

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

MICHAEL BANERIAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOCELYN BENSON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-CV-00054-RMK-JTN-PLM

DECLARATION OF ANTHONY EID

I, Anthony Eid, declare and state pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 as follows:

1. I am a Commissioner on the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission.
2. I serve as a Commissioner unaffiliated with any major political party.
3. This declaration is given based on my personal knowledge concerning facts with which I am intimately familiar. I reviewed Exhibit D to the Brace Declaration (the “Map Comparison”), a map comparing the enacted congressional plan to Plaintiffs’ proposed remedial plan, as part of preparing this declaration.

Role in Map-Drawing Process

4. I prepared the initial draft of the enacted congressional plan – called the Chestnut map – using community of interest heat maps facilitated through the work of Dr. Moon Duchin and the Metric Geometry and Gerrymandering Group (“MGGG”) Redistricting Lab. These heat maps aggregate comments made by the public on corresponding portions of the map to provide information about concentrated communities of interest within the map, and are available to the public. I sponsored the Chestnut map through the collaborative map-drawing process. The people

of Michigan had the opportunity to, and did, give feedback on the chestnut map. Commissioners collaboratively edited the plan after the Commission's second round of public hearings. I was present during all Commission meetings when map-drawing decisions were made related to the Chestnut map. I supported the Chestnut map because the public response to the map indicated that the public preferred the Chestnut map because it most closely corresponded with Michigan's ranked redistricting criteria, it valued Michigan's communities of interest and diverse populations, and I believed it would be a map supported by the necessary votes among the Commissioners.

Congressional District 1

5. The goals in drawing Congressional District 1 were to preserve the northern regions of the State, including the Upper Peninsula and contiguous regions on the other side of Lake Huron which have similar features. They are sparsely populated counties that are more rural and agricultural in nature. The district also includes many Native American communities.

Congressional District 2

6. The goals in drawing Congressional District 2 were to create a mid-Michigan district that included Barry County with other rural communities in response to public comments from residents of Barry County. Individuals expressed that Barry County was a rural farming community that wanted to be included with other rural counties such as Ionia, Montcalm, Gratiot, and Isabella. I understood that the Republican Commissioners agreed with this formation and wanted to see it in the final map.

7. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 2 does not include Barry County with other rural counties and support rural communities of interest. I also notice in Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 2 that Muskegon is annexed

from Grand Rapids. The Commission heard many comments from the Muskegon and Grand Rapids community of interest, asking to be kept together because of shared cultural and economic values. Plaintiffs' Congressional District 2 divides this community of interest.

Congressional District 3

8. The goals in drawing Congressional District 3 were to preserve the communities of interest in Grand Rapids, Muskegon, Grand Haven, and Rockford. Residents of these communities indicated, through public comment, that they wanted to remain together.

9. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 2 includes rural Barry County, whose residents asked to remain with other rural communities, with the more urban Grand Rapids community. Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 3 does not include Muskegon with Grand Rapids. The Commission was asked to keep these two more urban communities together because of their shared values and cultural commonalities.

Congressional District 4

10. The goals in drawing Congressional District 4 were to create a western Michigan district while preserving the communities of interest in the Battle Creek and Kalamazoo area. Many individuals at public comment spoke about living in Battle Creek and working or shopping in Kalamazoo; individuals also spoke about a shared common highway between the two communities. Commission Orton, who is familiar with the Battle Creek area, helped identify the portions of Battle Creek that felt more closely aligned with Kalamazoo.

11. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 4 splits Battle Creek and Kalamazoo and includes Kalamazoo with counties bordering Michigan and Indiana. This configuration divides the community of interest identified along the

southern border of Michigan which were kept whole in the enacted plan's Congressional District 5.

Congressional District 5

12. The goals in drawing Congressional District 5 were to preserve the communities of interest along the southern border of Michigan. Residents of the southern counties that border Indiana and Ohio spoke to the Commission about the unique circumstances that align them. For example, many individuals spoke about living in Michigan but working, shopping, and praying across the border or dealing with interstate transportation. Additionally, we heard public comment about the community feeling connected by a shared television market.

13. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional 5 does not comport with our goals because it divides the southern border community of interest.

Congressional District 6

14. The goals in drawing Congressional District 6 were create a district around Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, and the University of Michigan. Individuals made it clear through public comment that Jackson and Livingston Counties should not be included in a Congressional district with Washtenaw County, as they share different values. Since Washtenaw County does not contain enough population to make a congressional district by itself, the commission decided to add communities to this district that were similar in nature to Washtenaw County. The commission therefore decided to preserve the communities of interest between Novi and Ann Arbor. Individuals at public comment asked the Commission to include Novi with Ann Arbor based on shared commonalities, such as residents of Novi receiving services from the University of Michigan and Ann Arbor area. Additionally, Novi residents identified with Ann Arbor's white-collar workforce.

15. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 6 includes Livonia with Ann Arbor and splits the community of interest between Novi and Ann Arbor. The Commission heard during public comment that Livonia has more of a blue-collar workforce that is much more closely aligned with the communities in Detroit, Dearborn, and Southfield. The Commission decided to include Livonia with those communities as a result.

Congressional District 7

16. The goals in drawing Congressional District 7 were to create a tri-county district consisting of Clinton, Eaton, and Igham Counties while keeping Shiawassee County whole. The commission wanted to support the communities of interest within the tri-county area of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham County in response to public comment. This community was split in the previous 2011 congressional map, and the citizens of the area made it clear that they wanted to be made whole as they are in the Chestnut map.

17. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiff's proposed Congressional District 7 splits Shiawassee County and includes portions of Barry County with the tri-counties. Plaintiffs' District 7 splits the rural community of interest in Barry County against the expressed interests described above in the formation of Congressional District 2.

Congressional District 8

18. The goals in drawing Congressional District 8 were to accommodate various communities of interest and draw a district that compromised on competing interests in and around Midland County. The Commission heard many comments asking the Commission to keep Midland County as whole as possible. Some individuals asked that Midland be included with Gladwin County, while others asked for Midland to be included with the cities of Flint, Bay City, and Saginaw. In an effort to compromise and create a map that would receive bipartisan support, the

Commission opted to keep Midland County as whole as possible by only excluding five sparsely populated portions of Midland County.

19. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiff's proposed Congressional District 8 split the City of Midland from the County of Midland. The Commission considered this kind of split in the proposed Birch map configuration. Ultimately, the Commission did not opt for this configuration, and I did not believe that this alternative configuration would receive the support of two Republican Commissioners (a requirement for selecting a map).

Congressional District 9

20. The goal in drawing Congressional District 9 was to create a district centered around the "thumb" of Michigan. This area identified as a community of interest due to its rural, agricultural nature. In doing so, the commission decided not to include the cities of Wixom, Walled Lake, and Commerce Township within this "thumb"-centered district. These cities identified as a community of interest with the southern portion of Oakland County. The Commission heard public comment that these communities identified much more closely with the suburban metro-Detroit portions of Oakland County than with the rural communities in Michigan's thumb area. I understood from Commissioner Vallette, a Commissioner from that area, that these communities were much more aligned with Oakland County than the rural, agricultural community in the thumb.

21. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 9 includes Wixom and Walled Lake with Michigan's upper thumb portion. This does not comport with our goals because these communities are very different and includes the suburban, metro-Detroit communities with rural, agricultural communities.

Congressional District 10

22. The goals in drawing Congressional District 10 were to preserve communities of interest between Rochester Hills and the Macomb County communities of Sterling Heights, Warren, and St. Clair Shores because of shared cultural communities. The areas share a large Chaldean population that the Commission worked to keep together. Additionally, Commissioner Clark, who resides in Rochester Hills, believed that Rochester Hills was more closely associated with the communities in Sterling Heights and St. Clair Shores in Macomb County.

23. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 10 excludes Rochester Hills from the closely aligned Macomb County communities and splits up that cultural community of interest. Plaintiffs' decision to include Rochester Hills in District 11, instead of Congressional District 10, resulted in the exclusion of Walled Lake, White Lake, Wixom, and Commerce from Plaintiffs' Congressional District 11. These communities indicated, through public comment, a desire to be included with Oakland County and felt more closely aligned with other communities in Oakland County.

Congressional District 11

24. The goals in drawing Congressional District 11 were to preserve communities in and around Oakland County such as the cities of Wixom, Walled Lake, Wixom, Commerce, West Bloomfield, Troy, and Farmington Hills. Many of these townships identified as a community of interest representing the core townships of Oakland County, and share economic, cultural, and historic similarities. The Commission also worked to preserve the LGBTQ communities in the cities of Royal Oak, Ferndale, and Oak Park. The Commission decided to exclude Southfield from Congressional District 11 because individuals expressed that Southfield felt more closely aligned with the communities of Detroit than Oakland County.

25. In reviewing the Map Comparison, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed District 11 divides communities of interest by including the Rochester Hills area that asked to be included with portions of Macomb County and including the Novi area that expressed a desire to be included with Ann Arbor.

Congressional District 12

26. The goals in drawing Congressional District 12 were to create a district featuring the east side of Detroit with Dearborn and other similar communities, and to preserve the historical neighborhoods in and around Detroit. Commissioners Kellom and Curry, who were familiar with this area, made meaningful changes to the Detroit area to keep these neighborhoods together. The Commission also decided to include Livonia in Congressional District 12 because of Livonia's blue-collar workforce that aligned more with the communities in Detroit, Dearborn, and Southfield. The Commission worked to preserve township lines and followed the borders of Southfield and Livonia when drawing this District.

27. In reviewing the Comparison Map, I notice that Plaintiffs' proposed Congressional District 12 excludes Livonia from Congressional District 12 and includes it in Congressional District 6 with the Ann Arbor area. This decision splits up the community of interest between the Novi and the Ann Arbor area and includes the blue-collar workforce of Livonia with the white-collar workforce of Ann Arbor when these communities share little in common.

Congressional District 13

28. The goals in drawing Congressional District 13 were to create a Detroit centered district and to preserve the townships of Wayne and the southern portion of Dearborn Heights in order to keep minority communities whole.

* * * *

29. I never saw a plan that achieved the communities-of-interest goals of the Chestnut plan at a lower population deviation than the Chestnut plan.

30. I do not know how the Commission would have achieved all the communities-of-interest goals of the Chestnut plan at a lower population deviation.

31. Plaintiffs' alternative does not convince me that the Commission could have achieved all the communities-of-interest goals at a lower population deviation.

32. Plaintiffs' district configurations do not appear to try to achieve the Commission's goals concerning communities of interest.

33. I would not have proposed or voted for Plaintiffs' alternative plan.

I declare under penalty of perjury that to the best of my memory the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 18 day of February, 2022.



Anthony Eid