TABLE 55. SUMMARY OF LOCAL SALES AND USE TAX COLLECTIONS AND DISTRIBUTABLE SHARES BY COUNTY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006
[G.S. 105 ARTICLES 39,40,42,44]

| County | Total <br> net <br> collections <br> Articles <br> 39, 40, 42, 44 <br> [\$] <br> 36, | Total <br> net <br> distributable <br> proceeds <br> Articles <br> 39, 40, 42, 44 <br> [\$] <br> 28 | Total net distributable proceeds as \% of total net collections | County | Total net collections Articles 39, 40, 42, 44 [\$] | Total net distributable proceeds Articles 39, 40, 42, 44 [\$] | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { net } \\ \text { distributable } \\ \text { proceeds as } \% \\ \text { of total } \\ \text { net collections } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | County | Total net collections Articles 39, 40, 42, 44 [\$] | Total net distributable proceeds Articles 39, 40, 42, 44 [\$] | Total net distributable proceeds as $\%$ of total net collections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alamance.. | 36,988,438.10 | 38,501,789.37 | 104.09\% | Hertford. | 4,651,935.56 | 5,820,672.81 | 125.12\% | Van | 9,378,725.99 | 11,292,601.46 | 120.41\% |
| Alexander. | 3,977,828.78 | 7,078,102.49 | 177.94\% | Hoke. | 2,969,798.35 | 6,832,605.55 | 230.07\% | Wake | 284,031,833.79 | 238,637,604.93 | 84.02\% |
| Alleghany. | 1,861,531.60 | 2,565,296.55 | 137.81\% | Hyde. | 1,281,916.25 | 1,424,873.70 | 111.15\% | Warren | 1,600,718.49 | 3,619,676.47 | 226.13\% |
| Anson.... | 2,863,097.82 | 5,145,635.47 | 179.72\% | Iredell | 48,247,562.06 | 42,934,384.98 | 88.99\% | Washington | 1,772,988.18 | 2,932,629.45 | 165.41\% |
| Ashe... | 5,134,953.86 | 6,070,846.21 | 118.23\% | Jackson | 10,132,122.74 | 10,374,903.23 | 102.40\% | Watauga. | 18,399,889.81 | 15,534,416.10 | 84.43\% |
| Avery. | 5,271,451.89 | 5,539,037.48 | 105.08\% | Johnsto | 33,152,156.53 | 36,562,780.89 | 110.29\% | Wayn | 23,493,040.76 | 27,635,843.01 | 117.63\% |
| Beaufort. | 10,967,057.97 | 12,496,984.10 | 113.95\% | Jone | 726,858.33 | 1,677,763.56 | 230.82\% | Wilk | 12,910,969.40 | 16,294,075.22 | 126.20\% |
| Bertie. | 1,830,331.05 | 3,653,668.52 | 199.62\% | Lee | 14,401,503.98 | 14,125,692.13 | 98.08\% | Wilson | 18,472,751.74 | 20,007,316.39 | 108.31\% |
| Bladen. | 4,002,656.44 | 6,979,891.49 | 174.38\% | Lenoir | 12,582,583.11 | 13,750,128.75 | 109.28\% | Yadkin | 4,756,534.73 | 7,734,449.35 | 162.61\% |
| Brunswick. | 30,921,269.38 | 29,353,909.04 | 94.93\% | Lincoln | 14,063,629.99 | 16,505,867.57 | 117.37\% | Yancey | 3,034,122.51 | 4,151,383.13 | 136.82\% |
| Buncombe | 85,228,511.38 | 74,800,918.95 | 87.77\% | Macon. | 11,985,543.18 | 10,370,218.74 | 86.52\% | Totals | 2,447,233,401.31 | 2,432,877,583.11 | 99.41\% |
| Burke.. | 14,165,263.96 | 20,308,849.99 | 143.37\% | Madison. | 2,101,137.03 | 3,849,184.53 | 183.20\% | Less: |  |  |  |
| Cabarrus | 51,074,228.21 | 47,018,619.41 | 92.06\% | Martin | 4,566,775.55 | 5,940,224.72 | 130.07\% | administrative costs | 10,300,783.50 |  | 0.42\% |
| Caldwell. | 13,392,170.33 | 18,317,600.45 | 136.78\% | McDowel | 7,283,105.94 | 10,453,096.02 | 143.53\% | costs pursuant to G.S. 105-501. | 4,055,034.70 |  | 0.17\% |
| Camden.. | 1,544,506.79 | 1,863,581.19 | 120.66\% | Mecklenburg. | 346,861,001.45 | 267,849,045.06 | 77.22\% | Distributable to units. | 2,432,877,583.11 | 2,432,877,583.11 | 100.00\% |
| Carteret | 24,695,541.88 | 22,348,365.42 | 90.50\% | Mitchell. | 3,385,094.78 | 3,887,463.61 | 114.84\% | These amounts do not agree with the actual receipts of the local governments in fiscal year 2005-06 due to the lag in the collection/distribution cycle. Certain administrative costs must be deducted from net collections in determining the amount of distributable proceeds to local governments. The amount of costs associated with local sales and use taxes collected by the Department of Revenue |  |  |  |
| Caswell. | 1,282,748.82 | 3,888,478.93 | 303.14\% | Montgomery. | 3,667,752.67 | 5,676,991.88 | 154.78\% |  |  |  |  |
| Catawba. | 46,650,251.02 | 44,054,452.75 | 94.44\% | Moore.. | 24,883,933.13 | 24,973,900.15 | 100.36\% |  |  |  |  |
| Chatham. | 9,444,118.33 | 12,694,606.31 | 134.42\% | Nash. | 25,269,608.08 | 24,760,588.90 | 97.99\% |  |  |  |  |
| Cherokee. | 8,358,318.32 | 7,742,062.45 | 92.63\% | New Hanover. | 88,696,572.91 | 70,049,038.15 | 78.98\% |  |  |  |  |
| Chowan. | 2,797,595.02 | 3,676,889.98 | 131.43\% | Northampto | 1,723,775.77 | 3,930,367.83 | 228.01\% | during the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 was \$14,355,818.20. |  |  |  |
| Clay........ | 2,103,095.58 | 2,360,478.40 | 112.24\% | Onslow. | 37,737,853.92 | 42,296,966.25 | 112.08\% | Article 39 proceeds are allocated to counties on a point-of-sale basis. (Refer to Table 56 for details of distribution of Article 39 proceeds.) |  |  |  |
| Cleveland. | 17,182,935.94 | 22,843,585.39 | 132.94\% | Orange. | 28,128,612.05 | 34,031,534.13 | 120.99\% |  |  |  |  |
| Columbus. | 8,702,568.75 | 10,748,798.84 | 123.51\% | Pamlico. | 1,770,232.91 | 2,761,908.56 | 156.02\% |  |  |  |  |
| Craven.. | 23,069,538.31 | 25,151,911.55 | 109.03\% | Pasquotank... | 10,667,237.44 | 10,698,336.75 | 100.29\% |  |  |  |  |
| Cumberland | 78,790,377.43 | 82,663,974.91 | 104.92\% | Pender. | 7,859,456.83 | 10,300,391.72 | 131.06\% | Articles 40 and 42 proceeds are allocated to counties based on a county's share of state population. County allocated amounts are then reduced by administrative costs retained by the State and adjusted by an adjustment factor according to special provisions specified in G.S. 105-486(b). Article 42 1/2\% net allocated collections have been reduced for expenses associated with the Property Tax Commission, a property tax appraisal and |  |  |  |
| Currituck. | 9,824,028.20 | 7,681,631.66 | 78.19\% | Perquimans... | 1,373,353.90 | 2,495,110.90 | 181.68\% |  |  |  |  |
| Dare. | 32,387,555.76 | 23,026,137.68 | 71.10\% | Per | 6,731,423.46 | 8,705,109.51 | 129.32\% |  |  |  |  |
| Davidson. | 25,171,805.80 | 34,283,224.07 | 136.20\% | Pitt. | 44,111,058.78 | 43,408,320.11 | 98.41\% |  |  |  |  |
| Davie. | 6,176,008.71 | 8,130,652.69 | 131.65\% | Polk. | 2,403,793.85 | 3,947,347.49 | 164.21\% |  |  |  |  |
| Duplin... | 7,457,095.59 | 11,312,238.88 | 151.70\% | Randolph | 22,005,318.57 | 30,394,928.99 | 138.13\% | assesssment training program | (School of Gov | ment at UNC- | hapel Hill), Local |
| Durham.. | 92,360,224.96 | 84,430,718.86 | 91.41\% | Richmond. | 7,967,428.78 | 11,299,896.83 | 141.83\% | Government Commission, et | l. pursuant to G | 105-501, and ar | therefore not equal |
| Edgecombe.. | 8,602,680.82 | 12,297,563.54 | 142.95\% | Robeson. | 20,159,168.64 | 29,023,451.24 | 143.97\% | to Article 40 1/2\% net alloca | collections. |  |  |
| Forsyth. | 112,442,673.45 | 99,747,193.32 | 88.71\% | Rockingham.. | 14,970,347.31 | 21,040,614.93 | 140.55\% | (Refer to Table 57 for details of | distribution of | ticle 40 and Ar | le 42 proceeds.) |
| Franklin.... | 7,363,249.39 | 10,993,370.56 | 149.30\% | Rowan. | 25,465,545.83 | 30,348,168.77 | 119.17\% |  |  |  |  |
| Gaston. | 42,286,580.89 | 49,726,807.31 | 117.59\% | Rutherfor | 11,942,574.80 | 14,921,534.57 | 124.94\% | Aricle 44 proceeds are allocatr | ed to counties, | rporating bot |  |
| Gates | 731,067.67 | 1,897,400.72 | 259.54\% | Sampson..... | 9,778,585.56 | 13,547,286.00 | 138.54\% | point-of-sale and per capita m | ethods: |  |  |
| Graham. | 1,417,406.41 | 1,854,946.60 | 130.87\% | Scotland. | 6,992,137.79 | 8,713,257.50 | 124.62\% | (1) one-half (1/2) of the Article | 44 net tax collec | d in a county is |  |
| Granville. | 7,465,700.51 | 11,585,454.59 | 155.18\% | Stanly.. | 12,363,965.28 | 14,642,162.71 | 118.43\% | allocated on a point-of-sale | (origin) basis. |  |  |
| Greene......... | 1,439,170.61 | 3,456,697.55 | 240.19\% | Stokes........... | 4,378,076.04 | 8,871,824.42 | 202.64\% | (2) one-half (1/2) of the Artic | 44 net tax is all | d based on a | nty's |
| Guilford. | 154,423,896.62 | 134,817,136.57 | 87.30\% | Surry.. | 17,795,559.32 | 19,895,816.35 | 111.80\% | share of state population; | ounty allocated | ounts are then | uced |
| Halifax | 10,416,727.10 | 13,429,019.45 | 128.92\% | Swain. | 2,224,689.01 | 3,100,176.90 | 139.35\% | administrative costs re | ned by the Stat | d adjusted by | adjustment |
| Harnett. | 13,541,796.61 | 20,914,875.94 | 154.45\% | Transylvania. | 7,914,416.53 | 8,633,660.41 | 109.09\% | tor according to specia | rovisions speci | n G.S. 105-4 |  |
| Haywood... | 15,539,553.32 | 16,029,896.32 | 103.16\% | Tyrrell.......... | 475,222.11 | 832,624.27 | 175.21\% | (Refer to Table 58 for details of | distribution of | ticle 44 proceeds. |  |
| Henderson... | 24,018,839.77 | 26,250,664.29 | 109.29\% | Union.. | 36,164,950.66 | 39,643,399.29 | 109.62\% |  |  |  |  |

