

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 | * + • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | 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 | 179,179 | \$8,937,731,514.65 | | | |
| | 110,113 | \$3,001,101,01 1 .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.