



RESEARCH AND ADVOCACY FOR REFORM



State-Level Estimates of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States, 2010

**Christopher Uggen and Sarah Shannon,
University of Minnesota**

Jeff Manza, New York University

July 2012

For further information:

The Sentencing Project
1705 DeSales St., NW
8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 628-0871
www.sentencingproject.org

This report was written by Christopher Uggen, Professor of Sociology at the University of Minnesota; Sarah Shannon, Ph.D. candidate at the University of Minnesota; and Jeff Manza, Professor of Sociology at New York University.

The Sentencing Project is a national non-profit organization engaged in research and advocacy on criminal justice issues.

The work of The Sentencing Project is supported by many individual donors and contributions from the following:

Morton K. and Jane Blaustein Foundation

Ford Foundation

Bernard F. and Alva B. Gimbel Foundation

General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church

JK Irwin Foundation

Open Society Foundations

Public Welfare Foundation

David Rockefeller Fund

Elizabeth B. and Arthur E. Roswell Foundation

Tikva Grassroots Empowerment Fund of Tides Foundation

Wallace Global Fund

Working Assets/CREDO

Copyright © 2012 by The Sentencing Project. Reproduction of this document in full or in part, and in print or electronic format, only by permission of The Sentencing Project

The United States is one of the world's strictest nations when it comes to denying the right to vote to citizens convicted of crimes. A remarkable 5.85 million Americans are forbidden to vote because of "felon disenfranchisement," or laws restricting voting rights for those convicted of felony-level crimes. In this election year, the question of voting restrictions is once again receiving great public attention. This report is intended to update and expand our previous work on the scope and distribution of felon disenfranchisement in the United States (see Uggen and Manza 2002; Manza and Uggen 2006). The numbers presented here represent our best assessment of the state of felon disenfranchisement as of December 31, 2010, the most recent year for which complete data are available. Our goal is to provide statistics that will help contextualize and anticipate the potential effects of felon disenfranchisement on elections in November 2012.

Our key findings include the following:

- Approximately 2.5 percent of the total U.S. voting age population – 1 of every 40 adults – is disenfranchised due to a current or previous felony conviction.
- Ex-felons in the eleven states that disenfranchise people after they have completed their sentences make up about 45 percent of the entire disenfranchised population, totaling over 2.6 million people.
- The number of people disenfranchised due to a felony conviction has escalated dramatically in recent decades as the population under criminal justice supervision has increased. There were an estimated 1.17 million people disenfranchised in 1976, 3.34 million in 1996, and over 5.85 million in 2010.
- Rates of disenfranchisement vary dramatically by state due to broad variations in voting prohibitions. In six states – Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia – more than 7 percent of the adult population is disenfranchised.
- 1 of every 13 African Americans of voting age is disenfranchised, a rate more than four times greater than non-African Americans. Nearly 7.7 percent of

the adult African American population is disenfranchised compared to 1.8 percent of the non-African American population.

- African American disenfranchisement rates also vary significantly by state. In three states – Florida (23 percent), Kentucky (22 percent), and Virginia (20 percent) – more than one in five African Americans is disenfranchised.

STATE DISENFRANCHISEMENT LAW

To compile estimates of disenfranchised populations, we take into account new U.S. Census data on voting age populations and recent changes in state-level disenfranchisement policies, the latter reported in *Expanding the Vote: State Felony Disenfranchisement Reform, 1997-2010* (Porter 2010). For example, in 2007, Maryland repealed its lifetime voting ban for all ex-felons. Several other states have revised their waiting periods and streamlined the process for regaining civil rights. As shown in the following table, Maine and Vermont remain the only states that allow prison inmates to vote. Thirty U.S. states deny voting rights to felony probationers, and thirty-five states disenfranchise parolees. In the most extreme cases, eleven states continue to deny voting rights to some or all of the “ex-felons” who have successfully fulfilled their prison, parole, or probation sentences (for details, see notes to Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of State Felon Disfranchisement Restrictions in 2010

No restriction (2)	Inmates only (13)	Inmates & Parolees (5)	Inmates, Parolees, & Probationers (19)	Inmates, Parolees, Probationers, & Ex-felons (11)
Maine	Hawaii	California	Alaska	Alabama
Vermont	Illinois	Colorado	Arkansas	Arizona ²
	Indiana	Connecticut	Georgia	Delaware ³
	Massachusetts	New York	Idaho	Florida
	Michigan	South Dakota*	Iowa* ¹	Kentucky
	Montana		Kansas	Mississippi
	New Hampshire		Louisiana	Nebraska* ⁴
	North Dakota		Maryland*	Nevada ⁵
	Ohio		Minnesota	Tennessee ⁶
	Oregon		Missouri	Virginia
	Pennsylvania		New Jersey	Wyoming
	Rhode Island*		New Mexico	
	Utah		North Carolina	
			Oklahoma	
			South Carolina	
			Texas	
			Washington*	
			West Virginia	
			Wisconsin	

Notes: * indicates a recent change (since 2004)

1 Governor Tom Vilsack restored voting rights to ex-felons via executive order on July 4, 2005. Governor Terry Branstad reversed this executive order on January 14, 2011.

2 State disenfranchises recidivists.

3 State requires a five-year waiting period.

4 Nebraska reduced its indefinite ban on ex-felon voting to a two-year waiting period in 2005.

5 State disenfranchises recidivists and those convicted of violent felonies.

6 State disenfranchises those convicted of felonies since 1981, in addition to those convicted of select crimes prior to 1973.

METHODOLOGY

We estimated the number of ex-prisoners and ex-felons based on demographic life tables for each state, as described in Uggen, Manza, and Thompson (2006) and Shannon et al. (2011). We modeled each state's disenfranchisement rate in accordance with its distinctive felon voting policies, as described in Table 1. For example, some states impose disenfranchisement for five years after release from

supervision, some states only disenfranchise recidivists, and some only disenfranchise those convicted of violent offenses.¹

In brief, we compiled demographic life tables for the period 1948-2010 to determine the number of released felons lost to recidivism (and therefore already included in our annual head counts) and to mortality each year. This allows us to compute the number of ex-felons in a given state and year who are no longer under correctional supervision yet remain disenfranchised. Our duration-specific recidivism rate estimates are derived from large-scale national studies of recidivism for prison releasees and probationers. Based on these studies, we assume that most ex-prisoners will be re-incarcerated (66 percent) and a smaller percentage of ex-probationers and jail inmates (57 percent) will cycle back through the criminal justice system. We also assume a substantially higher mortality rate for felons relative to the non-felon population. Both recidivists and deaths are removed from the ex-felon pool to avoid overestimating the number of ex-felons in the population. Each release cohort is thus reduced each successive year – at a level commensurate with the age-adjusted hazard rate for mortality and duration-adjusted hazard rate for recidivism – and added to each new cohort of releases. Overall, we produced more than 200 spreadsheets covering 63 years of data.² These provide the figures needed to compile disenfranchisement rate estimates that are keyed to the appropriate correctional populations for each state and year.


¹ In Florida, some can avoid a formal felony conviction by successfully completing a period of probation. According to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, as much as 40 percent of the total probation population holds this “adjudication withheld” status. According to reports by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, only about 50 percent of Florida probationers successfully complete probation. In light of this, we reduce the annual current disenfranchised felony probation numbers by 40 percent and disenfranchised ex-felons by 20 percent (.4*.5=.20) in each year in the life tables.

² Our data sources include numerous United States Department of Justice (DOJ) publications, including the annual *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, Probation and Parole in the United States*, as well as the *Prisoners and Jail Inmates at Midyear* series. Where available, we used data from state departments of corrections rather than national sources, as in the case of Minnesota. For early years, we also referenced *National Prisoner Statistics*, and *Race of Prisoners Admitted to State and Federal Institutions, 1926-1986*. We determined the median age of released prisoners based on annual data from the National Corrections Reporting Program. The recidivism rate we use to decrease the releasee population each year is based upon the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1989) “Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1983” study and “Recidivism of Felons on Probation 1986-1989.” For prisoners and parolees, we use a reincarceration rate of 18.6% at one year, 32.8% at two years, 41.4% at 3 years. Although rearrest rates have increased since 1983, the overall reconviction and reincarceration rates used for this study are much more stable (Langan and Levin 2002, p. 11). For probationers and jail inmates, the corresponding three-year failure rate is 36%, meaning that individuals are in prison or jail and therefore counted in a different population. To extend the analysis to subsequent years, we calculated a trend line using the ratio of increases provided by Hoffman and Stone-Meierhoefer (1980) on federal prisoners. By year 10, we estimate a 59.4% recidivism rate among released prisoners and parolees, which increases to 65.9% by year 62 (the longest observation period in this analysis). Because these estimates are higher than most long-term recidivism studies, they are likely to yield conservative estimates of the ex-felon population. We apply the same trend line to the 3-year probation and jail recidivism rate of 36%; by year 62, the recidivism rate is 57.3%. 1948 is the earliest year for which detailed data are available on releases from supervision.

DISENFRANCHISEMENT RATES IN 2010

Figure 1 shows the distribution of the 5.85 million disenfranchised felons across correctional populations. Current prison and jail inmates only represent about one-fourth of those disenfranchised. The remaining 75 percent are living in their communities, having fully completed their sentences or remaining supervised while on probation or parole.


Figure 1. Disenfranchisement Distribution across Correctional Populations, 2010



Variation across States


Due to differences in state laws and rates of criminal punishment, states vary widely in the practice of disenfranchisement. The maps and tables below represent the disenfranchised population as a percentage of the adult voting age population in each state. As noted above, we estimate that 5.85 million Americans are currently ineligible to vote by state law. As Figure 2 and the statistics in Table 3 show, state-level disenfranchisement rates in 2010 varied from less than .5 percent in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Dakota, and Utah (and zero in Maine and Vermont) to more than 7 percent in Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia.

Figure 2. Total Felon Disenfranchisement Rates, 2010




These figures show significant growth in recent decades, even as many states began to dismantle voting restrictions for formerly disenfranchised populations. Figure 3 displays disenfranchisement rates in 1980, retaining the same scale as in Figure 2. At that time, far more of the nation had disenfranchisement rates below .5 percent and no state disenfranchised more than 5 percent of its adult citizens.

Figure 3. Total Felon Disenfranchisement Rates, 1980



The cartogram in Figure 4 provides another way to visualize the current state of American disenfranchisement. Cartograms distort the land area on the map according to an alternative statistic, in this case total felon disenfranchisement. States that disenfranchise hundreds of thousands of former felons, such as Florida, Kentucky, and Virginia appear bloated in the cartogram. In contrast, the many Northeastern and Midwestern states that only disenfranchise current prison inmates shrivel in size. This distorted map thus provides a clear visual representation of the great range of differences in the scope and impact of felon disenfranchisement across the 50 states.


Figure 4. Cartogram of Total Disenfranchisement Rates by State, 2010



Variation over Time

Figure 5 illustrates the historical trend in U.S. disenfranchisement, showing growth in the disenfranchised population for selected years from 1960 to 2010. The number disenfranchised dropped between 1960 and 1976, as states began to expand voting rights in the civil rights era. Many states have continued to pare back their disenfranchisement provisions since the 1970s (see Behrens, Uggen, and Manza, 2003; Manza and Uggen, 2006). Nevertheless, the total number banned from voting continued to rise with the expansion in U.S. correctional populations. Today, we estimate that 5.85 million Americans are disenfranchised by virtue of a felony conviction.

Figure 5. Number Disenfranchised for Selected Years, 1960-2010



Variation by Race

Disenfranchisement rates vary tremendously across racial and ethnic groups, such that felon voting restrictions have an outsized impact on communities of color. Race and ethnicity have not been consistently reported in the data sources used to compile our estimates, so our ability to construct race-specific estimates is limited. This is especially problematic for Latinos, who now constitute a significant portion of the criminal justice population. Nevertheless, we developed a complete set of state-specific disenfranchisement estimates for the African American voting age population, as shown in Figures 6 and 7. We will first show a map of the African American disenfranchisement rate for 1980, and then show how the picture looks today. By 1980, the African American disenfranchisement rate already exceeded 10 percent of the adult population in states such as Arizona and Iowa, as shown in Figure 6. The figure also indicates that several Southeastern states disenfranchised more than 5 percent of their adult African American populations at that time.

Figure 6. African American Felon Disenfranchisement Rates, 1980





Figure 7 shows the corresponding rates for 2010, again retaining a common scale and shading to keep the map consistent with the 1980 map in Figure 6. African American disenfranchisement rates in Florida, Kentucky, and Virginia now exceed 20 percent of the adult voting age population. Much of the nation now disenfranchises at least 5 percent of its African American adult citizens.

Figure 7. African American Disenfranchisement Rates, 2010



RECENT CHANGES

The rate of total disenfranchised ex-felons in 2010 (2.50 percent) is quite similar to the 2004 figures reported by Manza and Uggen in 2006 (2.42 percent), despite state changes in disenfranchisement policy and population growth. Our estimates for African American disenfranchisement in 2010, however, are lower than those for 2004 – 7.66 percent versus 8.25 percent, respectively. For these estimates, we used the most inclusive denominator for the African American voting age population available from the 2010 Census to ensure that we do not overestimate the disenfranchisement rate for this population. While growth in the baseline population

for African Americans contributes to the decline in the disenfranchisement rate from previous estimates, the lion's share of the difference is due to an important refinement in our estimation procedures. For 2010, we used new race-specific recidivism rates (resulting in a higher rate for African Americans) that more accurately reflect current scholarship on recidivism. This results in a higher rate of attrition in our life tables, but produces a more conservative and, we believe, more accurate portrait of the number of disenfranchised African American felons. Though lower than in 2004, the 7.66 percent rate of disenfranchisement for African Americans remains more than four times greater than the non-African American rate of 1.77 percent.

Given the size of Florida's disenfranchised population, we also note a change in our estimation procedure for this state. Based on a state-specific recidivism report in 1999, our 2004 estimates included much higher recidivism rates for African Americans in Florida (up to 88% lifetime). A 2010 report from the Florida Department of Corrections shows that rates of recidivism for African Americans are now more closely in line with the national rates we apply to other states. In light of this more recent evidence, we begin applying our national rate of recidivism for African Americans (up to 73% lifetime) to Florida's African American ex-felons from 2005 onward. In 2010, more people were disenfranchised in Florida than in any other state and Florida's disenfranchisement rate remains highest among the 50 states.

As Table 1 noted, there have been several significant changes in state disenfranchisement policies since 2004. Most notably, Maryland and Washington eliminated disenfranchisement after the completion of sentence. Governor Tom Vilsack of Iowa re-enfranchised all of that state's ex-felons by executive order on July 4, 2005 – though that order was then reversed by his successor, Governor Terry Branstad, in January 2011. Other states have also reduced disenfranchisement through streamlining restoration of rights or re-enfranchising certain groups of felons. For example, Rhode Island now restricts voting rights only for prison inmates as opposed to all current felons, including those on probation and parole. Nebraska also instituted automatic restoration of voting rights after a two-year waiting period following sentence completion. In 2007, Florida Governor Charlie Crist enacted

procedures to restore voting rights to ex-felons more quickly. This process was later reversed by Governor Rick Scott in 2011 and replaced by a five-year waiting period before former felons can apply for restoration of civil rights.

Our intent here is to provide a portrait of disenfranchisement that would be accurate as of December 31, 2010. This provides a good basis for understanding the potential impact of disenfranchisement on turnout for elections in November, 2012, so long as there have not been significant legal changes or major shifts in correctional populations in the intervening two years.

DISENFRANCHISEMENT AND RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

States typically provide some limited mechanism for disenfranchised felons and former felons to restore their right to vote. These vary greatly in scope, eligibility requirements, and reporting practices. It is thus difficult to obtain consistent information about the rate and number of disenfranchised Americans whose rights are restored through these procedures. Nevertheless, Table 2 provides some basic information about state restoration of rights policies in those states that disenfranchise beyond sentence completion. The table shows how many people were disenfranchised, the number of restorations reported by state officials in a given reporting period, and the number restored as a percentage of the total number of ex-felons disenfranchised. For comparative purposes, we also show the total number of felons *released* over that reporting period and the number restored as a percentage of those released. Because some of those whose rights were restored had been released in earlier years, this only provides a rough estimate of a state's re-enfranchisement rate. The percentages of felons and former felons whose rights were restored vary widely, from less than 1 percent of all ex-felons in several states to over 16 percent in Delaware.

Despite our best efforts, we were unable to obtain complete data for all states on restoration of civil rights. Nonetheless, we subtracted the available numbers granted restoration of civil rights or full pardon from each state's total disenfranchised ex-felons. Even accounting for these restorations, it is clear that the vast majority of ex-felons in these states remain disenfranchised. Indeed, some states have significantly curtailed restoration efforts since 2010, including Iowa and Florida.

Table 2 - Restoration of Voting Rights in States that Disenfranchise Ex-Felons

State	Disenfranchised Ex-Felons (2010)	Restorations	Period of Restoration Estimates	% of Total Ex-Felons ¹	Felons Released in Period ²	% Restored
Alabama	198,031	8,466 ³	2004-2011	4.10%	113,778	7.44%
Arizona	95,893	N/A ⁴	-	-	-	-
Delaware	14,032	2,242 ⁵	1988-2010	13.78%	89,245	2.51%
Florida	1,323,360	264,059 ⁶	1990-2011	16.63%	736,984	35.83%
Iowa	115,210	115,210 ⁷	2005-2010	100%	61,426	100%
Kentucky	180,984	4,260 ⁸	2008-2010	2.30%	73,770	5.77%
Mississippi	127,346	106 ⁹	2000-2010	.08%	37,754	.28%
Nebraska	7,819	N/A ¹⁰	-	-	-	-
Nevada	59,919	281 ¹¹	1990-2011	.47%	169,517	.17%
Tennessee	247,808	9,558 ¹²	1990-2011	3.71%	461,347	2.07%
Virginia	351,943	8,580 ¹³	2002-2010	2.38%	309,943	2.77%
Wyoming	19,470	48 ¹⁴	2003-2011	.25%	17,303	.28%

Notes:

1 Denominator is total ex-felons before reduction for restorations.

2 Release information compiled from annual Bureau of Justice Statistics sources (without reduction for recidivism or mortality).

3 Source: Sarah Still, Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole, email communication on December 7, 2011.

4 Voting rights in Arizona are restored on a county-level basis and no statewide records are kept. Email communication with Donna Kish, Maricopa County Elections.

5 In Delaware, most felons can apply for automatic restoration of voting rights after a five year wait period. Our life tables account for this process. However, people convicted of certain felonies (e.g. murder, sex offenses), must receive a pardon to have their voting rights restored. This number represents the total number of pardons for the time period, which is a conservative number for our purposes. Source: Judy Smith, Delaware Board of Pardons, email communication December 5, 2011.

6 Source: Tammy Salmon, Office of Communications/Legislative Affairs, Florida Parole Commission, email communication on December 29, 2011.

7 Governor Vilsack issued an Executive Order on July 4, 2005 ending Iowa's previous disenfranchisement practice. On January 14, 2011, Governor Branstad reversed Vilsack's order, reinstating disenfranchisement of felons post-sentence.

8 Source: Nicole D. Porter, October 2010, "Expanding the Vote: State Felony Disenfranchisement Reform, 1997-2010." The Sentencing Project.

9 Voting rights in Mississippi can be restored through executive order from the governor or bills of suffrage in the legislature. By far, the most common route is via suffrage bill, as per email conversation with Phil Carter, Special Assistant Attorney General on December 6, 2011. Numbers here reflect successful suffrage bills in the Mississippi legislature. Source: Mississippi Legislative Bill Status System, accessed online: <http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/sessions.htm>.

10 Voting rights in Nebraska are automatically restored after a two-year waiting period. Our life table estimates have fully accounted for this process.

11 Source: Brian Campolieti, Nevada Parole Board, email communication December 5, 2011.

12 Source: Cara Harr, Division of Elections, Tennessee Department of State, email communication December 19, 2011.

13 See note 2.

14 Source: Joanne Struebing, Wyoming Board of Parole, email communication December 6, 2011.

SUMMARY

This report provides new state-level estimates on felon disenfranchisement for 2010 in the United States to update those provided by Uggen and Manza for previous years. In Tables 3 and 4, we provide state-specific point estimates of the disenfranchised population and African American disenfranchised population, subject to the caveats described below.

Despite significant legal changes in recent decades, over 5.85 million Americans remained disenfranchised in 2010. When we break these figures down by race, it is clear that disparities in the criminal justice system are linked to disparities in political representation. The distribution of disenfranchised felons shown in Figure 1 also bears repeating: only about one-fourth of this population is currently incarcerated, meaning that over 4 million of the adults who live, work, and pay taxes in their communities are banned from voting. Of this total, nearly one million are African American ex-felons alone. Public opinion research shows that a significant majority of Americans favor voting rights for probationers and parolees who are currently supervised in their communities, as well as for former felons who have completed their sentences (Manza, Brooks, and Uggen 2004). How much difference would it make if state laws were changed to reflect the principles most Americans endorse? The answer is straightforward: Voting rights would be restored to well over 4 million of the 5.85 million people currently disenfranchised.

CAVEATS

We have taken care to produce estimates of current populations and “ex-felon” populations that are reliable and valid by social science standards. Nevertheless, readers should bear in mind that our state-specific figures for the 11 states that bar ex-felons from voting remain point estimates rather than actual head counts. In other work, we have presented figures that adjust or “bound” these estimates by assuming different levels of recidivism, inter-state mobility, and state-specific variation. With these caveats in mind, the results reported here present our best account of the prevalence of U.S. disenfranchisement in 2010. These estimates will be adjusted if and when we discover errors or omissions in the data compiled from individual states, U.S. Census and Bureau of Justice Statistics sources, or in our own spreadsheets and estimation procedures.

Table 3. Estimates of Disenfranchised Felons, 2010

State	Prisoners	Parolees	Fel. Prob.	Jail Inmates	Ex-felons	Total	VAP	Disf. Rate
AK	5,597	2,089	6,959	7		14,652	522,853	2.80%
AL	31,764	9,006	22,017	1,536	198,031	262,354	3,647,277	7.19%
AR	16,204	21,106	27,250	633		65,193	2,204,443	2.96%
AZ	40,130	7,993	54,135	1,583	95,893	199,734	4,763,003	4.19%
CA	165,062	105,133		8,282		278,477	27,958,916	1.00%
CO	22,815	11,014		1,370		35,199	3,803,587	0.93%
CT	19,321	2,894				22,215	2,757,082	0.81%
DE	6,598	560	4,448		14,032	25,638	692,169	3.70%
FL	104,306	4,093	103,318	6,525	1,323,360	1,541,602	14,799,219	10.42%
GA	49,164	25,091	197,013	4,597		275,866	7,196,101	3.83%
HI	5,912					5,912	1,056,483	0.56%
IA	9,455	3,197	8,862	374		21,888	2,318,362	0.94%
ID	7,431	3,957	13,721	386		25,495	1,138,510	2.24%
IL	48,418			2,085		50,503	9,701,453	0.52%
IN	28,028			1,255		29,283	4,875,504	0.60%
KS	9,051	5,063	3,704	691		18,509	2,126,179	0.87%
KY	20,544	14,628	25,688	1,998	180,984	243,842	3,315,996	7.35%
LA	39,445	26,202	42,599	3,648		111,894	3,415,357	3.28%
MA	11,312			1,448		12,760	5,128,706	0.25%
MD	22,645	13,195	26,164	1,584		63,588	4,420,588	1.44%
ME							1,053,828	0.00%
MI	44,113			1,820		45,933	7,539,572	0.61%
MN	9,796	5,807	42,661	962		59,226	4,019,862	1.47%
MO	30,623	19,421	54,916	1,064		106,024	4,563,491	2.32%
MS	21,067	6,434	26,793	1,173	127,346	182,814	2,211,742	8.27%
MT	3,716			230		3,946	765,852	0.52%
NC	40,116	3,621	36,869	1,826		82,432	7,253,848	1.14%
ND	1,487			97		1,584	522,720	0.30%
NE	4,587	941	4,080	312	7,819	17,739	1,367,120	1.30%
NH	2,761			184		2,945	1,029,236	0.29%
NJ	25,007	15,563	57,517	2,289		100,376	6,726,680	1.49%
NM	6,659	3,146	17,781	781		28,367	1,540,507	1.84%
NV	12,653	4,964	8,067	717	59,919	86,321	2,035,543	4.24%
NY	56,656	48,542		2,935		108,133	15,053,173	0.72%
OH	51,712			2,130		53,842	8,805,753	0.61%
OK	26,252	2,627	21,642	970		51,491	2,821,685	1.82%
OR	14,014			683		14,697	2,964,621	0.50%
PA	51,264			3,608		54,872	9,910,224	0.55%
RI	3,357					3,357	828,611	0.41%
SC	23,578	6,412	11,739	1,427		43,156	3,544,890	1.22%
SD	3,434	2,843		145		6,422	611,383	1.05%
TN	27,451	12,157	52,178	2,221	247,808	341,815	4,850,104	7.05%
TX	173,649	104,763	247,136	6,939		532,487	18,279,737	2.91%
UT	6,807			672		7,479	1,892,858	0.40%
VT							496,508	0.00%
VA	37,410	2,624	56,654	2,840	351,943	451,471	6,147,347	7.34%
WA	18,235	6,956	26,785	1,114		53,090	5,143,186	1.03%
WI	22,724	19,572	22,602	1,361		66,259	4,347,494	1.52%
WV	6,681	1,796	6,876	288		15,640	1,465,576	1.07%
WY	2,112	682	3,236	157	19,470	25,657	428,224	5.99%
Total	1,391,123	524,092	1,233,412	76,949	2,626,604	5,852,180	234,564,071	2.50%

Table 4. Estimates of Disenfranchised African American Felons, 2010

State	AA Prisoners	AA Parolees	AA Fel. Prob.	AA Jail Inmates	AA Ex-felons	Total	AA VAP	AA Disf. Rate
AK	528	217	724	2		1,471	20,257	7.26%
AL	18,460	5,416	10,905	801	101,896	137,478	917,500	14.98%
AR	7,185	8,558	9,573	40		25,357	321,201	7.89%
AZ	5,301	1,051	5,960	426	10,345	23,083	206,087	11.20%
CA	47,775	29,179		1,210		78,164	1,896,556	4.12%
CO	4,409	1,828		411		6,648	164,797	4.03%
CT	8,054	1,246				9,300	281,143	3.31%
DE	3,762	310	2,041		5,718	11,831	143,062	8.27%
FL	50,966	2,264	31,225	3,227	432,839	520,521	2,232,437	23.32%
GA	30,729	14,842	114,300	71		159,942	2,140,789	7.47%
HI	250					250	24,540	1.02%
IA	2,425	555	1,348	145		4,473	64,856	6.90%
ID	181	82	287	94		645	8,267	7.80%
IL	27,798			135		27,933	1,378,729	2.03%
IN	10,280			29		10,309	430,526	2.39%
KS	2,993	1,465	1,104	291		5,853	129,082	4.53%
KY	5,438	3,841	4,708	382	42,552	56,920	254,797	22.34%
LA	27,521	16,899	24,626	1,255		70,301	1,040,701	6.76%
MA	3,206			94		3,300	354,452	0.93%
MD	16,624	9,738	14,583	617		41,562	1,293,821	3.21%
ME							11,442	0.00%
MI	23,798			775		24,573	1,046,127	2.35%
MN	3,474	1,512	9,034	201		14,221	195,676	7.27%
MO	11,969	6,602	16,367	235		35,172	511,505	6.88%
MS	14,029	4,035	17,014	433	72,248	107,758	773,869	13.92%
MT	103			68		171	4,133	4.14%
NC	22,823	2,068	18,529	201		43,621	1,536,233	2.84%
ND	105			27		132	6,302	2.10%
NE	1,205	223	500	94	1,346	3,368	60,954	5.52%
NH	171			29		200	12,839	1.55%
NJ	15,399	6,785	27,949	766		50,898	933,354	5.45%
NM	518	213	1,035	45		1,811	37,145	4.87%
NV	3,611	1,650	2,400	25	14,137	21,823	173,233	12.60%
NY	28,628	21,610		1,080		51,318	2,442,295	2.10%
OH	24,399			881		25,280	1,048,613	2.41%
OK	7,497	911	5,084	34		13,526	216,073	6.26%
OR	1,431			185		1,616	61,380	2.63%
PA	25,347			1,203		26,550	1,045,246	2.54%
RI	964					964	51,527	1.87%
SC	15,296	4,333	12,198	598		32,425	953,961	3.40%
SD	187	162		20		369	7,810	4.73%
TN	13,052	5,541	20,698	835	105,817	145,943	771,351	18.92%
TX	62,575	39,239	54,257	245		156,316	2,196,259	7.12%
UT	454			237		691	22,683	3.05%
VA	22,810	1,779	29,190	180	188,999	242,958	1,192,554	20.37%
VT							5,276	0.00%
WA	3,440	1,283	4,033	23		8,779	207,299	4.24%
WI	9,610	7,604	5,057	303		22,574	252,719	8.93%
WV	856	205	668	94		1,822	52,816	3.45%
WY	94	36	95	17	563	805	4,403	18.29%
Total	587,730	203,282	445,493	18,059	976,458	2,231,022	29,138,677	7.66%

REFERENCES

- Behrens, Angela, Christopher Uggen, and Jeff Manza. 2003. "Ballot Manipulation and the 'Menace of Negro Domination': Racial Threat and Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States, 1850-2002." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:559-605.
- Florida Department of Corrections. 2010. "2009 Florida Prison Recidivism Study: Releases from 2001 to 2008." Florida Department of Corrections: Bureau of Research and Data Analysis.
- Manza, Jeff and Christopher Uggen. 2006. *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Manza, Jeff, Clem Brooks, and Christopher Uggen. 2004. "Public Attitudes toward Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68:275-86.
- Porter, Nicole D. 2010. "Expanding the Vote: State Felony Disenfranchisement Reform, 2010." *The Sentencing Project*, Washington DC.
- Shannon, Sarah, Christopher Uggen, Melissa Thompson, Jason Schnittker, and Michael Massoglia. 2011. "Growth in the U.S. Ex-Felon And Ex-Prisoner Population, 1948 to 2010." Paper presented at the 2011 Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America.
- Uggen, Christopher, Jeff Manza, and Melissa Thompson. 2006. "Citizenship, Democracy, and the Civic Reintegration of Criminal Offenders." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 605:281-310.
- Uggen, Christopher and Jeff Manza. 2002. "Democratic Contraction? The Political Consequences of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 67:777-803.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Uggen is currently supported by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Health Investigator Awards Program.