

**TEAM 1  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - July 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	22	\$3,487	22							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
20 CHEROKEE	4	\$337	4							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	4	\$804	4							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	2	\$296	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>\$7,962</b>	<b>53</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>1.76%</b>	<b>98.24%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
CASES		CASE								
6%	4%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	11%	2%	3%

**TEAM 2  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - July 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	9	\$1,440	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
23 CLEVELAND	16	\$3,012	15			1	\$104			1	\$104	3.45%	96.55%
59 MCDOWELL	5	\$477	4			1	\$32			1	\$32	6.71%	93.29%
61 MITCHELL	2	\$386	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
81 RUTHERFORD	8	\$2,016	8							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	6	\$581	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>\$12,044</b>	<b>69</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>1.13%</b>	<b>98.87%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</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%	11%	6%	0%	0%	5%	2%

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
4 ANSON	6	\$1,437	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
13 CABARRUS	12	\$3,567	11			1	\$213			1	\$213	5.97%	94.03%
18 CATAWBA	16	\$3,576	16							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
36 GASTON	20	\$4,810	18			1	\$41	1	\$49	2	\$90	1.87%	98.13%
49 IREDELL	9	\$1,752	8					1	\$90	1	\$90	5.14%	94.86%
55 LINCOLN	5	\$833	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
60 MECKLENBURG	75	\$15,289	71	3	\$1,098			1	\$41	4	\$1,139	7.45%	92.55%
62 MONTGOMERY	5	\$1,007	3	1	\$10			1	\$121	2	\$131	13.01%	86.99%
77 RICHMOND	9	\$2,717	8					1	\$103	1	\$103	3.79%	96.21%
80 ROWAN	15	\$2,853	14					1	\$85	1	\$85	2.98%	97.02%
84 STANLY	5	\$969	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
90 UNION	11	\$1,808	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>\$40,618</b>	<b>176</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>4.56%</b>	<b>95.44%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
20%	22%	20%	40%	53%	11%	12%	40%	38%	28%	33%

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	
1 ALAMANCE	9	\$2,072	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
17 CASWELL	2	\$294	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
29 DAVIDSON	18	\$3,173	17					1	\$30	1	\$30	0.95%	99.05%
30 DAVIE	1	\$10	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
34 FORSYTH	29	\$5,331	28					1	\$48	1	\$48	0.90%	99.10%
41 GUILFORD	49	\$11,444	46	1	\$23	2	\$158			3	\$181	1.58%	98.42%
68 ORANGE	8	\$1,205	7			1	\$142			1	\$142	11.78%	88.22%
73 PERSON	4	\$1,040	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
76 RANDOLPH	10	\$3,299	9					1	\$230	1	\$230	6.97%	93.03%
79 ROCKINGHAM	11	\$1,999	11							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
85 STOKES	6	\$1,296	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
86 SURRY	10	\$2,189	10							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>160</b>	<b>\$33,869</b>	<b>152</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>2.21%</b>	<b>97.79%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
17%	19%	17%	20%	7%	17%	14%	20%	24%	19%	14%	

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	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	22	\$5,025	20	1	\$152	1	\$101				2	\$253	5.03%	94.97%
35 FRANKLIN	7	\$1,213	6					1	\$39		1	\$39	3.22%	96.78%
39 GRANVILLE	3	\$799	3								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
42 HALIFAX	14	\$3,001	14								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
43 HARNETT	13	\$2,463	13								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
51 JOHNSTON	15	\$2,928	15								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
53 LEE	7	\$1,252	7								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
64 NASH	14	\$3,183	14								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
91 VANCE	9	\$920	9								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
92 WAKE	41	\$9,061	37			2	\$112	2	\$118		4	\$230	2.54%	97.46%
93 WARREN	6	\$1,545	5			1	\$229				1	\$229	14.82%	85.18%
98 WILSON	9	\$1,807	8			1	\$203				1	\$203	11.23%	88.77%
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>\$33,543</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$152</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$645</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$157</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$954</b>	<b>2.84%</b>	<b>97.16%</b>	
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</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%	17%	10%	7%	28%	30%	20%	12%	21%	17%

**TEAM 6  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - July 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	7	\$911	6	1	\$278					1	\$278	30.52%	69.48%
24 COLUMBUS	13	\$1,743	11			1	\$52	1	\$126	2	\$178	10.21%	89.79%
26 CUMBERLAND	37	\$8,000	36					1	\$64	1	\$64	0.80%	99.20%
31 DUPLIN	9	\$1,529	8			1	\$107			1	\$107	7.00%	93.00%
47 HOKE	5	\$948	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
63 MOORE	5	\$1,643	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
65 NEW HANOVER	13	\$2,718	12	1	\$278					1	\$278	10.23%	89.77%
71 PENDER	4	\$920	3			1	\$33			1	\$33	3.59%	96.41%
78 ROBESON	28	\$4,578	27	1	\$147					1	\$147	3.21%	96.79%
82 SAMPSON	9	\$2,065	8			1	\$378			1	\$378	18.31%	81.69%
83 SCOTLAND	8	\$2,259	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>\$27,424</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$703</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>\$570</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$190</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$1,463</b>	<b>5.33%</b>	<b>94.67%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</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%	22%	26%	13%	15%	21%	26%

**TEAM 7  
FS ERROR RATES  
October 2005 - July 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	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	14	\$3,253	14							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
37 GATES	3	\$751	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
46 HERTFORD	6	\$887	5			1	\$87			1	\$87	9.81%	90.19%
58 MARTIN	5	\$1,212	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
66 NORTHAMPTON	7	\$1,239	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
70 PASQUOTANK	5	\$824	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
72 PERQUIMANS	2	\$165	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
94 WASHINGTON	2	\$814	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>\$10,697</b>	<b>54</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>0.81%</b>	<b>99.19%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</b>

**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%	6%	4%	0%	0%	2%	2%

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	ERROR	RATE
7 BEAUFORT	9	\$1,558	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
16 CARTERET	8	\$920	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
25 CRAVEN	9	\$956	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
28 DARE	1	\$18	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
40 GREENE	6	\$1,092	6							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	12	\$1,692	12							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
67 ONSLOW	10	\$2,256	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
69 PAMLICO	1	\$27	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
74 PITT	20	\$3,910	19			1	\$163			1	\$163	4.17%	95.83%
89 TYRRELL										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
96 WAYNE	15	\$2,978	15							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>TEAM</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>\$15,417</b>	<b>91</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>1.06%</b>	<b>98.94%</b>
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
<b>STATE</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>\$181,574</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$2,105</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,155</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>\$1,284</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>\$5,544</b>	<b>3.05%</b>	<b>96.95%</b>

**Team / State  
Comparison  
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
10%	8%	10%	0%	0%	6%	8%	0%	0%	2%	3%