# **Verification Data Report**



# **Reapportionment of Oakland County Board of Commissioners**

Plan Name: GOP

Prepared by: Michael Gingell

Submission Date: <u>04/04/2012</u>

Validation Date: 04/05/2012

Validated By: Plat Engineering Department

Validated Yes/No 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.

Districts	Median Population	Low Populated	Dist #	Deviation	High Populated	Dist #	Deviation	Total 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 0
  - ii. Number of unassigned Precincts <u>0</u>

## b. <u>Validation.</u>

- i. Number of dis-contiguous Districts 0
- ii. Number of unassigned Precincts <u>0</u>



Dis-contiguou	s Districts	
District	Dis-contiguous Yes/No	Precincts involved
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		265
10		
11		<u> </u>
12		
13		
14		
15		<u> </u>
16		
17	ais	Districts  Districts  Contiguous
18	10 01	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Unassigned I	Precincts		
Precinct #	CVT Location	Adjacent Districts	Comments
			Precincts
		scionea	PIGG
	No Una		Precincts

# 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 5 New 3 Waterford 8
--

b. <u>Validation</u>.

i. Number of split Precincts New + Waterford \_\_\_\_\_11

Split Pred	incts		
·			
Precinct #	CVT Location	Adjacent 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 mans does not match /in guestion
5	Waterford	4/6	Waterford written and maps does not match/in question 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 dist	ricts shall be as com	npact and of as nearly square as is practicable, depending
	on the	geography of the co	ounty area involved.
	i.	Yes	(This Process is up to Judicial Interpretation)

	i. Yes	 (This Process is up to Judicial Interpretation)
	ii. No	
b.	<b>Validation</b>	
	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 Me	ethod	Scwartzb	erg	Roeck-El	hrenberg	Compact
	Value	As a %	Value	As a %	Value	As a %	Yes/No
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

b. Validation.

i. Number of districts with combined townships and cities

10

10

District CVT Assignment								
District	Complete	Partial	Complete	Partial	Township/City			
	Townships	Townships	Cities	Cities	Combination			
1	1	1	2	0	Υ			
2	5	0	0	0	N			
3	4	0	0	0	N			
4	0	2	1	0	Υ			
5	0	2	3	0	Υ			
6	1	1	0	0	N			
7	1	1	1	0	Υ			
8	2	0	1	0	Υ			
9	1	0	2	0	Υ			
10	0	0	1	0	N			
11	0	0	0	2	N			
12	0	1	2	0	Υ			
13	0	2	0	1	Υ			
14	1	0	1	1	Υ			
15	0	0	1	1	N			
16	0	0	1	2	N			
17	0	0	1	2	N			
18	1	0	3	1	Υ			
19	0	0	1	1	N			
20	0	0	2	2	N			
21	0	0	0	2	N			
Total					10			

## 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 C	Completer	ness Re	port				
Township	)A(la a la	Codia	No Colita	City	M/h a l a	Codia	No Colita
Township	Whole	Split	No. Splits	City Clarkston	Whole	Split	No. Splits
Holly	X				X		
Groveland	X			Pontiac	X		
Brandon	X			Lake Angelus			
Oxford	X			Auburn Hills	X	.,	
Addison	X			Rochester Hills		Х	1
Oakland	X			Rochester	X		-
Orion	Х			Troy		X	2
Independence		Х	1	Bloomfield Hills	X		
Springfield	Х			Birmingham	X		
Rose	X			Sylvan Lake	X		
Highland	Х			Keego Harbor	X		
White Lake	X			Orchard Lake	Х		
Waterford		Х	2	Walled Lake	Х		
Bloomfield		Х	1	Wixom	Х		
West Bloomfield		Х	2	South Lyon	Х		
Commerce	Х			Novi	Х		
Milford	Х			Northville	Х		
Lyon	Х			Farmington Hills		Х	2
Novi	Х			Farmington	Х		
Southfield	Х			Southfield		Х	1
Royal Oak	Х			Lathrup Village	Х		
-				Oak Park		Х	1
				Royal Oak		Х	2
				Berkley	Х		
				Huntington Woods	Х		
				Pleasant Ridge	Х		
				Ferndale	Х		
				Hazel Park	Х		
				Madison Heights	Х		
				Clawson	Х		
				Fenton	Х		
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.

	3.	Districts s	shall not be	drawn to	effect r	oolitical	advantag
--	----	-------------	--------------	----------	----------	-----------	----------

# 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 Number	Total Population	Total All Minority's Percent	Total Voter Population	Voter Black Minority 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:	Validation date:
Ron Crank	04/05/2012
Department: Plat Engineering	
If plan cannot be verified please indica	ate the reason and describe corrective action: