

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

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY
	COMP		CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT		
4 ANSON	2	\$657	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
13 CABARRUS	5	\$1,286	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
18 CATAWBA	10	\$2,307	10							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
36 GASTON	11	\$2,575	9			1	\$41	1	\$49	2	\$90	3.50%	96.50%
49 IREDELL	5	\$1,368	4					1	\$90	1	\$90	6.58%	93.42%
55 LINCOLN	3	\$501	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
60 MECKLENBURG	46	\$10,360	44	1	\$873			1	\$41	2	\$914	8.82%	91.18%
62 MONTGOMERY	3	\$845	2					1	\$121	1	\$121	14.32%	85.68%
77 RICHMOND	6	\$1,963	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
80 ROWAN	8	\$1,475	7					1	\$85	1	\$85	5.76%	94.24%
84 STANLY	3	\$297	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
90 UNION	7	\$1,053	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	109	\$24,687	102	1	\$873	1	\$41	5	\$386	7	\$1,300	5.27%	94.73%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4	\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802	27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
20%	23%	20%	25%	61%	8%	3%	50%	48%	26%	34%

TEAM 4
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - March 2006

COUNTY	NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL		ISSUE	ACCURACY	
	COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	ISSUE	AMT	ISSUE	AMT	ERROR	ERROR	RATE	
	CASES		CASE				NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	RATE	
1 ALAMANCE	5	\$1,199	5								0	\$0	100.00%	
17 CASWELL	1	\$152	1								0	\$0	100.00%	
29 DAVIDSON	12	\$2,146	11						1	\$30	1	\$30	98.60%	
30 DAVIE											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
34 FORSYTH	16	\$3,342	15						1	\$48	1	\$48	98.56%	
41 GUILFORD	29	\$7,075	28				1	\$31			1	\$31	99.56%	
68 ORANGE	5	\$678	4				1	\$142			1	\$142	79.06%	
73 PERSON	1	\$152	1								0	\$0	100.00%	
76 RANDOLPH	7	\$2,252	6						1	\$230	1	\$230	89.79%	
79 ROCKINGHAM	6	\$1,143	6								0	\$0	100.00%	
85 STOKES	4	\$786	4								0	\$0	100.00%	
86 SURRY	6	\$1,345	6								0	\$0	100.00%	
99 YADKIN	2	\$157	1	1		\$119					1	\$119	24.20%	
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	
TEAM	94	\$20,427	88	1		\$119	2	\$173	3	\$308	6	\$600	2.94%	97.06%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4		\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802	27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			CASES	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
17%	19%	17%	25%	8%	15%	11%	30%	38%	22%	16%

**TEAM 5
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - March 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	1	\$335	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
32 DURHAM	12	\$1,959	10	1	\$152	1	\$101				2	\$253	12.91%	87.09%
35 FRANKLIN	4	\$652	3					1	\$39		1	\$39	5.98%	94.02%
39 GRANVILLE	1	\$38	1								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
42 HALIFAX	7	\$1,167	7								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
43 HARNETT	8	\$1,265	8								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
51 JOHNSTON	8	\$927	8								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
53 LEE	4	\$458	4								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
64 NASH	8	\$1,892	8								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
91 VANCE	5	\$463	5								0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
92 WAKE	23	\$5,782	20			2	\$112	1	\$69		3	\$181	3.13%	96.87%
93 WARREN	3	\$793	2			1	\$229				1	\$229	28.88%	71.12%
98 WILSON	5	\$1,248	4			1	\$203				1	\$203	16.27%	83.73%
STATE AGENCY											0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	89	\$16,979	81	1	\$152	5	\$645	2	\$108		8	\$905	5.33%	94.67%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4	\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802		27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			CASES	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
16%	16%	16%	25%	11%	38%	41%	20%	13%	30%	24%

TEAM 6
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - March 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	3	\$546	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
24 COLUMBUS	8	\$1,356	7			1	\$52			1	\$52	3.83%	96.17%
26 CUMBERLAND	21	\$5,241	21							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
31 DUPLIN	6	\$1,018	6							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
47 HOKE	2	\$330	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
63 MOORE	3	\$707	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
65 NEW HANOVER	8	\$1,718	7	1	\$278					1	\$278	16.18%	83.82%
71 PENDER	3	\$763	2			1	\$33			1	\$33	4.33%	95.67%
78 ROBESON	17	\$2,888	17							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
82 SAMPSON	6	\$1,452	5			1	\$378			1	\$378	26.03%	73.97%
83 SCOTLAND	5	\$1,602	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	85	\$17,731	81	1	\$278	3	\$463	0	\$0	4	\$741	4.18%	95.82%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4	\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802	27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	CASE	NO	AMT	NO	AMT
16%	16%	16%	25%	20%	23%	29%	0%	0%	15%	20%

TEAM 7
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - March 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	4	\$602	4							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
15 CAMDEN										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
21 CHOWAN	2	\$96	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
27 CURRITUCK										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
33 EDGECOMBE	9	\$2,098	9							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
37 GATES	2	\$594	2							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
46 HERTFORD	5	\$735	4			1	\$87			1	\$87	11.84%	88.16%
58 MARTIN	3	\$712	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
66 NORTHAMPTON	3	\$353	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
70 PASQUOTANK	3	\$243	3							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
72 PERQUIMANS	1	\$10	1							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!
TEAM	34	\$6,257	33	0	\$0	1	\$87	0	\$0	1	\$87	1.39%	98.61%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4	\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802	27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**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%	8%	6%	0%	0%	4%	2%

TEAM 8
FS ERROR RATES
October 2005 - March 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	5	\$654	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
16 CARTERET	5	\$578	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
25 CRAVEN	5	\$576	5							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
28 DARE										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
40 GREENE	4	\$655	4							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	7	\$841	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
67 ONSLOW	7	\$1,533	7							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
69 PAMLICO	1	\$27	1							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
74 PITT	13	\$2,664	12			1	\$163			1	\$163	6.12%	93.88%
89 TYRRELL										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
96 WAYNE	8	\$1,624	8							0	\$0	0.00%	100.00%
STATE AGENCY										0	\$0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TEAM	56	\$9,162	55	0	\$0	1	\$163	0	\$0	1	\$163	1.78%	98.22%
*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
STATE	546	\$108,014	519	4	\$1,422	13	\$1,572	10	\$802	27	\$3,796	3.51%	96.49%

**Team / State
Comparison
Percentages**

NUM	TOTAL	NUM	INELIG		OVER		UNDER		TOTAL	
			COMP	ISSUE	CORR	NO	AMT	NO	AMT	NO
CASES		CASE								
10%	8%	11%	0%	0%	8%	10%	0%	0%	4%	4%