

APPENDIX

Blocked from the Ballot Box

Structural Obstacles Depress Turnout, Exacerbate Ballot Rejections Across Racial Lines

HIGHLIGHTS

Effective participation in elections is at the heart of our political system, but not everyone is equally represented. Class and race disparities affect whether a person votes and how likely their ballot is to be counted—and inconsistent and inequitable rules exacerbate these inequities. Groups that experience more institutional barriers throughout the voting process and who are less likely to have their ballots counted are underrepresented in the political process, and public policies are less likely to protect their health, safety, and well-being. It can be difficult to even access clear, usable data about turnout and ballot rejections.

Fortunately, there are active measures we can take to advance racial equity in elections. Better policies for ballot design, including expanding language and disability access, can decrease rejection rates. And more election data transparency—making sure key election data is clear, accessible, and usable—can help us better understand and alleviate these gaps.

Data Tables

Liza Gordon-Rogers

Rose Nafa

September 2025 (corrected March 2026)

www.ucs.org/resources/blocked-ballot-box
es.ucs.org/recursos/barreras-al-voto

<https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DZKGSJ>

CONTENTS

Table A1. 2016 General Election County Turnout	3
Table A2. 2016 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority	4
Table A3. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2016)	5
Table A4. 2020 General Election County Turnout	6
Table A5. 2020 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority	7
Table A6. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2020)	8
Table A7. 2024 General Election County Turnout	9
Table A8. 2024 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority	10
Table A9. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2024)	11
Table A10. Ballots Included in Ballot Rejection Data	12
Table A11. 2016 General Election Ballot Rejection by County	13
Table A12. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Columbus County, NC	13
Table A13. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Durham County, NC	14
Table A14. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Mecklenburg County, NC	15
Table A15. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Maricopa County, AZ	16
Table A16. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2016)	17
Table A17. 2020 General Election Ballot Rejection by County	18
Table A18. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Fulton County, GA	18
Table A19. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Philadelphia County, PA	19
Table A20. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Durham County, NC	20
Table A21. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Columbus County, NC	21
Table A22. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Mecklenburg County, NC	22
Table A23. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2020)	23
Table A24. 2024 General Election Ballot Rejection by County	23
Table A25. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Cuyahoga County, OH	24
Table A26. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Philadelphia County, PA	25
Table A27. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Wayne County, MI	26
Table A28. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2024)	27

Table A1. 2016 General Election County Turnout

County	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
Maricopa, AZ	736	70.39	72.18	0	51.30	52.27	22
Fulton, GA	366	73.25	76.69	23	55.34	55.30	39
Wayne, MI	1,061	NA	NA	1,061	55.41	55.16	50
Columbus, NC	28	65.41	65.93	10	55.99	57.54	1
Durham, NC	58	68.93	71.46	5	66.34	67.00	3
Mecklenburg, NC	195	61.77	62.60	1	61.70	62.75	1
Cuyahoga, OH	976	66.69	68.91	13	60.85	61.64	3
Lorain, OH	189	68.05	71.84	0	60.33	60.55	9
Allegheny, PA	1,322	70.77	72.43	1	64.82	65.50	19
Philadelphia, PA	1,686	64.42	64.98	0	59.47	60.14	26
Milwaukee, WI	2,746	77.48	80.04	15	58.58	59.29	374

Note: Voter registration data for Wayne County in 2016 are available only in an image-based pdf, which did not allow for their use in this analysis. NA are the number of precincts for which we do not have data.

Table A2. 2016 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority

Majority Race	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
White	5,556	75.49	77.27	512	62.35	63.08	332
Black	2,582	64.60	64.90	502	59.15	59.84	96
Hispanic	431	63.04	62.22	17	37.52	33.60	14
API	14	58.76	60.02	1	42.43	39.36	0
Native	8	47.66	44.38	1	30.01	34.25	1
Plurality	772	62.44	62.70	95	46.21	45.53	104

Note: Registered turnout columns do not include values from Wayne County, MI, as registration data was available only as an imaged-based pdf.

Table A3. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2016)

	Registered Turnout Model 1		Registered Turnout Model 2		CVAP Turnout Model 1		CVAP Turnout Model 2	
Intercept	75.487***	(0.126)	73.874***	(3.179)	62.349***	(0.207)	56.740***	(4.203)
Majority Black	-10.889***	(0.233)	-10.723***	(0.210)	-3.203***	(0.365)	-3.279***	(0.381)
Majority Hispanic	-12.451***	(0.457)	-13.947***	(0.396)	-24.829***	(0.762)	-23.839***	(0.764)
Majority API	-16.723***	(2.485)	-16.642***	(2.109)	-19.921***	(4.009)	-20.734***	(3.930)
Majority Native	-27.8230***	(3.384)	-26.210***	(2.883)	-32.339***	(5.665)	-26.730***	(5.577)
Racial Plurality	-13.042***	(0.366)	-11.267***	(0.321)	-16.136***	(0.616)	-16.646***	(0.621)
Georgia			8.470*	(3.763)			1.209	(5.065)
North Carolina			-4.077	(3.730)			8.753+	(4.977)
Ohio			-3.838	(3.899)			5.603	(5.165)
Pennsylvania			-1.799	(3.890)			8.578+	(5.139)
Wisconsin			7.720***	(4.488)			5.262	(5.924)
Michigan							1.191	(5.936)
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			3.166				4.164	
SD (Observations)			7.588				14.679	
R2	0.289				0.158			
R2 Adj.	0.289				0.157			
R2_M.			.450				.178	
R2_C.			.531				.240	
Num.Obs.	8,235		8,235		8,816		8,816	

Notes: Model 1 reference category is majority-White precincts. Model 1 is a baseline OLS regression. Model 2 includes state-level fixed effects and a random slope to capture between-county variance. State reference category is Arizona. R2_M = Marginal R squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effect only; R2_C = Conditional R squared, which explains the variance of the fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05 +p<.1

Table A4. 2020 General Election County Turnout

County	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
Maricopa, AZ	743	82.49	85.01	8	63.06	66.15	1
Fulton, GA	400	63.75	66.72	28	60.61	60.65	59
Wayne, MI	982	62.69	61.21	23	61.35	61.01	59
Columbus, NC	28	75.54	74.12	0	65.69	68.23	1
Durham, NC	58	72.76	74.89	0	69.57	70.32	0
Mecklenburg, NC	195	71.43	72.86	0	67.46	68.34	2
Cuyahoga, OH	937	72.53	76.34	11	61.74	61.38	2
Lorain, OH	181	74.68	79.10	7	65.05	66.95	3
Allegheny, PA	1,319	75.07	78.42	15	70.44	71.75	25
Philadelphia, PA	1,692	66.08	66.62	26	60.16	61.30	1
Milwaukee, WI	587	79.12	81.96	2	63.62	64.29	29

Table A5. 2020 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority

Majority Race	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
White	3,909	79.15	81.20	75	69.86	71.21	55
Black	2,083	60.72	61.51	18	60.04	60.64	26
Hispanic	286	58.19	59.62	1	39.65	39.86	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	62.70	60.74	1	33.10	29.75	0
Native	9	69.57	66.57	4	38.12	40.30	2
Plurality	820	65.59	67.14	21	49.59	48.80	99

Table A6. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2020)

	Registered Turnout Model 1		Registered Turnout Model 2		CVAP Turnout Model 1		CVAP Turnout Model 2	
Intercept	79.153***	(0.179)	87.509***	(1.656)	69.862***	(0.216)	70.029***	(2.868)
Majority Black	-18.432***	(0.303)	-15.829***	(0.305)	-9.825***	(0.366)	-8.959***	(0.395)
Majority Hispanic	-20.960***	(0.682)	-23.709***	(0.648)	-30.207***	(0.821)	-30.020***	(0.837)
Majority API	-16.452***	(2.975)	-13.655***	(2.745)	-36.762***	(3.464)	-36.326***	(3.434)
Majority Native	-9.580+	(4.972)	-17.936***	(4.598)	-31.743***	(5.065)	-31.910***	(5.037)
Racial Plurality	-13.564***	(0.432)	-12.452***	(0.413)	-20.268***	(0.543)	-20.179***	(0.557)
Georgia			-13.776***	(2.372)			-1.755	(4.091)
Michigan			-15.231***	(5.355)			-2.316	(4.051)
North Carolina			-9.423***	(2.040)			3.891	(3.449)
Ohio			-9.423***	(2.050)			-3.235	(3.534)
Pennsylvania			-10.315***	(2.017)			0.984	(3.502)
Wisconsin			-1.708	(2.346)			-0.352	(4.062)
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			1.608				2.823	
SD (Observations)			10.242				13.259	
R2	0.386				0.287			
R2 Adj.	0.386				0.286			
R2_M.			.469				0.281	
R2_C.			.481				0.313	
Num.Obs.	7,002		7,002		6,940		6,940	

Notes: Model 1 is a baseline OLS regression. Reference category is majority-White precincts. Model 2 includes state-level fixed effects and a random slope to capture between-county variance. Reference categories are majority-White precincts and Arizona. R2_M = Marginal R squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effect only; R2_C = Conditional R squared, which explains the variance of the fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: + $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table A7. 2024 General Election County Turnout

County	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
Maricopa, AZ	935	79.24	82.37	30	64.72	66.36	97
Fulton, GA	481	69.03	72.50	25	64.84	66.50	85
Wayne, MI	801	55.52	53.27	1	61.28	60.66	30
Columbus, NC	21	70.20	70.63	0	68.82	65.87	1
Durham, NC	59	71.83	73.39	9	75.16	76.13	13
Mecklenburg, NC	195	68.76	70.31	0	72.80	72.34	20
Cuyahoga, OH	995	61.32	68.46	102	59.28	59.24	82
Lorain, OH	205	72.40	77.17	0	63.98	66.94	24
Allegheny, PA	1,327	74.50	78.32	0	69.40	70.75	207
Philadelphia, PA	1,703	64.49	64.47	3	63.52	62.94	112
Milwaukee, WI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: We were unable to obtain precinct-level data from Milwaukee County, WI, at the time of analysis.

Table A8. 2024 General Election Turnout by Racial Majority

Majority Race	Precincts	Mean Registered Turnout (%)	Median Registered Turnout (%)	NA	Mean CVAP Turnout (%)	Median CVAP Turnout (%)	NA
White	3,738	75.35	77.68	72	69.99	71.60	415
Black	1,883	55.60	57.30	36	58.56	57.68	114
Hispanic	220	53.38	53.23	1	46.81	44.96	7
Asian/Pacific Islander	14	61.10	58.33	2	51.43	56.63	3
Native	5	51.09	52.31	0	31.64	31.28	0
Plural	606	61.26	63.57	33	54.39	53.40	66
NA	256	75.96	82.22	26	68.45	71.35	66

Table A9. Regression Models Predicting Racial Turnout (2024)

	Registered Turnout Model 1		Registered Turnout Model 2		CVAP Turnout Model 1		CVAP Turnout Model 2	
Intercept	75.350***	(0.199)	83.902***	(2.915)	69.990***	(0.285)	69.990***	(1.742)
Majority Black	-19.752***	(0.343)	-17.193***	(0.333)	-11.433***	(0.484)	-11.433***	(0.484)
Majority Hispanic	-21.965***	(0.837)	-25.156***	(0.762)	-23.179***	(1.162)	-23.179***	(1.162)
Majority API	-14.340***	(3.985)	-15.237***	(3.093)	-18.563***	(4.963)	-18.563***	(4.963)
Majority Native	-24.255***	(5.385)	-32.807***	(4.794)	-38.352***	(7.355)	-38.352***	(7.355)
Racial Plurality	-14.087***	(0.541)	-15.320***	(0.492)	-15.601***	(0.762)	-15.601***	(0.762)
Georgia			-4.652	(4.138)				
Michigan			-18.970***	(4.126)				
North Carolina			-7.286*	(3.477)				
Ohio			-13.109***	(3.583)				
Pennsylvania			-7.814*	(3.566)				
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			2.891				5.299	
SD (Observations)			10.688					
R2	0.378				0.156			
R2 Adj.	0.377				0.155			
R2_M.			0.477				0.164	
R2_C.			0.513				0.244	
Num.Obs.	6,322		6,322		5,861		5,861	

Model 1 is a baseline OLS model. Model 2 includes state-level fixed effects and a random slope to capture between-county variance. Due to the small amount of county-level variance in CVAP Model 2, random effects were ignored and the model reverted back to an OLS model. R2_M = Marginal R squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effect only; R2_C = Conditional R squared, which explains the variance of the fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: + $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table A10. Ballots Included in Ballot Rejection Data

County	2016	2020	2024
Maricopa, AZ	Absentee + provisional	Provisional	NA
Fulton, GA	Absentee + provisional	Absentee (provisional subgroup in absentee file)	NA
Wayne, MI	Provisional	NA	NA
Columbus, NC	Absentee + Provisional	Absentee + Provisional	NA
Durham, NC	Absentee + Provisional	Absentee + Provisional	NA
Mecklenburg, NC	Absentee + Provisional	Absentee + Provisional	NA
Cuyahoga, OH	NA	Provisional	Provisional + vote by mail + post vote by mail
Lorain, OH	NA	Provisional	NA
Allegheny, PA	NA	NA	NA
Philadelphia, PA	NA	Absentee	Absentee + provisional
Milwaukee, WI	NA	NA	NA

Table A11. 2016 General Election Ballot Rejection by County

County	Precincts	Mean Rejection (%)	Median Rejection (%)	NA
Maricopa, AZ	736	1.79	1.54	60
Columbus, NC	28	4.48	2.89	2
Durham, NC	58	6.76	5.09	0
Mecklenburg, NC	195	4.46	3.61	1

Note: Ballot rejection data for 2016 are not available from Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, or Wisconsin.

Table A12. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Columbus County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
NO RECORD OF REGISTRATION	92	71.88
PREVIOUSLY REMOVED	28	21.88
JURISDICTION DISPUTE	3	2.34
INCORRECT PRECINCT	2	1.56
NO ACCEPTABLE ID	1	0.78
UNRECOGNIZED ADDRESS (GEOCODE ISSUE)	1	0.78
UNREPORTED MOVE	1	0.78
Total	128	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A13. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Durham County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
NO RECORD OF REGISTRATION	748	72.13
UNREPORTED MOVE	97	9.35
JURISDICTION DISPUTE	63	6.08
INCORRECT PRECINCT	59	5.69
NO ACCEPTABLE ID	27	2.60
PREVIOUSLY REMOVED	21	2.03
VOTER ALREADY VOTED	10	0.96
UNRECOGNIZED ADDRESS (GEOCODE ISSUE)	8	0.77
INCORRECT PARTY	2	0.19
VOTED DURING EXTENDED HOURS	2	0.19
Total	1,037	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A14. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Mecklenburg County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
NO RECORD OF REGISTRATION	1,864	90.62
UNREPORTED MOVE	89	4.33
INCORRECT PRECINCT	36	1.75
NO ACCEPTABLE ID	27	1.31
PREVIOUSLY REMOVED	21	1.02
VOTER ALREADY VOTED	10	0.49
UNRECOGNIZED ADDRESS (GEOCODE ISSUE)	6	0.29
JURISDICTION DISPUTE	3	0.15
INCORRECT PARTY	1	0.05
Total	2,057	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A15. 2016 Rejection Breakdown for Maricopa County, AZ

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
YOU ARE NOT REGISTERED TO VOTE	8,467	25.45
Provisional: No Signature	7,801	23.44
Provisional: Returned Late	5,359	16.11
Provisional: Bad Signature	5,123	15.40
YOU WERE NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN THIS ELECTION.	2,841	8.54
YOU WENT TO THE WRONG POLLING PLACE FOR THIS ELECTION.	2,144	6.44
INCOMPLETE INFORMATION GIVEN ON YOUR PROVISIONAL BALLOT FORM.	851	2.56
YOUR EARLY BALLOT WAS SENT, RETURNED, AND COUNTED	383	1.15
INSUFFICIENT IDENTIFICATION PROVIDED AFTER ELECTION DAY	305	0.92
Total	33,274	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A16. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2016)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Intercept	1.612***	(0.100)	3.329**	(1.218)
Majority Black	0.173	(0.225)	-0.005	(0.235)
Majority Hispanic	1.081***	(0.303)	1.303***	(0.286)
Majority API	-1.612	(2.837)	-1.392	(2.625)
Majority Native	8.565***	(1.640)	7.797***	(1.517)
Racial Plurality	1.746***	(0.227)	1.357***	(0.214)
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			2.412	
SD (Observations)			2.620	
R2	0.067			
R2 Adj.	0.063			
R2_M.			0.032	
R2_C.			.470	
Num.Obs.	1,293		1,293	

Notes: Model 1 is a baseline OLS regression with a reference category of majority-White precincts. Model 2 is a mixed effects model with county-level random slopes. R^2_M = Marginal R-squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effects only; R^2_C = Conditional R-squared, which explains the variance from both fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table A17. 2020 General Election Ballot Rejection by County

County	Precincts	Mean Rejection (%)	Median Rejection (%)	NA
Maricopa, AZ	743	0.64	0.66	164
Fulton, GA	400	0.19	0.13	20
Columbus, NC	28	3.30	2.79	2
Durham, NC	58	4.38	2.88	3
Mecklenburg, NC	195	2.21	2.02	26
Lorain, OH	181	12.26	11.27	13
Cuyahoga, OH	937	12.64	11.54	0
Philadelphia, PA	1,692	1.90	1.32	350

Table A18. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Fulton County, GA

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
MISSING SIGNATURE	431	57.47
BALLOT RECEIVED AFTER DEADLINE	268	35.73
INVALID SIGNATURE	50	6.67
MIDR - ID NOT PROVIDED	1	0.13
Total	750	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A19. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Philadelphia County, PA

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
Not Registered	2,889	69.25
Voted by conventional alternative or absentee mail in	793	19.01
Registered in a different county	433	10.38
Duplicate Provisional Ballot Cast	35	0.84
Signatures are not genuine	13	0.31
Registered in different election district	9	0.22
Total	4,172	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A20. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Durham County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
NOT REGISTERED	689	55.30
Blank	285	22.87
VOTING OUT OF PRECINCT	116	9.31
REMOVED	55	4.41
MOVED OUT OF COUNTY MORE THAN 30 DAYS	23	1.85
VOTER ALREADY VOTED	18	1.44
PREVIOUSLY DENIED	15	1.20
REGISTRATION AFTER DEADLINE	14	1.12
ID NOT PROVIDED	12	0.96
OTHER	10	0.80
INELIGIBLE TO VOTE	9	0.72
Toal	1,246	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A21. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Columbus County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
Blank	159	54.08
NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN CURRENT ELECTION	121	41.16
VOTING OUT OF PRECINCT	9	3.06
NOT REGISTERED	4	1.36
BALLOT MISSING FROM ENVELOPE	1	0.34
Total	294	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A22. 2020 Rejection Breakdown for Mecklenburg County, NC

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
NOT REGISTERED	975	38.89
Blank	569	22.70
VOTING OUT OF PRECINCT	362	14.44
REGISTRATION AFTER DEADLINE	215	8.58
REMOVED	139	5.54
MOVED OUT OF COUNTY MORE THAN 30 DAYS	64	2.55
VOTER ALREADY VOTED	48	1.91
ID NOT PROVIDED	40	1.60
PROVISIONAL APPLICATION INCOMPLETE/ILLEGIBLE	39	1.56
NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN CURRENT ELECTION	38	1.52
OTHER	17	0.68
INELIGIBLE TO VOTE	1	0.04
Total	2,507	100

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A23. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2020)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Intercept	4.762***	(0.175)	3.884*	(1.844)
Majority Black	0.712*	(0.284)	1.876**	(0.221)
Majority Hispanic	-2.304	(0.586)	1.861***	(0.429)
Majority API	-2.382	(2.818)	0.636	(2.020)
Majority Native American	-4.006	(3.332)	0.592	(2.393)
Racial Plurality	-0.270	(0.361)	2.005***	(0.267)
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			5.184	
SD (Observations)			5.325	
R2	0.008			
R2 Adj.	0.007			
R2_M.			.0016	
R2_C.			0.495	
Num.Obs.	3,656		3,656	

Notes: Model 1 is a baseline OLS regression. Model 2 is a mixed effects model with county-level random slopes. Reference category of majority-White precincts. R^2_M = Marginal R-squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effects only; R^2_C = Conditional R-squared, which explains the variance from both fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table A24. 2024 General Election Ballot Rejection by County

County	Precincts	Mean Rejection (%)	Median Rejection (%)	NA
Cuyahoga, OH	995	0.43	0.32	0
Philadelphia, PA	1,703	1.11	0.83	25

Table A25. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Cuyahoga County, OH

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
Not Registered	1,833	59.38
Missing Identification	441	14.29
Wrong Precinct	254	8.23
No Envelope	132	4.28
Non-matching Identification	126	4.08
Voted an Absent Voters Ballot	80	2.59
Missing Date of Birth	68	2.20
Missing Address	31	1.00
Non-matching Signature	28	0.91
Bad Address	26	0.84
Wrong County	26	0.84
No Signature	25	0.81
Voter Absentee Challenged	14	0.45
No Printed Name	3	0.10
Total	3,087	100.0

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A26. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Philadelphia County, PA

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
Undeliverable	3,606	27.24
No Signature	3,086	23.32
Returned Late	2,130	16.09
No Secrecy	1,374	10.38
No Date	1,254	9.47
Incorrect Date	900	6.80
ID Not Verified	886	6.69
Total	13,236	100.0

Notes: Percentages are rounded to the second decimal place.

Table A27. 2024 Rejection Breakdown for Wayne County, MI

	Total Rejected	Percent Rejected
VOTER HAS ALREADY VOTED THROUGH OTHER MEANS	9,878	66.12
VOTER MOVED AND ELIGIBLE TO VOTE IN NEW JURISDICTION	1,602	10.72
BALLOT RETURNED AFTER 8 PM ON ELECTION DAY	938	6.28
NO SIGNATURE	906	6.06
SIGNATURE DOES NOT MATCH	825	5.52
VOTER DIED BEFORE ELECTION DAY	713	4.77
VOTER STATUS MARKED CANCELLED	61	0.41
ID NOT CONFIRMED	8	0.05
ENVELOPE CONTAINED NO BALLOT	6	0.04
VOTER STATUS MARKED REJECTED	2	0.01
Total	14,939	100

Note: Two categories for rejection, “Voted at early voting site” and “Voted on Election Day,” were combined into one category, “Voted has already voted through other means.”

Table A28. Regression Models Predicting Ballot Rejections (2024)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Intercept	0.513***	(0.025)	0.509+	(0.263)
Majority Black	0.538***	(0.038)	0.437***	(0.037)
Majority Hispanic	1.252***	(0.087)	1.003***	(0.086)
Majority API	1.958***	(0.398)	1.700***	(0.383)
Racial Plurality	0.724***	(0.055)	0.605***	(0.054)
SD (Intercept CTY_ID)			0.371	
SD (Observations)			0.853	
R2	0.138			
R2 Adj.	0.1387			
R2_M.			0.089	
R2_C.			0.233	
Num.Obs.	2,673		2,673	

Notes: Model 1 is a baseline OLS regression. Model 2 is a mixed effects model with county-level random slopes. Reference category of majority-White precincts. R^2_M = Marginal R-squared, which explains the variance described by the fixed effects only; R^2_C = Conditional R-squared, which explains the variance from both fixed and random effects together. Significance levels: + $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

During post-publication review, we identified some issues affecting the specificity of turnout and rejection calculations, which we have addressed. Although none of these changes altered the core findings of the report, they do refine our calculations and improve the overall precision of the analysis. In addition to these specific changes, the revised report contains a modestly expanded discussion of the challenges of this type of data collection, formatting, and processing. The errata can be found at www.ucs.org/resources/blocked-ballot-box.