

**TEAM 1**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	ISSUE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE	
	CASES		CASE				NO		NO		NO	RATE		
11 BUNCOMBE	19	\$3,961	19								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
20 CHEROKEE	4	\$587	4								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
22 CLAY	1	\$127	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
38 GRAHAM	2	\$683	2								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
44 HAYWOOD	8	\$1,079	7					1	\$68		1	\$68	6.30%	93.70%
45 HENDERSON	7	\$728	7								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
50 JACKSON	3	\$267	3								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
56 MACON	3	\$437	2					1	\$43		1	\$43	9.84%	90.16%
57 MADISON	3	\$588	3								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
75 POLK	1	\$290	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
87 SWAIN	3	\$326	3								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
88 TRANSYLVANIA	2	\$630	2								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>\$9,703</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$111</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$111</b>	<b>1.14%</b>	<b>98.86%</b>	
*****														
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>	

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
6%	5%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	10%	5%	3%

**TEAM 2**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
2 ALEXANDER	1	\$315	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
3 ALLEGHANY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
5 ASHE	1	\$155	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
6 AVERY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
12 BURKE	10	\$2,124	10								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
14 CALDWELL	10	\$1,795	9					1	\$28		1	\$28	1.56%	98.44%
23 CLEVELAND	14	\$2,941	14								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
59 MCDOWELL	4	\$442	4								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
61 MITCHELL	1	\$70	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
81 RUTHERFORD	10	\$2,500	10								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
95 WATAUGA	4	\$593	3				1	\$212			1	\$212	35.75%	64.25%
97 WILKES	9	\$2,633	5	1	\$340		2	\$129	1	\$261	4	\$730	27.73%	72.27%
00 YANCEY	8	\$1,197	8								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>\$14,765</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$340</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>\$341</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$289</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$970</b>	<b>6.57%</b>	<b>93.43%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP	TOTAL	NUM CORR	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			CASES	ISSUE	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
7%	7%	7%	14%	24%	18%	19%	13%	26%	15%	23%

**TEAM 3**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE										
4 ANSON	10	\$1,998	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
13 CABARRUS	14	\$2,886	14							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
18 CATAWBA	17	\$3,192	17							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
36 GASTON	25	\$6,050	22			3	\$246			3	\$246	4.07%	95.93%
49 IREDELL	10	\$1,610	9			1	\$96			1	\$96	5.96%	94.04%
55 LINCOLN	7	\$1,140	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
60 MECKLENBURG	73	\$15,522	70			2	\$353	1	\$37	3	\$390	2.51%	97.49%
62 MONTGOMERY	3	\$482	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
77 RICHMOND	9	\$1,446	8			1	\$34			1	\$34	2.35%	97.65%
80 ROWAN	12	\$2,659	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
84 STANLY	4	\$967	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
90 UNION	7	\$2,682	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>\$40,634</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$729</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$37</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>\$766</b>	<b>1.89%</b>	<b>98.11%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
20%	20%	20%	0%	0%	41%	42%	7%	3%	21%	18%

**TEAM 4**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	RATE	RATE
1 ALAMANCE	11	\$2,130	10			1	\$67			1	\$67	3.15%	96.85%
17 CASWELL	3	\$1,003	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
29 DAVIDSON	16	\$3,387	15					1	\$222	1	\$222	6.55%	93.45%
30 DAVIE	4	\$646	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
34 FORSYTH	34	\$6,231	31			2	\$109	1	\$30	3	\$139	2.23%	97.77%
41 GUILFORD	53	\$13,074	52					1	\$57	1	\$57	0.44%	99.56%
68 ORANGE	9	\$1,674	8					1	\$54	1	\$54	3.23%	96.77%
73 PERSON	8	\$1,348	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
76 RANDOLPH	12	\$2,718	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
79 ROCKINGHAM	11	\$1,285	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
85 STOKES	7	\$1,745	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
86 SURRY	8	\$1,702	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
99 YADKIN	2	\$155	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>\$37,098</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$176</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>\$363</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$539</b>	<b>1.45%</b>	<b>98.55%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
18%	19%	19%	0%	0%	18%	10%	27%	33%	18%	13%

**TEAM 5**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY	
	COMP		ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO		AMT
19 CHATHAM	3	\$386	3								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
32 DURHAM	24	\$5,912	24								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
35 FRANKLIN	5	\$1,148	5								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
39 GRANVILLE	8	\$1,138	8								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
42 HALIFAX	12	\$2,549	12								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
43 HARNETT	12	\$2,434	12								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
51 JOHNSTON	19	\$3,712	18			1	\$28				1	\$28	0.75%	99.25%
53 LEE	4	\$1,122	4								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
64 NASH	13	\$3,108	12					1	\$33		1	\$33	1.06%	98.94%
91 VANCE	10	\$1,044	10								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
92 WAKE	47	\$10,691	44	2	\$435			1	\$56		3	\$491	4.59%	95.41%
93 WARREN	4	\$622	3	1	\$243						1	\$243	39.07%	60.93%
98 WILSON	12	\$2,560	11					1	\$30		1	\$30	1.17%	98.83%
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>\$36,426</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$678</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$119</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$825</b>	<b>2.26%</b>	<b>97.74%</b>	
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>	

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
18%	18%	18%	43%	48%	6%	2%	20%	11%	18%	19%

**TEAM 6**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE										
9 BLADEN	9	\$814	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
10 BRUNSWICK	9	\$1,931	8					1	\$38	1	\$38	1.97%	98.03%
24 COLUMBUS	11	\$2,660	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
26 CUMBERLAND	42	\$9,253	41	1	\$155					1	\$155	1.68%	98.32%
31 DUPLIN	7	\$1,300	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
47 HOKE	6	\$1,383	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
63 MOORE	7	\$1,426	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
65 NEW HANOVER	17	\$3,687	17							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
71 PENDER	3	\$221	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
78 ROBESON	31	\$7,771	30					1	\$88	1	\$88	1.13%	98.87%
82 SAMPSON	10	\$2,407	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
83 SCOTLAND	9	\$2,020	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>\$34,873</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$126</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$281</b>	<b>0.81%</b>	<b>99.19%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
17%	18%	17%	14%	11%	0%	0%	13%	11%	8%	7%

**TEAM 7**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE									RATE	RATE
8 BERTIE	2	\$67	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
15 CAMDEN										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
21 CHOWAN	2	\$180	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
27 CURRITUCK	2	\$82	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
33 EDGECOMBE	16	\$4,199	15	1	\$81					1	\$81	1.93%	98.07%
37 GATES										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
46 HERTFORD	3	\$638	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
58 MARTIN	3	\$217	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
66 NORTHAMPTON	4	\$1,439	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
70 PASQUOTANK	7	\$1,250	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
72 PERQUIMANS	1	\$139	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
94 WASHINGTON	1	\$10	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>\$8,221</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$81</b>	<b>0.99%</b>	<b>99.01%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
4%	4%	4%	14%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%

**TEAM 8**  
**FS ACTIVE ERROR RATES**  
**October 2006 - August 2007**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE										
7 BEAUFORT	9	\$1,303	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
16 CARTERET	8	\$1,252	7	1	\$155					1	\$155	12.38%	87.62%
25 CRAVEN	10	\$1,453	9					1	\$58	1	\$58	3.99%	96.01%
28 DARE	3	\$477	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
40 GREENE	1	\$495	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
48 HYDE										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
52 JONES	1	\$408	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
54 LENOIR	11	\$2,240	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
67 ONSLOW	12	\$2,073	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
69 PAMLICO										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
74 PITT	21	\$4,041	20			1	\$45			1	\$45	1.11%	98.89%
89 TYRRELL	1	\$38	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
96 WAYNE	14	\$3,572	12			2	\$430			2	\$430	12.04%	87.96%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>\$17,352</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$155</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$475</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$58</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$688</b>	<b>3.96%</b>	<b>96.04%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>\$199,072</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,103</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>\$4,261</b>	<b>2.14%</b>	<b>97.86%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM COMP CASES	TOTAL ISSUE	NUM CORR CASE	INELIG		OVER ISSUE		UNDER ISSUE		TOTAL ERRORS	
			NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
9%	9%	9%	14%	11%	18%	27%	7%	5%	13%	16%