

FY23 FEDERAL AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING BY NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY

BY NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY										
	ALL FEDERAL SPENDING	G	DEPA	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING						
Federal County	Federal Total Actions	Federal Total Dollars	DoD County	DoD Total Actions	DoD Total Dollars					
CUMBERLAND	3,622	\$1,975,239,358.85	CUMBERLAND	3,059	\$1,376,871,409.52					
DURHAM	60,021	\$1,203,465,147.41	ONSLOW	2,797	\$953,031,075.70					
ONSLOW	2,928	\$987,485,419.19	CRAVEN	6,021	\$506,249,811.72					
CRAVEN	6,142	\$531,310,820.15	WAKE	5,775	\$211,263,712.30					
WAKE	7,287	\$376,638,763.00	WAYNE	1,401	\$113,756,398.34					
GUILFORD	29,105	\$334,567,881.58	GUILFORD	28,668	\$97,040,716.47					
MECKLENBURG	1,901	\$209,207,752.97	MECKLENBURG	1,198	\$95,857,590.85					
BUNCOMBE	1,407	\$177,831,432.92	NEW HANOVER	2,011	\$81,466,253.30					
PASQUOTANK	772	\$175,757,482.29	DURHAM	769	\$75,169,837.21					
NEW HANOVER	4,192	\$130,181,938.35	BRUNSWICK	255	\$70,573,101.25					
WAYNE	1,417	\$115,796,725.31	ROCKINGHAM	248	\$66,759,829.40					
BRUNSWICK FORSYTH	465 354	\$115,557,171.75 \$91.708.643.25	FORSYTH PITT	128 38,524	\$60,000,850.99 \$56,970,596.24					
ROCKINGHAM	329	\$77,876,573.15	JOHNSTON	5,262	\$42,023,922.67					
ALAMANCE	266	\$66,538,713.35	IREDELL	877	\$40,996,902.64					
PITT	42,236	\$62,037,816.20	UNION	366	\$34,282,491.50					
ROWAN	1,504	\$58,100,535.01	NASH	1,950	\$33,391,854.56					
ORANGE	461	\$52,459,673.11	BUNCOMBE	362	\$30,232,555.75					
JOHNSTON	5,318	\$49,824,886.21	CARTERET	186	\$28,379,897.46					
CARTERET	350	\$43,568,191.36	WILSON	772	\$22,064,581.63					
IREDELL	931	\$43,123,195.99	CABARRUS	3,087	\$21,027,726.91					
UNION	439	\$40,500,658.03	RICHMOND	42	\$16,593,279.79					
NASH	1,968	\$40,112,547.38	ALAMANCE	133	\$15,886,153.31					
TRANSYLVANIA	88	\$34,217,092.78	MOORE	56	\$14,554,027.57					
DARE	94	\$33,814,122.32	BLADEN	766	\$14,160,566.66					
ROBESON	83	\$27,944,847.46	HOKE	247	\$11,876,261.31					
MOORE	386	\$25,092,605.68	ROBESON	31	\$10,834,025.11					
CABARRUS	3,120	\$24,840,034.68	PASQUOTANK	282	\$6,333,708.39					
WILSON	776	\$23,356,912.22	COLUMBUS	53	\$5,317,748.01					
SWAIN	82	\$20,430,131.82	BURKE	40	\$4,991,075.23					
VANCE	34	\$18,997,757.91	HARNETT	36	\$4,692,029.76					
RICHMOND	72	\$17,667,456.68	ORANGE	58	\$4,606,077.93					
HOKE	648	\$16,032,045.15	MONTGOMERY	38	\$4,161,469.72					
GRANVILLE	3,730	\$15,709,356.97	CURRITUCK	48	\$3,450,752.27					
BLADEN	766	\$14,160,566.66	CLEVELAND	59	\$3,362,519.65					
ALLEGHANY	10	\$11,337,946.00	ASHE	10	\$3,173,247.76					
RUTHERFORD STANLY	426	\$10,389,927.48 \$10,108,458.65	CHEROKEE CATAWBA	23 165	\$3,064,676.47 \$2,791,309.51					
HARNETT	79	\$9,119,798.25	DARE	25	\$2,791,309.31					
CHATHAM	106	\$8,831,181.17	CHATHAM	33	\$2,494,100.91					
CATAWBA	439	\$8,786,557.31	GRANVILLE	95	\$1,795,127.09					
CLEVELAND	99	\$7,130,235.83	WILKES	24	\$1,723,350.12					
BURKE	50	\$6,947,439.01	RANDOLPH	58	\$1,707,251.90					
DAVIDSON	45	\$6,636,333.88	MACON	13	\$1,613,164.16					
MACON	132	\$5,825,964.57	STANLY	100	\$1,538,695.32					
GASTON	96	\$5,743,295.26	PERQUIMANS	3	\$1,437,556.00					
COLUMBUS	62	\$5,576,480.77	LENOIR	75	\$1,361,454.22					
MONTGOMERY	66	\$4,947,664.17	SURRY	24	\$1,228,994.30					
CURRITUCK	68	\$4,157,445.14	RUTHERFORD	35	\$1,035,448.68					
CHEROKEE	45	\$3,721,722.26	LINCOLN	125	\$872,589.45					
GREENE	7	\$3,598,352.73	SCOTLAND	47	\$582,257.51					
ASHE	14	\$3,562,244.12	HENDERSON	56	\$467,738.09					
CALDWELL	72	\$3,146,220.21	PENDER	68	\$465,144.46					
HYDE	16	\$3,101,542.17	CHOWAN	4	\$437,185.92					
HALIFAX	71	\$2,305,592.25	DAVIDSON	6	\$427,671.43					
STOKES	9	\$2,291,644.85	TRANSYLVANIA	3	\$375,137.28					
PERQUIMANS	5	\$2,217,352.80	BEAUFORT	26	\$342,745.35					
MADISON	20	\$2,129,191.73	ALLEGHANY	6	\$304,535.00					
MCDOWELL DUPLIN	42	\$2,108,450.18 \$1,963,649.91	HYDE CASWELL	3 4	\$303,504.40 \$261,187.28					
LENOIR	94	\$1,963,649.91	EDGECOMBE	19	\$258,891.69					
LEE	14	\$1,859,668.32	LEE	7	\$250,691.69					
RANDOLPH	70	\$1,859,668.32	WATAUGA	2	\$220,429.61					
ALEXANDER	8	\$1,497,189.89	YADKIN	3	\$122,971.00					
LINCOLN	130	\$1,410,374.10	HAYWOOD	1	\$110,000.00					
CASWELL	6	\$1,358,841.28	ANSON	2	\$56,232.00					
HENDERSON	105	\$1,340,607.74	CALDWELL	4	\$44,702.00					
PENDER	74	\$1,299,563.40	HALIFAX	2	\$43,730.00					
			= ,		Ţ.J,.JJ.00					

WILKES	26	\$1,063,670.32	MCDOWELL	2	\$28,743.60
WATAUGA	17	\$1,024,933.85	DAVIE	2	\$25,075.74
SCOTLAND	54	\$980,114.67	VANCE	8	\$22,237.67
CAMDEN	16	\$815,957.82	SAMPSON	3	\$21,480.00
BEAUFORT	43	\$641,342.88	DUPLIN	2	\$15,000.00
CHOWAN	9	\$540,619.49	FRANKLIN	1	\$1,155.00
EDGECOMBE	25	\$392,071.79	ROWAN	28	(\$20,995.42)
TYRRELL	8	\$325,619.35	ALEXANDER	3	(\$50,021.07)
GRAHAM	21	\$295,130.71	PERSON	6	(\$1,089,452.40)
HAYWOOD	22	\$289,942.43	GASTON	18	(\$56,274,037.49)
SAMPSON	44	\$189,108.08		106,753	\$4,114,338,979.16
JACKSON	8	\$165,592.87			
MARTIN	1	\$160,625.00			
MITCHELL	5	\$130,361.44			
PAMLICO	6	\$126,061.16			
CLAY	8	\$122,016.30			
WASHINGTON	1	\$118,400.00			
YADKIN	4	\$115,758.66			
ANSON	2	\$56,232.00			
FRANKLIN	4	\$50,869.20			
YANCEY	3	\$25,244.00			
GATES	3	\$5,700.00			
BERTIE	2	(\$26.19)			
POLK	3	(\$18,472.47)			
PERSON	9	(\$1,036,257.22)			
DAVIE	4	(\$4,248,862.76)			
	186,203	\$7,382,972,658.08			

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.