

TEAM 3
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - January 2006

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	1	\$351	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
13 CABARRUS	3	\$1,079	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
18 CATAWBA	7	\$1,640	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
36 GASTON	8	\$2,030	6			1	\$41	1	\$49	2	\$90	4.43%	95.57%
49 IREDELL	3	\$714	2					1	\$90	1	\$90	12.61%	87.39%
55 LINCOLN	2	\$462	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
60 MECKLENBURG	30	\$6,413	29					1	\$41	1	\$41	0.64%	99.36%
62 MONTGOMERY	2	\$783	1					1	\$121	1	\$121	15.45%	84.55%
77 RICHMOND	4	\$1,352	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
80 ROWAN	5	\$1,090	4					1	\$85	1	\$85	7.80%	92.20%
84 STANLY	1	\$83	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
90 UNION	5	\$799	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	71	\$16,796	65	0	\$0	1	\$41	5	\$386	6	\$427	2.54%	97.46%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	360	\$71,798	339	1	\$152	11	\$1,334	9	\$754	21	\$2,240	3.12%	96.88%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
CASES	ISSUE	CASE								
20%	23%	19%	0%	0%	9%	3%	56%	51%	29%	19%

TEAM 4
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - January 2006

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG	OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	ISSUE		ACCURACY	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	RATE	
1 ALAMANCE	4	\$977	4							0	\$0	100.00%	
17 CASWELL	1	\$152	1							0	\$0	100.00%	
29 DAVIDSON	8	\$1,672	7					1	\$30	1	\$30	98.21%	
30 DAVIE										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
34 FORSYTH	11	\$2,281	11							0	\$0	100.00%	
41 GUILFORD	18	\$4,330	17			1	\$31			1	\$31	99.28%	
68 ORANGE	4	\$526	3			1	\$142			1	\$142	73.00%	
73 PERSON										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
76 RANDOLPH	5	\$1,468	4					1	\$230	1	\$230	84.33%	
79 ROCKINGHAM	4	\$749	4							0	\$0	100.00%	
85 STOKES	3	\$528	3							0	\$0	100.00%	
86 SURRY	4	\$318	4							0	\$0	100.00%	
99 YADKIN	1	\$38	1							0	\$0	100.00%	
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
TEAM	63	\$13,039	59	0	\$0	2	\$173	2	\$260	4	\$433	3.32%	96.68%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	360	\$71,798	339	1	\$152	11	\$1,334	9	\$754	21	\$2,240	3.12%	96.88%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
18%	18%	17%	0%	0%	18%	13%	22%	34%	19%	19%

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
19 CHATHAM	1	\$335	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
32 DURHAM	9	\$1,265	7	1	\$152	1	\$101			2	\$253	20.00%	80.00%
35 FRANKLIN	3	\$442	2					1	\$39	1	\$39	8.82%	91.18%
39 GRANVILLE	1	\$38	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
42 HALIFAX	4	\$547	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
43 HARNETT	6	\$1,227	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
51 JOHNSTON	5	\$268	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
53 LEE	3	\$373	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
64 NASH	6	\$878	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
91 VANCE	4	\$224	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
92 WAKE	13	\$2,716	11			1	\$37	1	\$69	2	\$106	3.90%	96.10%
93 WARREN	2	\$323	1			1	\$229			1	\$229	70.90%	29.10%
98 WILSON	3	\$632	2			1	\$203			1	\$203	32.12%	67.88%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	60	\$9,268	53	1	\$152	4	\$570	2	\$108	7	\$830	8.96%	91.04%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	360	\$71,798	339	1	\$152	11	\$1,334	9	\$754	21	\$2,240	3.12%	96.88%

**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%	13%	16%	100%	100%	36%	43%	22%	14%	33%	37%

TEAM 6
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - January 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	1	\$314	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
24 COLUMBUS	5	\$1,122	4			1	\$52			1	\$52	4.63%	95.37%
26 CUMBERLAND	14	\$3,950	14							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
31 DUPLIN	4	\$856	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
47 HOKE	2	\$330	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
63 MOORE	2	\$487	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
65 NEW HANOVER	4	\$948	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
71 PENDER	3	\$763	2			1	\$33			1	\$33	4.33%	95.67%
78 ROBESON	12	\$2,056	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
82 SAMPSON	4	\$1,209	3			1	\$378			1	\$378	31.27%	68.73%
83 SCOTLAND	4	\$1,203	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	58	\$13,348	55	0	\$0	3	\$463	0	\$0	3	\$463	3.47%	96.53%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	360	\$71,798	339	1	\$152	11	\$1,334	9	\$754	21	\$2,240	3.12%	96.88%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
16%	19%	16%	0%	0%	27%	35%	0%	0%	14%	21%

TEAM 7
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - January 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	
8 BERTIE	2	\$162	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
15 CAMDEN										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
21 CHOWAN	1	\$58	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
27 CURRITUCK										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
33 EDGECOMBE	6	\$1,787	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
37 GATES	2	\$594	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
46 HERTFORD	3	\$430	2			1	\$87			1	\$87	20.23%	79.77%
58 MARTIN	2	\$445	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
66 NORTHAMPTON	2	\$190	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
70 PASQUOTANK	2	\$210	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
72 PERQUIMANS	1	\$10	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
94 WASHINGTON	1	\$601	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	22	\$4,487	21	0	\$0	1	\$87	0	\$0	1	\$87	1.94%	98.06%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	360	\$71,798	339	1	\$152	11	\$1,334	9	\$754	21	\$2,240	3.12%	96.88%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
CASES		CASE								
6%	6%	6%	0%	0%	9%	7%	0%	0%	5%	4%

