

**TEAM 1  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
	CASES		CASE									RATE	
11 BUNCOMBE	24	\$3,645	24							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
20 CHEROKEE	5	\$375	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
22 CLAY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
38 GRAHAM	2	\$37	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
44 HAYWOOD	7	\$1,285	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
45 HENDERSON	5	\$531	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
50 JACKSON	4	\$337	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
56 MACON	5	\$817	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
57 MADISON	1	\$128	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
75 POLK	1	\$155	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
87 SWAIN	2	\$565	1					1	\$140	1	\$140	24.78%	75.22%
88 TRANSYLVANIA	3	\$387	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>\$8,262</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$140</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$140</b>	<b>1.69%</b>	<b>98.31%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
	CASES		CASE								
	6%	4%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	11%	2%	2%

**TEAM 2  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
2 ALEXANDER	1	\$318	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
3 ALLEGHANY	2	\$784	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
5 ASHE										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
6 AVERY	1	\$15	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
12 BURKE	9	\$1,899	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
14 CALDWELL	10	\$1,558	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
23 CLEVELAND	18	\$3,067	17			1	\$104			1	\$104	3.39%	96.61%
59 MCDOWELL	6	\$518	5			1	\$32			1	\$32	6.18%	93.82%
61 MITCHELL	2	\$386	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
81 RUTHERFORD	9	\$2,229	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
95 WATAUGA	2	\$265	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
97 WILKES	10	\$851	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
0 YANCEY	7	\$961	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>\$12,851</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$136</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$136</b>	<b>1.06%</b>	<b>98.94%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</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
8%	7%	8%	0%	0%	10%	6%	0%	0%	4%	2%

**TEAM 3  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	
4 ANSON	7	\$1,447	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
13 CABARRUS	13	\$3,840	12			1	\$213			1	\$213	5.55%	94.45%
18 CATAWBA	17	\$3,667	17							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
36 GASTON	22	\$4,933	20			1	\$41	1	\$49	2	\$90	1.82%	98.18%
49 IREDELL	10	\$2,030	9					1	\$90	1	\$90	4.43%	95.57%
55 LINCOLN	5	\$833	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
60 MECKLENBURG	82	\$16,659	78	3	\$1,098			1	\$41	4	\$1,139	6.84%	93.16%
62 MONTGOMERY	6	\$1,151	4	1	\$10			1	\$121	2	\$131	11.38%	88.62%
77 RICHMOND	9	\$2,717	8					1	\$103	1	\$103	3.79%	96.21%
80 ROWAN	16	\$2,865	15					1	\$85	1	\$85	2.97%	97.03%
84 STANLY	6	\$1,031	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
90 UNION	12	\$1,828	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>\$43,001</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>\$1,108</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$254</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$489</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>\$1,851</b>	<b>4.30%</b>	<b>95.70%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
20%	22%	20%	40%	53%	10%	10%	40%	38%	26%	32%	

**TEAM 4**  
**FS ERROR RATES**  
**October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
	CASES	ISSUE	CASE										
1 ALAMANCE	10	\$2,166	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
17 CASWELL	2	\$294	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
29 DAVIDSON	19	\$3,297	18					1	\$30	1	\$30	0.91%	99.09%
30 DAVIE	2	\$347	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
34 FORSYTH	33	\$5,825	32					1	\$48	1	\$48	0.82%	99.18%
41 GUILFORD	53	\$12,581	50	1	\$23	2	\$158			3	\$181	1.44%	98.56%
68 ORANGE	9	\$1,268	8			1	\$142			1	\$142	11.20%	88.80%
73 PERSON	4	\$1,040	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
76 RANDOLPH	12	\$3,462	11					1	\$230	1	\$230	6.64%	93.36%
79 ROCKINGHAM	12	\$2,068	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
85 STOKES	6	\$1,296	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
86 SURRY	11	\$2,331	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
99 YADKIN	3	\$517	2	1	\$119					1	\$119	23.02%	76.98%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>\$36,492</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$142</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$300</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$308</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>\$750</b>	<b>2.06%</b>	<b>97.94%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
CASES	ISSUE	CASE								
17%	18%	17%	20%	7%	14%	12%	20%	24%	17%	13%

**TEAM 5  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
	CASES		CASE									RATE	
19 CHATHAM	2	\$346	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
32 DURHAM	24	\$5,329	22	1	\$152	1	\$101			2	\$253	4.75%	95.25%
35 FRANKLIN	8	\$1,491	7					1	\$39	1	\$39	2.62%	97.38%
39 GRANVILLE	3	\$799	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
42 HALIFAX	16	\$3,198	16							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
43 HARNETT	14	\$2,497	14							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
51 JOHNSTON	17	\$3,049	16			1	\$91			1	\$91	2.98%	97.02%
53 LEE	7	\$1,252	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
64 NASH	16	\$3,468	16							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
91 VANCE	10	\$1,198	9			1	\$131			1	\$131	10.93%	89.07%
92 WAKE	45	\$9,666	41			2	\$112	2	\$118	4	\$230	2.38%	97.62%
93 WARREN	6	\$1,545	5			1	\$229			1	\$229	14.82%	85.18%
98 WILSON	11	\$1,921	10			1	\$203			1	\$203	10.57%	89.43%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>\$35,759</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$152</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$867</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$157</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>\$1,176</b>	<b>3.29%</b>	<b>96.71%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			CASES	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
18%	18%	17%	10%	7%	33%	35%	20%	12%	24%	20%

**TEAM 6**  
**FS ERROR RATES**  
**October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
9 BLADEN	3	\$110	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
10 BRUNSWICK	8	\$921	7	1	\$278					1	\$278	30.18%	69.82%
24 COLUMBUS	14	\$2,015	12			1	\$52	1	\$126	2	\$178	8.83%	91.17%
26 CUMBERLAND	41	\$8,910	39			1	\$71	1	\$64	2	\$135	1.52%	98.48%
31 DUPLIN	9	\$1,529	8			1	\$107			1	\$107	7.00%	93.00%
47 HOKE	6	\$958	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
63 MOORE	5	\$1,643	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
65 NEW HANOVER	14	\$2,728	13	1	\$278					1	\$278	10.19%	89.81%
71 PENDER	4	\$920	3			1	\$33			1	\$33	3.59%	96.41%
78 ROBESON	32	\$6,022	31	1	\$147					1	\$147	2.44%	97.56%
82 SAMPSON	10	\$2,396	9			1	\$378			1	\$378	15.78%	84.22%
83 SCOTLAND	8	\$2,259	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>\$30,411</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$703</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$641</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$190</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$1,534</b>	<b>5.04%</b>	<b>94.96%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
15%	15%	15%	30%	33%	24%	26%	13%	15%	22%	26%

**TEAM 7**  
**FS ERROR RATES**  
**October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
8 BERTIE	7	\$945	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
15 CAMDEN										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
21 CHOWAN	4	\$607	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
27 CURRITUCK										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
33 EDGECOMBE	15	\$3,545	15							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
37 GATES	4	\$832	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
46 HERTFORD	7	\$1,488	6			1	\$87			1	\$87	5.85%	94.15%
58 MARTIN	5	\$1,212	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
66 NORTHAMPTON	8	\$1,424	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
70 PASQUOTANK	6	\$1,142	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
72 PERQUIMANS	3	\$416	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
94 WASHINGTON	3	\$1,030	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>\$12,641</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$87</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$87</b>	<b>0.69%</b>	<b>99.31%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</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%	6%	6%	0%	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%	2%	1%

**TEAM 8  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - August 2006**

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
CASES		CASE										RATE	
7 BEAUFORT	10	\$1,710	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
16 CARTERET	9	\$1,132	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
25 CRAVEN	10	\$1,424	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
28 DARE	2	\$28	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
40 GREENE	7	\$1,491	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
48 HYDE	1	\$10	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
52 JONES										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
54 LENOIR	14	\$1,996	14							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
67 ONSLOW	11	\$2,560	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
69 PAMLICO	1	\$27	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
74 PITT	22	\$4,269	21			1	\$163			1	\$163	3.82%	96.18%
89 TYRRELL										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
96 WAYNE	17	\$3,240	17							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>\$17,887</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$163</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$163</b>	<b>0.91%</b>	<b>99.09%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>\$197,304</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$2,448</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>\$5,837</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>97.04%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		
			CASES	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
10%	9%	11%	0%	0%	5%	7%	0%	0%	2%	3%	