204,385
Erie	265,422	88,474	57,508	411,404
Fairfield	602,205	200,735	144,006	946,946
Fayette	103,817	34,606	25,954	164,376
Franklin	12,815,591	4,200,218	3,004,634	20,020,444
Fulton	106,556	35,519	31,079	173,153
Gallia	71,646	26,867	17,911	116,424
Geauga	326,395	105,289	84,231	515,914
Greene	630,213	210,071	148,800	989,084
Guernsey	94,887	25,878	21,565	142,330
Hamilton	5,295,465	1,740,596	1,243,283	8,279,344
Hancock	285,771	98,234	66,978	450,983
Hardin	80,933	24,280	20,233	125,446
Harrison	35,390	8,847	17,695	61,932
Henry	60,560	17,303	17,303	95,165
Highland	109,503	33,693	33,693	176,890
Hocking	93,214	33,896	21,185	148,295
Holmes	72,051	27,019	13,510	112,580
Huron	162,115	54,038	40,529	256,682
Jackson	112,139	34,504	25,878	172,521
Jefferson	201,855	70,211	48,270	320,336
Knox	168,101	53,084	44,237	265,422
Lake	574,337	191,446	126,180	891,962
Lawrence	259,533	83,720	58,604	401,858
Licking	700,236	227,577	166,306	1,094,119
Logan	149,379	46,681	37,345	233,405
Lorain	925,699	302,799	216,285	1,444,782
Lucas	3,082,768	1,009,872	728,171	4,820,811
Madison	176,948	61,932	44,237	283,117

Table A-4 (continued)

County	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Mahoning	$ 637,205	$ 212,402	$ 151,132	$ 1,000,739
Marion	185,313	58,963	46,328	290,604
Medina	484,570	155,062	121,142	760,775
Meigs	61,932	17,695	17,695	97,321
Mercer	79,689	26,563	22,136	128,388
Miami	390,560	127,159	86,287	604,006
Monroe	24,584	8,195	0	32,779
Montgomery	3,770,944	1,243,281	883,654	5,897,879
Morgan	17,695	8,847	0	26,542
Morrow	97,321	26,542	22,119	145,982
Muskingum	307,078	99,349	72,254	478,681
Noble	26,542	8,847	4,424	39,813
Ottawa	156,997	56,070	39,249	252,317
Paulding	17,049	8,525	0	25,574
Perry	106,169	35,390	17,695	159,253
Pickaway	247,951	85,500	55,575	389,026
Pike	61,271	17,506	17,506	96,282
Portage	593,180	194,902	144,058	932,140
Preble	103,513	34,504	25,878	163,895
Putnam	81,973	27,324	18,216	127,514
Richland	407,968	135,989	93,493	637,450
Ross	314,194	104,731	78,549	497,474
Sandusky	102,296	34,099	25,574	161,969
Scioto	302,799	95,165	69,211	467,175
Seneca	171,000	59,850	38,475	269,326
Shelby	129,391	43,130	30,191	202,712
Stark	1,334,396	441,966	314,475	2,090,837
Summit	2,906,867	951,653	679,134	4,537,653
Trumbull	616,752	202,768	147,851	967,371
Tuscarawas	226,254	78,319	47,861	352,434
Union	210,070	63,934	50,234	324,238
Van Wert	68,603	25,726	8,575	102,904
Vinton	53,084	17,695	17,695	88,474
Warren	704,036	228,336	166,495	1,098,867
Washington	208,850	69,617	43,510	321,977
Wayne	223,259	71,443	49,117	343,818
Williams	94,887	25,878	21,565	142,330
Wood	519,430	170,158	116,424	806,012
Wyandot	43,765	17,506	4,376	65,647

Source: Author's calculations.

Works Cited

Badgett, M.V. Lee, and Jody L. Herman. "Patterns of Relationship Recognition by Same-Sex Couples in the United States." The Williams Institute, November 2011. Web. 7 July 2012.

Cost of Wedding. 2012. The Wedding Report, Inc. Web. 29 June 2012.

"DP02: Selected Social Characteristics in the United States, 2010, American Community Survey. United States and Ohio." *American FactFinder*. 2011. Bureau of the Census. Web. 12 July 2012.

Fields, Reginald. "Numbers Aside, Ohio Is Losing Young Talent." *The Plain Dealer*, 17 November 2011. Page B1. *NewsBank*. Web. 12 July 2012.

Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books. 2002.

Gates, Gary J., and Abigail M. Cooke. "Census Snapshot: 2010 Methodology – Adjustment Procedures for Same-Sex Couple Data." The Williams Institute, 28 September 2011. Web. 29 June 2012.

Goldberg, Naomi G., Michael D. Steinberger, and M.V. Lee Badgett. "The Business Boost from Marriage Equality: Evidence from the Health and Marriage Equality in Massachusetts Survey." The Williams Institute, 15 May 2009. Web. 2 July 2012.

Kastanis, Angeliki, M.V. Lee Badgett, and Jody L. Herman. "The Economic Impact of Extending Marriage to Same-Sex Couples in Washington State." The Williams Institute, 21 January 2012. Web. 22 June 2012.

"Lodging Tax: Amounts Collected by Local Governments, Calendar Year 2009." Tax Analysis Division, Ohio Department of Taxation, 12 August 2011. Web. 7 July 2012.

"Major Ohio Employers." Office of Policy Research and Strategic Planning, Ohio Department of Development, May 2012. Web. 12 July 2012.

O'Connell, Martin, and Sarah Feliz. "Same-sex Couple Household Statistics from the 2010 Census." Bureau of the Census, 27 September 2011. Web. 24 June 2012.

"PCT15: Husband-Wife and Unmarried-Partner Households by Sex of Partner by Presence of Related and Own Children Under 18 Years, 2010, Census Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data. All Counties: Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia." *American FactFinder*. 2011. Bureau of the Census. Web. 24 June 2012.

"Sales and Use Tax: County and Regional Transit Authority Permissive Sales and Use Tax Collections and Tax Rates, Calendar Year 2011 and 2010." Tax Analysis Division, Ohio Department of Taxation, 22 February 2012. Web. 9 July 2012.

The Wedding Report. 2012. The Wedding Report, Inc. Web. 7 July 2012.