

# Verification Data Report



## 2010 Census

### Reapportionment of Oakland County Board of Commissioners

Plan Name: Cooper

Prepared by: Jessica Cooper Oakland County Prosecutor

Submission Date: 04/18/2011

Validation Date: 04/19/2011

Validated By: Ronald Crank Jr. Plat & Boundary Specialist

#### 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 Districts	Median Population	Low Populated	Dist. #	Deviation	High Populated	Dist. #	Deviation	Total Deviation
25	48,094	47,111	15	-2.04	49,449	6	2.82	4.9

#### 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 0

Dis-contiguous Districts		
District	Dis-contiguous Yes/No	Precincts involved
1	N	
2	N	
3	N	
4	N	
5	N	
6	N	
7	N	
8	N	
9	N	
10	N	
11	N	
12	N	
13	N	
14	N	
15	N	
16	N	
17	N	
18	N	
19	N	
20	N	
21	N	
22	N	
23	N	
24	N	
25	N	
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		



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 7

[illegible]

**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.
- b. 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.)

District	Polsby Method		Swartzberg		Ehrenberg		Compact Yes/No
	Value	As a %	Value	As a %	Value	As a %	
1	.39	38.9	.76	78.7	.19	19.4	
2	.61	60.9	.99	98.9	.28	27.8	
3	.49	49.3	.86	85.6	.28	28.5	
4	.61	61.2	.97	97.3	.42	42.4	
5	.37	37.0	.86	86.1	.31	30.8	
6	.67	67.4	1.00	99.6	.31	31.5	
7	.58	58.2	.92	92.4	.34	33.9	
8	.62	62.1	.93	92.9	.42	42.3	
9	.51	51.0	.82	81.5	.28	28.4	
10	.21	20.8	.70	69.8	.26	25.8	
11	.39	39.4	.85	85.2	.29	28.8	
12	.37	37.3	.66	65.9	.25	24.8	
13	.73	72.5	.97	96.8	.37	36.7	
14	.37	37.3	.70	70.0	.32	32.5	
15	.50	50.2	.90	89.9	.35	34.8	
16	.35	34.7	.82	81.7	.19	19.4	
17	.32	32.0	.81	81.2	.14	13.7	
18	.39	39.0	.75	74.8	.26	25.7	
19	.34	33.7	.72	72.3	.28	28.0	
20	.44	43.7	.84	83.9	.36	35.6	
21	.36	35.9	.78	78.0	.19	18.6	
22	.53	52.9	.92	92.1	.38	38.3	
23	.53	52.7	.88	87.6	.30	30.2	
24	.48	48.1	.85	85.5	.28	27.9	
25	.45	45.0	.83	83.2	.29	28.6	
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
2010 High	.73	72.5	1.00	99.6	.42	42.4	
2010 Low	.21	20.8	.66	65.9	.14	13.7	
Average	<b>.46</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>.84</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>.29</b>	<b>29.4</b>	
2000 High	.62	62.5	.99	99.3	.42	41.5	Y
2000 Low	.24	24.0	.61	61.3	.14	13.8	Y
200 Ave	<b>.42</b>	<b>41.53</b>	<b>.81</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>27.1</b>	

**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 11

District CVT Assignment					
District	Complete Townships	Partial Townships	Complete Cities	Partial Cities	Township/City Combination
1	3	1	0	0	
2	3	1	0	0	
3	1	1	0	1	X
4	1	1	1	0	X
5	0	1	0	0	
6	3	0	0	0	
7	1	0	1	0	X
8	1	1	2	1	X
9	1	0	1	1	X
10	0	2	0	1	X
11	0	0	2	1	
12	0	0	0	2	
13	0	0	1	1	
14	0	0	1	2	
15	0	0	0	1	
16	0	2	3	0	X
17	0	2	0	0	
18	0	0	0	1	
19	0	0	1	1	
20	0	1	2	1	X
21	0	1	2	1	X
22	1	0	2	1	X
23	0	1	0	1	X
24	0	0	1	1	
25	0	0	3	1	
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
Total	11				

**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>Number of whole Townships</b>	15
<b>Number of whole Cities</b>	24
<b>Number of split Townships</b>	6
<b>Number of split Cities</b>	7
<b>Number of Township Splits</b>	8
<b>Number of City Splits</b>	12

<b>Township &amp; City Completeness Report</b>							
Township	Whole	Split	No. Splits	City	Whole	Split	No. Splits
Holly	X			Clarkston	X		
Groveland	X			Pontiac		X	1
Brandon	X			Lake Angelus	X		
Oxford	X			Auburn Hills	X		
Addison	X			Rochester Hills		X	2
Oakland		X	1	Rochester	X		
Orion	X			Troy		X	3
Independence	X			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	2	Wixom	X		
West Bloomfield		X	1	South Lyon	X		
Commerce	X			Novi		X	2
Milford		X	1	Northville	X		
Lyon	X			Farmington Hills		X	1
Novi	X			Farmington	X		
Southfield		X	1	Southfield		X	2
Royal Oak	X			Lathrup Village	X		
				Oak Park	X		
				Royal Oak		X	1
				Berkley	X		
				Huntington Woods	X		
				Pleasant Ridge	X		
				Ferndale	X		
				Hazel Park	X		
				Madison Heights	X		
				Clawson	X		
				Fenton	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

