## Verification Data Report

## 2010 Census

Reapportionment of Oakland County Board of Commissioners


| Plan Name: | GOP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prepared by: | $\underline{\text { Michael Gingell }}$ |
| Submission Date: | $\underline{04 / 04 / 2012}$ |
| Validation Date: | $\underline{04 / 05 / 2012}$ |
| Validated By: | $\underline{\text { Plat Engineering Department }}$ |
| Validated Yes/No | $\underline{\text { Yes }}$ |

1. Run "Population Summary Report (Legal)".
a. All districts shall be single-member districts and be as nearly of equal population as is practicable.

| Number <br> Districts | Median <br> Population | Low <br> Populated | Dist <br> $\#$ | Deviation | High <br> Populated | Dist <br> $\#$ | Deviation | Total <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 57,255 | 54,899 | 21 | -4.1 | 59,776 | 1 | 4.4 | 8.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. Run "Check Plan Errors" report.
a. This Verify Plan tool allows you to check your current plan for errors in contiguity, unassigned, areas, and split features.
i. Number of dis-contiguous Districts $\underline{0}$
ii. Number of unassigned Precincts $\underline{0}$
b. Validation.
i. Number of dis-contiguous Districts $\underline{0}$
ii. Number of unassigned Precincts $\underline{0}$

Dis-contiguous Districts

| District | Dis-contiguous Yes/No | Precincts involved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |
| 11 |  | (1) |
| 12 |  |  |
| 13 |  | $0-\sqrt{2}$ |
| 14 |  | O O |
| 15 |  | A5 0 |
| 16 |  | CO) |
| 17 | A | 5 |
| $18$ | - (1) |  |
| 19 |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |

Unassigned Precincts

| Precinct \# | CVT Location | Adjacent Districts | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 3. Run "Identify Splits" report, then "Split Geography" and "Split Geography by Geography" reports.

a. This Identify Splits tool allows you to create a layer identifying the census data (precincts) which are split by the current District configuration. (Precincts shall be divided only if necessary to meet the population standard).
i. Number of split Precincts Old $\quad 5$ New_3 Waterford $\quad 8$
b. Validation.
i. Number of split Precincts New + Waterford

## Split Precincts

| Precinct <br> $\#$ | CVT Location | Adjacent <br> Districts | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | City of Troy | $16 / 20$ | Precincts were redefined/No splits within new precincts |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | City Royal Oak | $19 / 20$ | Precincts were redefined/No splits within new precincts |
| 5 | City Royal Oak | $19 / 20$ | Precincts were redefined/No splits within new precincts |
| 6 | City Royal Oak | $19 / 20$ | Precincts were redefined/No splits within new precincts |
| 10 | City Royal Oak | $19 / 20$ | Precincts were redefined/No splits within new precincts |
| 22 | City Royal Oak | $16 / 19$ | Split within new precinct |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2 | City Oak Park | $17 / 18$ | Split within new precinct |
| 8 | City Oak Park | $17 / 18$ | Split within new precinct |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Waterford | $4 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 5 | Waterford | $4 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 12 | Waterford | $4 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 14 | Waterford | $4 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 18 | Waterford | $5 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 20 | Waterford | $5 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 23 | Waterford | $5 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
| 24 | Waterford | $5 / 6$ | Waterford written and maps does not match/in question |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4. Run "Compactness Analysis" and "Compact Analysis (Legal)" reports.

a. All districts shall be as compact and of as nearly square as is practicable, depending on the geography of the county area involved.
i. Yes $\qquad$ (This Process is up to Judicial Interpretation)
ii. No
b. Validation
i. Yes
ii. No
c. Before running any of the above reports; in Analysis Tools select and run Compactness Analysis function. (Make sure all districts are checked, and all defined measures are checked. Leave User Defined unchecked.)

Compactness Analysis

| District | Polsby Method |  | Scwartzberg |  | Roeck-Ehrenberg |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Compact } \\ & \text { Yes/No } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | As a \% | Value | As a \% | Value | As a \% |  |
| 1 | . 45 | 44.6 | . 83 | 82.6 | . 30 | 29.8 |  |
| 2 | . 65 | 64.9 | . 90 | 90.5 | . 35 | 34.8 |  |
| 3 | . 47 | 46.5 | . 80 | 79.7 | . 22 | 21.8 |  |
| 4 | . 36 | 36.0 | . 86 | 86.3 | . 28 | 28.0 |  |
| 5 | . 44 | 44.0 | . 85 | 85.2 | . 38 | 38.1 |  |
| 6 | . 36 | 36.3 | . 90 | 89.7 | . 24 | 24.0 |  |
| 7 | . 47 | 47.1 | . 87 | 86.7 | . 26 | 26.3 |  |
| 8 | . 58 | 58.1 | . 89 | 88.8 | . 44 | 44.1 |  |
| 9 | . 64 | 64.0 | . 93 | 92.5 | . 36 | 35.5 |  |
| 10 | . 48 | 47.6 | . 84 | 83.9 | . 37 | 37.5 |  |
| 11 | . 40 | 40.0 | . 76 | 75.8 | . 23 | 22.6 |  |
| 12 | . 48 | 47.5 | . 84 | 83.8 | . 28 | 28.3 |  |
| 13 | . 31 | 30.5 | . 66 | 65.6 | . 18 | 17.6 |  |
| 14 | . 21 | 21.3 | . 65 | 64.6 | . 11 | 10.6 |  |
| 15 | . 57 | 57.2 | . 91 | 91.1 | . 32 | 32.3 |  |
| 16 | . 27 | 26.7 | . 75 | 75.4 | . 29 | 28.7 |  |
| 17 | . 38 | 37.8 | . 74 | 74.0 | . 24 | 24.2 |  |
| 18 | . 32 | 31.8 | . 77 | 71.1 | . 18 | 18.2 |  |
| 19 | . 54 | 53.9 | . 86 | 86.1 | . 31 | 30.7 |  |
| 20 | . 30 | 29.9 | . 66 | 65.9 | . 27 | 26.7 |  |
| 21 | . 43 | 42.5 | . 87 | 87.3 | . 25 | 24.8 |  |
| High | . 65 | 64.9 | . 93 | 92.5 | . 44 | 44.1 |  |
| Low | . 21 | 21.3 | . 65 | 64.6 | . 11 | 10.6 |  |
| Average | . 43 | 43.25 | . 82 | 81.27 | . 28 | 27.84 |  |

5. Print Map and Identify District Township and City Distribution.
a. No township or part thereof shall be combined with any city of part thereof, for a single district, unless such combination is needed to meet the population standard.
i. Number of districts with combined townships and cities
10
b. Validation.
i. Number of districts with combined townships and cities

| District CVT Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| District | Complete <br> Townships | Partial <br> Townships | Complete <br> Cities | Partial <br> Cities | Township/City <br> Combination |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | Y |
| 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Y |
| 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | Y |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | N |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | Y |
| 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | Y |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | Y |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | N |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | N |
| 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | Y |
| 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | Y |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Y |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | N |  |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | N |
| 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | N |  |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | Y |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | N |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | N |
| 21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | N |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. From Printed Map Identify Whole and Split Townships and Cities.
a. Townships, Villages, or Cities shall be divided if necessary to meet the population standard.
b. SEE TABLES NEXT PAGE.

| Number of whole Townships | 17 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of whole Cities | 25 |
| Number of split Townships | 4 |
| Number of split Cities | 6 |
| Number of Township Splits | 6 |
| Number of City Splits | 9 |

Township \& City Completeness Report

| Township | Whole | Split | No. Splits | City | Whole | Split | No. Splits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Holly | X |  |  | Clarkston | X |  |  |
| Groveland | X |  |  | Pontiac | X |  |  |
| Brandon | X |  |  | Lake Angelus | X |  |  |
| Oxford | X |  |  | Auburn Hills | X |  |  |
| Addison | X |  |  | Rochester Hills |  | X | 1 |
| Oakland | X |  |  | Rochester | X |  |  |
| Orion | X |  |  | Troy |  | X | 2 |
| Independence |  | X | 1 | Bloomfield Hills | X |  |  |
| Springfield | X |  |  | Birmingham | X |  |  |
| Rose | X |  |  | Sylvan Lake | X |  |  |
| Highland | X |  |  | Keego Harbor | X |  |  |
| White Lake | X |  |  | Orchard Lake | X |  |  |
| Waterford |  | X | 2 | Walled Lake | X |  |  |
| Bloomfield |  | X | 1 | Wixom | X |  |  |
| West Bloomfield |  | X | 2 | South Lyon | X |  |  |
| Commerce | X |  |  | Novi | X |  |  |
| Milford | X |  |  | Northville | X |  |  |
| Lyon | X |  |  | Farmington Hills |  | X | 2 |
| Novi | X |  |  | Farmington | X |  |  |
| Southfield | X |  |  | Southfield |  | X | 1 |
| Royal Oak | X |  |  | Lathrup Village | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oak Park |  | X | 1 |
|  |  |  |  | Royal Oak |  | X | 2 |
|  |  |  |  | Berkley | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Huntington Woods | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pleasant Ridge | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ferndale | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Hazel Park | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Madison Heights | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Clawson | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Fenton | X |  |  |
| Total | 17 | 4 | 6 | Total | 25 | 6 | 9 |

7. Residents of state institutions who cannot by law register in the county as electors shall be excluded from any consideration of representation.
8. Districts shall not be drawn to effect political advantage.
9. Run "Summary Majority Minority", "Racial Demographics" and Voting Age Minority Population Report(Legal)" reports.
a. At least 3 (three) districts shall be created to represent a minority population base.

| District <br> Number | Total <br> Population | Total All Minority's <br> Percent | Total Voter <br> Population | Voter Black <br> Minority <br> Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 59,651 | 73.49 | 43,427 | 50.8 |
| 17 | 56,106 | 70.76 | 43,200 | 64.8 |
| 21 | 54,889 | 62.74 | 43,667 | 54.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Verified by:

Ron Crank
04/05/2012

Department: Plat Engineering
If plan cannot be verified please indicate the reason and describe corrective action:

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |


| $\square$ |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

