

CONNECTING MILITARY AND BUSINESS

## FY22 FEDERAL AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING BY NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY

BY NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY										
ALL F	EDERAL S	PENDING		DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING						
Federal County	Federal Total Actions	Federal Total Dollars		DoD County	DoD Total Actions	DoD Total Dollars				
DURHAM	48,269	\$2,702,177,347.62		DURHAM	813	\$1,688,839,370.79				
CUMBERLAND	3,913	\$1,493,534,188.64		CUMBERLAND	3,341	\$1,126,453,036.00				
ONSLOW	6,242	\$903,204,054.22		ONSLOW	3,033	\$869,227,279.47				
GUILFORD	33,764	\$576,476,896.89		CRAVEN	4,661	\$543,856,483.89				
CRAVEN	4,791	\$551,819,647.05		WAKE	6,324	\$193,707,122.16				
WAKE	7,939	\$404,009,450.68		GUILFORD	32,991	\$140,731,708.37				
NEW HANOVER	4,021	\$359,551,405.12		NEW HANOVER	2,800	\$125,428,848.69				
MECKLENBURG	2,276	\$184,696,084.38		BRUNSWICK	250	\$97,760,634.71				
BUNCOMBE	1,622	\$182,398,604.60		MECKLENBURG	1,561	\$91,316,783.83				
BRUNSWICK	494	\$126,744,439.10		WAYNE	1,158	\$80,243,732.17				
ALAMANCE	253	\$123,180,447.72		GASTON	11	\$80,054,363.45				
PASQUOTANK	711	\$122,981,524.44		ROCKINGHAM	288	\$65,378,302.71				
ALLEGHANY	14	\$100,836,885.95		FORSYTH	116	\$39,024,783.60				
GASTON	73	\$88,446,984.83		PITT	36,375	\$36,826,489.23				
TRANSYLVANIA	139	\$86.773.146.35		JOHNSTON	5.163	\$33,768,599.88				
WAYNE	1.177	\$81,028,999.81		HOKE	220	\$27,862,789.28				
FORSYTH	402	\$74,734,617.28		UNION	476	\$25,227,357.26				
ORANGE	434	\$73,917,188.62		IREDELL	538	\$25,038,606.48				
ROCKINGHAM	327	\$68.831.950.77		RICHMOND	89	\$22,646,508.12				
ROWAN	1,254	\$46,317,824.23		BLADEN	894	\$19,266,852.96				
PITT	39,519	\$41,606,666.94		NASH	1,422	\$17,585,993.97				
ROBESON	187	\$38,121,017.56		WILSON	664	\$16.930.948.26				
JOHNSTON	5,201	\$36.699.168.90		PASQUOTANK	351	\$15,021,849.56				
ASHE	11	\$32,362,791.89		ORANGE	47	\$14,431,612.81				
HOKE	1,085	\$31,390,938.74		ALAMANCE	126	\$13,214,162.16				
UNION	530	\$28,298,227.94		MOORE	49	\$10,992,182.05				
IREDELL	574	\$25,404,766.62		CABARRUS	3,301	\$10,162,281.76				
NASH	1,448	\$25,257,081.03		PERSON	8	\$9,974,066.19				
DAVIE	20	\$24,677,990.12		BUNCOMBE	343	\$8,984,142.01				
RICHMOND	110	\$22,952,740.31		ROBESON	145	\$7,508,192.42				
CARTERET	287	\$22,163,970.38		STANLY	90	\$5,583,015.81				
MOORE	257	\$20,779,762.98		CLEVELAND	105	\$5,483,255.42				
BLADEN	896	\$19,274,050.29		COLUMBUS	75	\$4,703,427.76				
WILSON	671	\$18,010,641.52		CARTERET	118	\$3,795,823.81				
CHATHAM	88	\$14,073,103.00		CURRITUCK	46	\$3,630,909.16				
HARNETT	103	\$13,524,112.71		ASHE	2	\$3,600,383.48				
VANCE	50	\$12,960,751.06		BURKE	55	\$3,337,641.42				
GRANVILLE	3,899	\$12,687,181.12		HARNETT	42	\$2,961,816.24				
0.40.400.00	0.000	<b>*</b> + <b>•</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		0	42 34					
	3,336	\$12,326,881.56 \$11,700,273,70				\$2,928,714.15 \$2,431,455,46				
	68	\$11,799,273.70 \$0,646,720,45			151	\$2,431,455.46 \$1,805,122,22				
DARE	109	\$9,646,739.45 \$0,614,167,48			94	\$1,805,122.23 \$1,802,961,75				
PERSON	14	\$9,614,167.48			38	\$1,802,861.75 \$1,788,206,47				
MCDOWELL	31	\$8,499,836.26		WILKES	25	\$1,788,296.47				
	396	\$7,253,887.97		RANDOLPH	41	\$1,711,141.07				
	83	\$6,346,283.61		MACON	10	\$1,676,229.19				
STANLY	391	\$6,162,803.81		SURRY	14	\$1,536,479.68				

CLEVELAND	118	\$5,687,066.30	DAVIDSON	13	\$1,406,668.56
BURKE	65	\$4,968,498.68	RUTHERFORD	53	\$1,370,530.30
SWAIN	91	\$4,900,962.26	SCOTLAND	164	\$1,338,713.20
HENDERSON	59	\$4,768,606.06	LINCOLN	58	\$931,980.83
HALIFAX	64	\$4.353.773.75	GRANVILLE	95	\$903.889.03
CURRITUCK	70	\$4,169,101.13	BEAUFORT	30	\$852,116.86
MACON	118	\$3,925,682.17	PERQUIMANS	1	\$711,323.00
YADKIN	12	\$3,608,216.60	PENDER	65	\$674,240.28
LEE	15	\$2,964,844.50	DARE	26	\$494,605.29
MADISON	23	\$2,910,612.46	TRANSYLVANIA	7	\$366,982.56
WILKES	32	\$2,733,124.69	CASWELL	5	\$299,415.47
PENDER	84	\$2,680,650.39	HALIFAX	3	\$275,819.00
CHEROKEE	50	\$2,263,165.45	HENDERSON	15	\$253,023.47
LENOIR	112	\$2,017,182.85	MADISON	2	\$249,998.01
RANDOLPH	47	\$1,840,396.76	ROWAN	50	\$238,113.55
CALDWELL	65	\$1,720,266.88	ALLEGHANY	4	\$156,000.00
RUTHERFORD	56	\$1,619,949.36	DAVIE	2	\$128,289.98
WATAUGA	16	\$1,587,469.56	GATES	8	\$117,275.00
JACKSON	23	\$1,558,656.62	CALDWELL	6	\$105,020.60
SURRY	14	\$1,536,479.68	LEE	4	\$94,778.71
DUPLIN	15	\$1,369,059.40	ANSON	2	\$90,000.00
SCOTLAND	165	\$1,338,713.20	ALEXANDER	2	\$50,275.07
BEAUFORT	57	\$1,338,365.19	CHOWAN	3	\$48,261.60
CHOWAN	19	\$1,273,155.00	YADKIN	7	\$36,795.92
LINCOLN	65	\$1,204,620.27	VANCE	24	\$32,026.29
STOKES	7	\$1,135,118.95	WATAUGA	1	\$28,460.00
ALEXANDER	9	\$1.072.091.96	FRANKLIN	5	\$24,393.24
MITCHELL	10	\$1,067,495.16	 SAMPSON	1	\$2,009.00
PERQUIMANS	5	\$901,937.00	EDGECOMBE	9	\$1,985.96
GRAHAM	14	\$530,088.64	DUPLIN	1	\$0.00
YANCEY	6	\$491,535.12	MONTGOMERY	13	(\$2,835,426.80)
HYDE	12	\$484,831.00	TOTAL	109,177	\$ 5,514,689,221.32
CASWELL	9	\$361,031.15		100,111	\$ 0,014,000,221.02
NORTHAMPTON	1	\$344,694.52			
TYRRELL	8	\$325,287.00			
HAYWOOD	24	\$259,334.20			
GREENE	1	\$199,500.00			
EDGECOMBE	13	\$184,214.56			
GATES	9	\$113,975.00			
ANSON	2	\$90,000.00			
CLAY	9	\$59,448.19			
PAMLICO	5	\$23.888.23			
POLK	2	\$15,500.00			
SAMPSON	49	\$3,195.90			
JONES	3	\$55.60			
FRANKLIN	9	(\$26,085.41)			
BERTIE	 	(\$28,100.00)			
AVERY	3	(\$52,863.97)			
MONTGOMERY	34	(\$1.719.802.61)			
TOTAL	<b>179,179</b>	\$8,937,731,514.65			
	110,113	\$3,001,101,01 <del>1</del> .00			

Information within this report is subject to the data and transaction integrity of the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS). Multiple entries for the same company likely result from changes and/or modifications to contracts during the period of performance. Negative value entries normally reflect work remaining to be performed, work in progress or modifications requested by the government and/or the vendor for unnecessary or delayed work. Negative values may also result from de-obligation of funds due to performance, non-performance or other contract actions, potentially during a previous fiscal year (resulting in negative values for the current fiscal year). While a single contractor may have a negative value, the county may be positive overall, due to contract actions with other contractors. Conversely, while a county may have an overall negative value due to a high negative by even a single contractor, many of the contractors within the county may have had positive contract revenues.