CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL: The clerk called the roll and recorded it as follows:

PRESENT: Jason Marsh, Chairman, Thomas Whitmoyer, Vice Chairman, Alissa Hall, Kelly Mallozzi, Carl Massaro, Steve Lemoine, Alternate, (VOTING), Bill Mecca, Alternate (arrived at 7:05 p.m.

ABSENT: Chris DeCruze

ALSO PRESENT: First Selectman Vicki A. Tesoro, Chief Administrative Officers Cynthia Katske and Kathleen McGannon, Town Attorney Daniel Schopick, Town Council Chairman Ashley Gaudiano, Town Council members Dawn Cantafio, Tony Scinto, Joy Colon, Mary Isaac, Democratic Registrar of Voters Jean Rabinow, Republican Registrar of Voters Tracy Vonick, Redistricting Committee Chairman Laurel Anderson, Human Services Director Michele Jacab, BOE Operations Director Dave Cote

1. RESOLUTION TC29-51: Moved by Hall, seconded by Mallozzi
BE IT RESOLVED, That Bridget Dial is hereby reappointed as a member of the Trumbull Day Commission for a term extending to September 1, 2026.

Bridget Dial was present and indicated her party affiliation as democrat and is looking forward to serve. VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

2. RESOLUTION TC29-52: Moved by Whitmoyer, seconded by Massaro
BE IT RESOLVED, That the submission of the funding application for the Caregiver Services Grant is authorized, and Vicki A. Tesoro, First Selectman, is hereby identified as the individual authorized to sign the application and all subsequent amendments, reports and related documents in order to administer and implement the project. (Full Resolution
Michel Jacab was present and indicated this was the 4th year they applied for this grant. The funds are used for outreach information assistance, referrals, support groups, and counseling to any care giver that comes in. They connect them with services. They can apply for up to $50,000 with this grant and applied for $20,000 because that is what is required to maintain their work. VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

3. RESOLUTION TC29-53: Moved by Massaro, seconded by Whitmoyer
BE IT RESOLVED, That RESOLUTION TC29-01, the resolution creating the Middlebrook Elementary School Roof Building Committee, is hereby repealed and replaced. (Full Resolution Attached)

Attorney Schopick explained:
- The Middlebrook roof project will be delayed one year because state funding has been delayed. This building committee will take over the services for the Booth Hill roof. It has been confirmed this is not an issue with the state. The Building committee and its Chair are willing to handle the Booth Hill roof project.

Mr. Cote explained:
- Before the BOE can apply for any grants a building committee has to be in place.
- The Middlebrook roof project went out to bid in February and bids were received in March. All bids were in excess of the estimate. If it the bids exceed by 10%, the state does not approve the higher amount. The grant is withdrawn and will have to reapply when the estimate is more in line with the bids received.
- They will go back out to bid under a new grant, the work cannot be done this summer because by the time the grant is approved and they go out to bid it would be June and the contractors will have their work lined up for the summer.
- They will go out to bid in January, the contractors’ pricing is set at the beginning of the year. He expects better bids because the contractors will know their numbers and won’t try to come back and say they have to increase the number when they start the work.
- The project is expected to cost $2.4 million to $2.5 million. The original grant commitment was based on the architect’s estimate of $1.4 million.
- Booth Hill roof needs replacement, it was installed in 1991, and anticipates doing this roof in 2023. He doesn’t see an issue having the two roofs done in the same summer since there will be two different contractors.
- Middlebrook has the broader scope of work, it is a larger school and is more challenging due to the courtyard and different elevations.

VOTE: VOTE: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

4. RESOLUTION TC29-54: Moved by Mecca, seconded by Whitmoyer
BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDAINED, That in accordance with Section 9-169 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Chapter 6, Section 6-1 of the Trumbull Town Code is hereby amended by redividing the Town of Trumbull into seven (7) voting districts. Said districts shall be divided in accordance with the metes and bounds description attached
hereto. Said revised voting districts shall be effective commencing with the Primary elections to be held on August 9, 2022.

The Chair OPENED the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m. There was one (1) person from the public to speak. (Public Comment Attached) After having called three (3) times for public comment and hearing none the Chair CLOSED the Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

It was confirmed the Minority Report had been circulated to the Council prior to this meeting and it was posted on the website.

Ms. Anderson explained:
- The biggest challenge was trying to work with the now four house districts and to make as few split districts as possible.
- They have three split districts, which both registrars agreed was as good as they could get. The committee was hoping for fewer.
- Based on a suggestion by Mr. Block, Mr. White started top left, looking at the population and worked clockwise coming up with as close to equal numbers as possible within the seven (7) districts. That's how they came to the configurations.
- The 2020 census population was 36,000, the 2010 was 35,000+, approximately a 1,000 difference.
- Had we not been redistricted into four Connecticut House districts, there would have been minor tweaking, and maybe just several hundred people would have changed districts. It was the addition of the 112th that changed this. The 112th district has 2223 people.

Ms. Rabinow noted page 4 of the committee report has the population breakdowns and explained the following:
- There are approximately 5200 people in each of the seven (7) districts.
- The 112th district went into district #4 & #6. District 6 was less compact. All of the streets in the 112th district have been reassigned, #4 & #6 and are now all essentially #4. With the 112 that came into Trumbull were a couple of hundred voters.
- District 6 is much the same except for pseudopod heading west. Councilman Massaro disagreed, District 6 used to go all the way to the Easton line. Ms. Rabinow noted they were trying to accommodate compactness in designing the districts. Many of the people in #6 objected strongly to having to go to Madison to vote.
- There is a census block that the US Census gave them, which runs almost half the length of Trumbull and are not allowed to break up census blocks. That's one of the reasons why district #6 looks the way it does. There is a map that can made available showing the long census block, it runs along the eastern boundary of district #6 from the top of the district to ¾ of the way down. Mr. Vonick explained the census block has 15 people in it. Ms. Rabinow noted if district #6 went to the Easton line it would have too many people and would be less compact and possibly affect the numbers. The priority was numerical balance with a second priority to keep the districts as compact as possible. Councilman Massaro questioned why district #6 is as south of where it had ever been. Ms. Rabinow explained it was a
result of voters’ objections. They had complaints for weeks following the last
election from District #6 voters in the southern part of the old District #6 about
going to Madison Middle School to vote and are hoping to get fewer with them
voting at Middlebrook.

- The law requires them to use the most recent national census, however obsolete it
  may be in designing districts, and we must decide on the basis of population, not on
  the basis of number of voters. The great migration from New York into southern CT
  started after March after this census was completed, in addition to that there are
  apartment complexes being built in town, none of which could be considered. The
districts meet the federal and state standards for equal population, but there will be
some polling places that will have heavier usage than others because of the
additional population change and using data two years out of date.

- The Redistricting Committee chose not to look at or use the data of who is currently
  in office, the committee chose both two years ago and this year not to look at that
data. Using that data is technically leading more states to take redistricting out of
politicians hands. The Chair noted if that data was used, it would not know who
would be moving out of town or within Trumbull, it would be a moving target. The
argument of displacing sitting council members misses the mark, and takes away
from the focus. Councilman Massaro explained he makes the point that current
sitting council people are moved out of district, not for the sake of the council, but
for the constituents who voted for these people and want them to serve. Ms.
Rabinow noted it was a valid concern. Councilman Hall added that none of the
committee had spoken about officials in any district at their meetings. They only
considered population.

- Mr. White explained census blocks as follows: The US Census divides the country
  into four divisions, one is the northeast, seven or eight regions, and one is New
England. Below that is a state, below that is a county, below that is a county
subdivision. Trumbull is a whole county subdivision. Below that there are seven or
nine census tracks, below a census track is a census block group. Block group is a
census block. It's generally bounded, it's a polygon with edges, and almost always
those edges are streets. Think of it as a city block, but it could contain multiple city
blocks. When streets are not sufficient, it uses a river edge or lake, railroad tracks,
ferry lines, they tend to be within a jurisdiction within a county of similar population
density. However, that's not always the case. After the 2010 census, he informally
pointed out a couple of flaws including census blocks that are contained within other
census blocks, which should not be the case. There's a very long census block to the
right that has several 100 people in it and to the right of the Pequonnock that is the
mirror of the one that has 15 people that should be split in half. There were two
census blocks that were merged along Strobel which is also problematic. Census
blocks are not necessarily even in population. Most of the census data that you'll
hear about this aggregate, not from the decennial census, includes income,
educational attainment. They tend to group them up to the Census Block Group to
keep that more consistent.

- Ms. Rabinow explained they do not why the state gave them four state reps instead
  of three. They have asked but have not received an answer.

- Mr. White explained the old House District 134 was almost the exact size of two of
  Trumbull’s before. Districts #4 and #5, used to be contained completely in 134. The
portion to the left, District #4, ended up split between the new district #5 and the new district #4 and the portion to their right was between #6 and #5.

- The Committees considered seven different plans. The first plan was to minimize change, and adjust to the new house districts. Mr. Block made a suggestion to start in the upper left, with 112 and going clockwise around the town, trying to clean things up, keep compact size, minimize splits, etc. The other suggestion was in the opposite direction, starting with 112 in District #4 and go the other way. When the committee reviewed those two plans, the preference was to going clockwise. There was a fourth plan attempting to do two splits that didn't work out and requested three additional plans. The answer to as to why the hundred or so people in district #6 who are now in the 112th house district were not sliced off would be in the details of Mr. Block’s second suggestion, starting with 112 and go counterclockwise.

- Ms. Rabinow explained Councilman Massaro’s concerns and suggestion to take part of #6 and put it in #4 and adjust the other boundary lines would have put 2,000 people into the wrong district or would have unbalanced the districts by 2,000. The part of District #6 that went to the eastern boundary was a very narrow segment, which is now part of the top of District #4.

- Mrs. Anderson noted the committee had met twice a week for about 6 weeks, they tried very hard to avoid split districts and relied on both registrars on the number of split districts they could work with. They could work with three not four or five. The house districts is what did them in. The Chair noted the redistricting to 4 districts also changed what we knew of districts and where to vote. He appreciates the concern with the change on district #6 but can’t be hamstrung by the way it looks for the sake of complying with the law.

- Mrs. Anderson explained the first meeting the committee had they reviewed guidelines. One was not to look at voter rolls, they were immaterial to what they had to do, which was based on population only. Second, they would not look at where current sitting council people lived. One of the biggest things was to stop as many split districts as possible.

- Mr. White explained District #2 and District #5, both border a fair number of other districts. Looking at District #6, if it was moved in and back toward the eastern line, that population of District #4 would have to go somewhere. Right now the split for District #4 is between the 112 and 123. That population of District #4 can either go into District #6, around Marina, and at the edge of that corner an inch below Quality, two inches on that map or it would create a district with two splits, not one, by going into district #5. It's technically not possible. He is not sure if you extend District #6 into District #4, where the southern end of District #4 goes or where the middle of District #4 goes. They have not looked at the counterclockwise plan in a bit. That is probably why that plan was discarded by the committee because it became too cumbersome, starting with District #4 and #1 and going counterclockwise. Councilman Massaro sees room to move #4 and #6 boundary lines without affecting anything else. Mr. White explained looking at the census block to the left of the northwest corner of District #6, there are 330 people. If you go over one census block, that's followed by another census block with 97, and another with 126. To work your way to the eastern boundary, you're picking up a population of around 1000 or 1200 people. Above the 112 line in District #4, if you go into the neighborhood around Quality, Bonita, Marina and Crown there isn't the
population there if you try to stay above 134.

- The Chair noted it isn’t as simple as moving a line, it has a butterfly effect, picking up people and dropping people. This is getting repetitive and second guessing how the lines were drawn. The goal of the committee was to create equal numbers and with the limitations they had with voting districts, state voting districts and census blocks. This is getting into the minutiae of what the committee's work was, as opposed to voting in on the report presented. It is not the Council’s job to second guess how they got there, it's to trust that they arrived there in a cohesive, thoughtful, centered manner.

- Mr. White explained Mr. Vonick had a similar thought regarding the border of #1 and #2, they spent an hour trying to reshape along Strobel Road to get it to continue through, It was interesting because it would fix one spot and then would have a hole of 194 people in another. It just didn’t work, it was a good effort. No one brought to his attention other than the clockwise versus counterclockwise, to try to extend District #6 back to the eastern border. Looking at it now he is not sure it is possible without creating an additional split.

- Chairman Gaudiano explained one of the biggest challenges when looking at the map up close is that census blocks range from the teens, to the mid hundreds. You could have a 357 person census block, and when looking at it from far away, it does seem like you could move up or down or left or right. But it’s possible you would be picking up a whole chunk of census blocks that are again in the teens, and trying to shift it with a census block that's in 200, 300, or 400. It is a butterfly effect. You have to look at the map up close to see those census block numbers and realize that you're dealing with a range of sizes. The redistricting committee did exactly this exercise, let's pick up this and swap it with this and suggested re-watching some of the meetings to see how they went through the exercise because they did this exhaustively over 12-13 meetings and urged everybody to look at the census block sizes, it's not that simple.

- The Chair extended his gratitude to Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Rabinow, Mr. Vonick and all of the committee members. It was a difficult task. They worked diligently on behalf of the committee. It was a monumental task and they all did the best they could under the circumstances

VOTE: Motion CARRIED 4-2 (AGAINST: Massaro, Lemoine)

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to discuss and upon motion made by Mecca, seconded by Mallozzi the L&A Committee adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

_______________________________
Margaret D. Mastroni
Town Council Clerk
RESOLUTION TC29-52:

Whereas, the Southwestern Connecticut Agency on Aging, Title III Funding-E under the Older Americans Act, offers grants for Caregiver Assistance; and

Whereas, grants are to be used to fund caregiver services including outreach, information and assistance, and referral; and

Whereas, grants cannot exceed $50,000 and shall be used towards salary, supplies, and printing costs; and

Whereas, the Town of Trumbull will submit an application for funding for $20,000 to provide support to caregivers through counseling, information and assistance, support groups, and public education.

NOW, THEREFORE, Be it Resolved, that the Trumbull Town Council authorizes the submission of the funding application for the Caregiver Services Grant, and identifies Vicki A. Tesoro, First Selectman, as the individual authorized to sign the application and all subsequent amendments, reports and related documents in order to administer and implement the project.
RESOLUTION TC29-53:

BE IT RESOLVED, That RESOLUTION TC29-01, the resolution creating the Middlebrook Elementary School Roof Building Committee and charging said Committee with planning and overseeing the roof replacement and related improvements, is hereby repealed and the following substituted in its place:

The Middlebrook and Booth Hill Elementary Schools Roof Building Committee is hereby established for the purpose of planning and overseeing the roof replacements and related improvements for Middlebrook Elementary School and Booth Hill Elementary School; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the minutes and actions of the Middlebrook Elementary School Roof Building Committee are hereby made the minutes and actions of the Middlebrook and Booth Hill Elementary Schools Roof Building Committee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the membership of the Middlebrook and Booth Hill Elementary Schools Roof Building Committee shall consist of two (2) Town Council members, provided that such members shall not be from the same political party, one (1) Board of Education member and six (6) residents of the Town of Trumbull; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all of the members previously appointed as members of the MIDDLEBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROOF BUILDING COMMITTEE are hereby made the members of this combined committee.
Local District Boundary Description
(Revised 3/1/22)

District 1
Northerly: The Monroe town line.

Easterly: The Shelton town line, Booth Hill Road, each in part.

Southerly: Strobel Road, Pinewood Trail, Bear Den Road, Hemlock Trail, Strobel Road again, northerly along Booth Hill Brook, Oldfield Road, Old Stream Lane, Brookhedge Road, Brookside Drive, Country Club Road, Daniels Farm Road, Rte 25 Expressway, each in part.

Westerly: Rte 25 Expressway, Monroe Turnpike (Rte 111), each in part.

District 2
Northerly: Country Club Road, Brookside Drive, Brookhedge Road, Old Stream Lane, Oldfield Road, southerly along Booth Hill Brook to Strobel Road, Strobel Road, Hemlock Trail, Bear Den Road, Pinewood Trail, Strobel Road again, Booth Hill Road, the Shelton town line, each in part.

Easterly: Wild Rose Lane, Foxwood Road, Ironwood Road, Copper Kettle Road, Red Fox Lane, Primrose Drive, Huntington Turnpike (Rte 108), each in part.

Southerly: Unity Road, Merritt Parkway (Rte 15), each in part.

Westerly: Reservoir Avenue, along the line of the 134th State Assembly District, White Plains Road (Rte 127), Daniels Farm Road, each in part.

District 3
Northerly: Monroe town line.

Easterly: Monroe Turnpike (Rte 111), Rte 25 Expressway, each in part.

Southerly: Whitney Avenue, Main Street (Rte 111), Stonehouse Road, West Rock Road, Fieldcrest Drive, Old Coach Lane, Wedgewood Road, Asbury Road, Dayton Road, Old Village Lane, Limerick Road, Cromwell Road, Madison Avenue, Monitor Hill, Mariner Circle, Inverness Road, Deepdene Road, each in part.

Westerly: Easton town line.

District 4
Northerly: Deepdene Road, Inverness Road, Mariner Circle, Monitor Hill, Madison Avenue, Cromwell Road, Limerick Road, Old Village Lane, Dayton Road, Asbury Road, Wedgewood Road, Meadow View Drive, North Lynnwood Drive, Oakland Drive, Clemens Avenue, Ridgeview Avenue, Home Street, George Street, Lake Avenue, each in part.
Easterly:  Main Street (Rte 111).

Southerly:  Bassick Road, Blackhouse Road, Madison Avenue, Fairview Avenue, each in part.

Westerly:  The Easton town line.

District 5

Northerly:  Fairview Avenue, Madison Avenue, Blackhouse Road, Bassick Road, Main Street (Rte 111), Melrose Avenue, Edison Road, Woolsley Avenue, Thorburn Avenue, Moorland Road, Suzanne Circle, Lawrence Road, Geraldine Circle, Geraldine Place, each in part.

Easterly:  Reservoir Avenue.

Southerly:  The Bridgeport town line.

Westerly:  Fairfield Town Line, Easton Town Line, each in part.

District 6

Northerly:  Old Coach Lane, Fieldcrest Drive, West Rock Road, Stonehouse Road, Main Street (Rte 111), Whitney Avenue, each in part.

Easterly:  Rte 25 Expressway, Daniels Farm Road, White Plains Road, along the line of the 134th State Assembly District, Reservoir Avenue, each in part.

Southerly:  Geraldine Place, Geraldine Circle, Lawrence Road, Suzanne Circle, Moorland Road, Thorburn Avenue, Woolsley Avenue, Edison Road, Melrose Avenue, each in part.

Westerly:  Main Street (Rte 111), Lake Avenue, George Street, Home Street, Ridgeview Avenue, Clemens Avenue, Oakland Drive, North Lynnwood Drive, Meadow View Drive, Wedgewood Road, each in part.

District 7

Northerly:  Merritt Parkway (Rte 15), Unity Road, Huntington Turnpike (Rte 108), Primrose Drive, Red Fox Lane, Copper Kettle Road, Ironwood Road, Foxwood Road, Wild Rose Lane, each in part.

Easterly:  The Stratford town line.

Southerly:  The Bridgeport town line.

Westerly:  Reservoir Avenue.
Notes:

1. In the boundary descriptions above, the dividing lines between districts run down the middle of the named streets and watercourses. So, for example, when a District 5 boundary is described in part as “Northerly: Fairview Avenue ...” the middle of Fairview Avenue is the dividing line, and all the houses south of that north boundary are in the district, and all of the houses north of that line are in another district, in this case District 4.

2. The terms “northerly,” “easterly,” “southerly,” and “westerly” are approximate. For example, a street that is part of a northerly boundary may run east-west, northeast-southwest, southeast-northwest, etc.
Trumbull Redistricting 2022

Richard W. White
169 Church Hill Road

I. Edison Road

"The near zero percent (0%) deviation required cutting in and out of some odd streets/delineators which would have been much clearer and could have made for better, more compact, and concrete districts (i.e., a border line all the way down Edison Road versus only halfway) [sic]." (from Minority Report)

Possible (in green): Swap 46 people north of Edison Road in District 5 with 111 people south of Edison Road from District 6.

Problem (in orange): 231 people remain south of Edison Road in District 6.
II. Compactness

"Republican party members agreed that while compactness should be a requirement for a close union of area rather than a requirement dependent upon a district being of any shape or size, it is subservient to the requirement of substantial equality of population among districts." (from Minority Report)

Iso-Perimetric Quotient (IPQ) or Polsby-Popper Test or Cox’s Circularity.

Note: a perfect circle would have a value of 1 and a perfect (thin) line would approach a value of 0.

\[
IPQ(d) = \frac{4 \cdot \pi \cdot \text{area}(d)}{\text{perimeter}(d)^2}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area Square Feet</th>
<th>Perimeter Feet</th>
<th>Compact IPQ</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>116,587,121</td>
<td>62,191</td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>114,565,385</td>
<td>54,451</td>
<td>0.4856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>116,528,372</td>
<td>53,274</td>
<td>0.5160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>72,687,791</td>
<td>38,670</td>
<td>0.6108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>60,662,998</td>
<td>45,072</td>
<td>0.3752</td>
<td>Constrained by House 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>74,297,527</td>
<td>52,539</td>
<td>0.3382</td>
<td>Constrained by Pequannock River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>99,242,925</td>
<td>64,413</td>
<td>0.3006</td>
<td>Constrained by House 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trumbull
- Minimum 0.3006
- Maximum 0.6108
- Range 0.3102
- Average 0.4293
- Standard Deviation 0.1028

State (All)
- Minimum 0.1419
- Maximum 0.7273
- Range 0.5853
- Average 0.3890
- Standard Deviation 0.1101

Note: there are other measurements of compactness that can be investigated. Several of which can be derived directly from IPQ and others that include moment of inertia or convex hull.

Note: there are other measurements such as complexity and circularity that can be investigated.
III. District Renumbering

"District lines should have been renumbered in a fashion more closely aligned to where they currently exist." (from Minority Report)

Districts 1 and 3 are only slightly changed and are numbered properly. Districts 2 and 7 could be swapped, but are numbered properly. Districts 6 and 4 could be swapped, but District 6 is numbered properly. Focus on Districts 4 and 5 and use House Districts to help resolve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Districts (Final)</th>
<th>Districts (Current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>House Districts</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts (Final)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>