TEXAS INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION

Fiscal Monitoring Report

Denton County, Texas

FY2023 Indigent Defense Expenses

Final Report

June 2026

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
DETAILED REPORT 4
Background 4
County Background 4
Commission Background 4
Formula Grant 4
Objective 5
Scope 5
Methodology 5
Review Assessment 5
Statutory Data Reporting 5
Promulgate Standard Attorney Fee Schedule and Payment Process 9
Establish Minimum Attorney Qualifications 10
Findings and Recommendations 10
Statutory Data Reporting 10
Promulgate Standard Attorney Fee Schedule and Payment Process 11
Conclusion 13
APPENDICES 14
Appendix A – Indigent Defense Expenditure Report 15
Appendix B – Criteria 17
Appendix C – Distribution List 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Texas Indigent Defense Commission (Commission or TIDC) is responsible for fiscal monitoring of Texas counties' indigent defense expenditures per Texas Administrative Code Subchapter D Sec. 173.401, which states:

> The Commission or its designees will monitor the activities of grantees as necessary to ensure that Commission grant funds are used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of grant agreements.

TIDC conducted an on-site fiscal monitoring review of Denton County from July 23 through July 26, 2024. Email exchanges and phone calls continued until May 12, 2025. The fiscal monitor reviewed financial records to determine whether grant funds were spent in accordance with the terms and conditions of TIDC grants. TIDC reviewed the expenditure period of October 1, 2022, through September 30, 2023 (FY2023).

Summary of Findings

- The FY2023 Indigent Defense Expenditure Report (IDER) submitted in accordance with Texas Government Code §79.036(e) was not prepared in the manner required. Specifically, Denton County included unallowable general court expenditures with the criminal indigent defense expenses on the FY2023 IDER.

- Denton County uses a contract defender system with one attorney for the mental health specialty court. The County did not fully comply with the contract defender rules in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 174, Subchapter B.

These findings and associated recommendations are detailed in the following report.

TIDC thanks Denton County officials and staff for their assistance in completing this review. TIDC stands ready to provide assistance to remedy these issues.

DETAILED REPORT

Background

TIDC selected Denton County for a review through its annual county monitoring selection process, which considers county size, spending, date of last fiscal review (if any), and other reported indigent defense data. The selection process seeks to cycle through counties around the state.

This fiscal review covered the reports filed for FY2023.

County Background

Denton County was formed from Fannin County in 1846. The County is located just north of Tarrant and Dallas Counties. The current population is estimated at 995,510, and the county seat is the city of Denton. Denton County covers 953 square miles, including 75 square miles of water.

Criminal cases in Denton County were handled by six district courts — the 16th, 158th, 211th, 362nd, 367th, and 462nd — one county court-at-law, and five county criminal courts in FY2023.

Denton County uses the private assigned counsel system for indigent defense, with the exception of one mental health specialty court program that uses a contract defender.

Total expenditures for criminal defense representation reported by Denton County for FY2023 were $5,339,732.

Commission Background

In January 2002, the Texas Legislature established the Texas Task Force on Indigent Defense. In May 2011, the Legislature changed the agency's name to the Texas Indigent Defense Commission (TIDC), effective September 1, 2011. TIDC is a permanent standing committee of the Texas Judicial Council and is administratively attached to the Office of Court Administration (OCA).

TIDC's mission is to protect the right to counsel and improve indigent defense.

TIDC's purpose is to promote justice and fairness for all indigent persons accused of crimes, including juvenile respondents, as provided by the laws and constitutions of the United States and the State of Texas. TIDC conducts these reviews based on the directive in Section 79.037, Texas Government Code, to "monitor each county that receives a grant and enforce compliance by the county with the conditions of the grant…," as well as Section 173.401(a), Texas Administrative Code, which provides that "the Commission or its designees will monitor the activities of grantees as necessary to ensure that grant funds are used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of the grant."

Formula Grant

The County submitted the FY2023 indigent defense online grant application to assist in the provision of indigent defense services. Denton County met the formula grant eligibility requirements and was awarded $340,777 in Formula Grant funds for FY2023. Denton County was also awarded $196,371 in Improvement Grant funds for the second year of a four-year grant to fund the indigent defense coordinator team.

Objective

The objectives of this review were to:

- Determine the accuracy of the Indigent Defense Expenditure Report (IDER) and any other grant report that may have been filed for the period of review.
- Determine whether grant funds were used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations, and the provisions of the grant.
- Validate policies and procedures relating to indigent defense payments.
- Provide recommendations pertaining to operational efficiency.
- Assist with any questions or concerns on the indigent defense program requirements.

Scope

TIDC reviewed the County's criminal and juvenile delinquency indigent defense expenditures to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of the grants for FY2023. Family protection representation expenditures related to cases affecting the parent/child relationship, i.e., "CPS cases," were not part of this review.

The records reviewed were provided by the Denton County Auditor's Office. Compliance with other statutory indigent defense program requirements was not included in this review.

Methodology

To accomplish the objectives, the fiscal monitor met with staff from the County Auditor's Office. The fiscal monitor reviewed:

- General ledger transactions provided by the County Auditor's Office.
- Random samples of paid attorney fee vouchers.
- The Indigent Defense Expenditure Report (IDER).
- Attorney fee schedule.
- Any applicable contracts.
- The County's local indigent defense plan filed with TIDC.

Review Assessment

Statutory Data Reporting

Under Section 79.036(e) of the Texas Government Code, the county auditor (or other person designated by the commissioners court if the county does not have an auditor) must annually prepare and send indigent defense data to TIDC. This data must include the total expenses for cases in which an attorney was appointed for an indigent defendant or indigent juvenile respondent in each district court, county court, statutory county court, and appellate court. Financial data reports must include attorney-level information[1] and shall be prepared in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission.[2]

To determine the accuracy of the IDER, TIDC requested the general ledger transactions Denton County used to prepare the IDER and received two Excel files. The first file was labeled "FY23 TIDC General Ledger Expenses" and included 9,637 lines of data, showing a total expense of $8,588,334.37 in the column labeled "TOTAL_INVOICE-AMOUNT-PAID" and $7,530,222.02 in the column labeled "EXTENDED-LINE-ITEM-VALUE." The second Excel file was titled "FY23 TIDC Workbook." The first worksheet in this file was the general ledger, but it had 9,623 lines of data and totaled $8,565,761.25 in the invoice total column and $7,507,570.27 in the extended line total. The discrepancy between the two files was 14 lines of data, with totals differing by $22,573.12 and $22,651.75, respectively. TIDC identified the lines that were not included in the "Workbook" file and found that all excluded lines had a voucher status code "V," which indicates a voided entry. The general ledger included in the Workbook file was further separated by the account department code, and seven accounts were identified, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

	Invoice Total		**Extended Line Item Total**
5650	$374,792.84	Misc court-ordered expenses	$107,890.96
5651	$786,315.97	Family court misc ordered expenses	$26,939.53
5695	$61,523.38	Appeal	$61,305.00
5800	$4,822,060.03	Court-appointed attorneys	$4,812,300.68
5870	$7,350.00	Cr appt atty – veterans court	$7,350.00
5880	$256,422.92	Ct appt atty – juvenile	$255,612.92
5890	$2,257,296.11	Ct appt atty family courts	$2,236,171.18
	$8,565,761.25		**$7,507,570.27**

Table 2 reflects the amounts that result when the data from Table 1 is restricted to only the criminal case information.

Table 2

	Invoice Total		**Extended Line Item Total**
5650	$374,792.84	Misc court-ordered expenses	$107,890.96
5695	$61,523.38	Appeal	$61,305.00
5800	$4,822,060.03	Court-appointed attorneys	$4,812,300.68
5870	$7,350.00	Cr appt atty – veterans court	$7,350.00
5880	$256,422.92	Cr appt atty - juvenile	$255,612.92
	$5,522,149.17		**$5,244,459.56**

Each account is further broken down by department number, program number, and budget item number. The department code used for the expenditures listed in the general ledger provided was 20. The program code 07 appears to correspond to the district courts, while program code 08 corresponds to the county criminal courts and county courts-at-law. The budget line number matches the court number, with the budget code 40 being a catch-all for capital murder cases assigned to the district courts and probate cases assigned to the county courts.

[1] TEX. GOV'T CODE § 79.036(a-1).

[2] TEX. GOV'T CODE § 79.036(e)

The extended line-item totals appear to be the final numbers included in the IDER. It seems that if more than one account code was used on a voucher, the total invoice amount would be repeated for each account line, resulting in some invoice totals being included multiple times in that column.

The extended line-item amounts for the court-appointed attorneys break down as follows. The account code ending in 5800 corresponds to court-appointed attorneys, and the total expense is $4,812,300.68. Of this amount, $3,246,797.73 is allocated to program code 7 for district courts and $1,565,502.95 to program code 8 for county courts. Under program code 7, felony-level appointed attorney costs are allocated to each district court, with the amount for capital murder appointed attorney fees listed under budget code 40. Similarly, the amounts paid for misdemeanor-appointed attorney fees are allocated to each county court per the appropriate court code. Court code 40 under program code 8 corresponds to probate court. Because probate cases are civil matters, they must not be reported on the IDER for criminal and juvenile delinquency cases. Although the fees paid to the attorneys who worked probate cases were included in the ledger, TIDC notes that these amounts were appropriately excluded from the IDER.

Table 3

Summary Totals of Account 5800 – Court Appointed Attorneys			
Department Code	**Program Code**	**Budget Code**	**Amount**
20			$4,812,300.68
	7		$3,246,797.73
		16	$526,290.32
		40	$53,675.00
		158	$582,834.71
		211	$771,256.83
		362	$519,388.34
		367	$1,487.50
		462	$791,865.03
	8		$1,565,502.95
		1	$248,886.00
		2	$399,966.10
		3	$229,797.00
		4	$268,963.22
		5	$243,855.72
		40	$172,521.91
		41	$1,513.00

TIDC compared the information in Table 3 to the IDER. The attorney fees paid for felony cases in the district courts all matched up except for the 211th District Court. For this court, the amount reported on the IDER was $770,808.91, which is $447.91 less than the amount from the supporting documents provided. The capital murder case assigned with a 211th District Court case number totaled $8,785.00, while the IDER indicated $9,232.91, which is $447.91 more than the amount on the general ledger. The attorney fees paid on adult misdemeanor cases in the county courts all matched up, except County Criminal Court 5. For this court, the amount reported on the IDER was $243,655.72, which is $200 less than the general ledger amount.

TIDC compared each account to the amounts reported on the IDER. For juvenile attorney fees, the IDER included $255,500.42, which is $112.50 less than the general ledger amount. The total appeal amount matched between the IDER and the general ledger. However, the general ledger amount for court-appointed attorney fees in veterans court was not included in the IDER.

Although TIDC found slight discrepancies in a few accounts, this is not considered to be a significant issue due to the complexity and volume of the accounts. The small discrepancies may be due to adjusting entries made during IDER preparation that reclassified the expenses. TIDC commends Denton County for the work to establish the coding necessary to prepare the IDER. However, the veterans court expenditures should have been included on the IDER, and contract defender rules should have been followed.

After reviewing the accounts for attorney fees, TIDC reviewed the account labeled "misc. court ordered expense." As shown in Table 2, this account had expenses totaling $107,890,96. In addition to the accounts provided in the original general ledger, there was an account labeled "5900-Psych" with a total expenditure of $276,268 in the provided workbook file. The combined expenses reported on the IDER for the categories of investigation, expert witness, and other litigation expenses totaled $383,422.83, which is $736.13 less than the combined total of the two ledger accounts.

When questioning this difference, TIDC was provided an additional file titled "FY23 YTD detailed TB for misc and psy expenses." This file included four tabs, two of which were labeled 5900 and 5650, corresponding to the general ledger accounts. Account 5900 totals $468,268, which is $192,000 more than the amount listed in the earlier workbook's expenses. This account included 12 payments of $16,000 to James G. Shupe, MD, for a mental health contract. The account 5650 appeared to include the same data as the above "Misc. court-ordered expense." However, this expense report contained 166 lines totaling $107,165.59, whereas the original misc. court ordered expense report listed 169 lines totaling $107,890.96. A comparison found three lines totaling $725.37 in the original file that were not included in this second file. When comparing the two amounts for accounts 5900 and 5650 to the IDER, TIDC was able to match up all amounts except the $192,000 contract amount from account 5900, which was coded to budget 40, and $11 from code 5650, which was assigned to court ID PC1, which appears to be the probate court.

In addition to verifying the accuracy of the IDER, TIDC also looks at the allowability of the expenses. Thirty-three vouchers from the categories labeled Investigation, Expert Witness, and Other Litigation Expense were reviewed for allowability. Thirteen of the vouchers were from the 5900- Psych account. Not all psychological evaluations are eligible for reporting on the IDER. A request for a mental health evaluation to determine competency to stand trial is considered a general court expense. The mental health examinations considered indigent defense expenses are those requested by defense counsel, where the results are shared exclusively with the defense team. Mental health competency evaluations requested by the judge or prosecuting attorney should not be reported as indigent defense expenses. To be eligible for inclusion on the IDER, documentation must demonstrate that the expense is for a mental health expert working for the defense under derivative attorney-client privilege to assist in the criminal defense of an indigent defendant. An order granting an *ex parte* defense motion requesting funds for a mental health defense expert is generally sufficient to establish eligibility as an indigent defense expenditure. An evaluation of competency to stand trial is not an eligible indigent defense expense, regardless of which party initiates consideration of the evaluation.

In reviewing the 13 "psych" vouchers, TIDC looked for documentation to support that the defense attorney requested the evaluation. Two of the 13 vouchers were billed directly to the juvenile probation department and listed the services as Chapter 55 psychological testing. The remaining 11 vouchers were billed directly to a judge, and the services described were psychological testing. Four vouchers explicitly describe the service as competency to stand trial. None of the vouchers include an *ex parte* motion, indicating the report was prepared exclusively for the defense. One voucher had a motion attached, which referenced an Order for Incompetency to Stand Trial.

Expenses for a doctor to evaluate the defendant to determine competency to stand trial are considered general court expenditures and are not eligible for inclusion in the IDER, as outlined on page six of the FY23 IDER Manual. Therefore, based on the above information, the allowability of $276,268 reported on the IDER is in question.

The IDER overstated the county's criminal indigent defense expenditures due to the inclusion of these ineligible costs. This means that the FY2023 Formula Grant for Denton County was greater than would have been authorized if reported without the ineligible expenses. Please refer to the Indigent Defense Expenditure Report Procedure Manual: https://tidc.texas.gov/media/hb5bearm/fy2023-ider-manual-final.pdf.

Standard Attorney Fee Schedule and Payment Process

Under Article 26.05(c), to receive payment for an indigent case, a defense attorney must submit a voucher to the judge presiding in the case, or if the county operates a managed assigned counsel (MAC) program, to the director of the MAC. The voucher documents the services rendered and the requested amount of payment. The judge or MAC director may approve the requested payment or may approve a different amount. Under Article 26.05(c) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, if the requested amount is not approved, the judge or MAC director must make written findings explaining the difference. No payment may be made to the attorney without a signed order by a judge approving payment or approval by the MAC director.

To evaluate compliance with the above statute and other related policies and procedures, a random sample of 40 attorney fee vouchers was selected to perform attribute testing.

The ten attributes tested were:

1) Is the voucher for an allowable expense?
2) Was the voucher submitted by the attorney?
3) Is the payment related to a criminal matter?
4) Is more than one case presented on the voucher? If yes, does the county have a method for accurately tracking case counts to ensure all cases are reported?
5) Does the voucher itemize the service performed?
6) Is the court identified on the voucher?
7) Are the fees paid consistent with the published fee schedule?
8) Is the voucher paid within 60 days of submission?
9) Is the voucher approved by the judge?
10) If the judge does not agree with the amount requested, is a written explanation provided for the changed amount?

Of the forty attorney fee vouchers reviewed, one was found to have an approved fee amount that was lower than the amount requested by the attorney, with no explanation provided by the judge. When this voucher was brought to the attention of the Denton County staff, additional information was provided to show that the County had noticed the error, which resulted from the dropping of a digit in the approved amount. As a result, the attorney received the full amount requested. Additionally, one attorney fee voucher reflected a request for $500, which was approved and paid in full. This voucher listed seven juvenile cases. When comparing this voucher to the fee schedule to test the attribute that fees are paid in accordance with the fee schedule, TIDC could not determine that this voucher was paid in compliance with the published fee schedule. Upon further inquiry, TIDC learned that the attorney fee voucher in question covered the cases from a mental health specialty court docket.

Further inquiry determined that payments to this attorney for work in the mental health specialty court should be treated as contract defender payments. Contract Attorney rules found in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter B must be followed. TIDC found that no written contract exists between the attorney and the County. Without a written contract, Denton County is not in compliance with these contract defender rules.

Findings and Recommendations

Statutory Data Reporting

Finding

The FY2023 Indigent Defense Expenditure Report (IDER) submitted in accordance with Texas Government Code §79.036(e) was not prepared in the manner required. Specifically, Denton County included unallowable general court expenditures with the criminal indigent defense expenses on the FY2023 IDER.

Recommendation

The County must develop procedures to identify and record expenses for mental health experts requested by the appointed defense counsel for the exclusive use of defense counsel in preparation of a defense. Procedures must distinguish such expenses from examinations to determine competency to stand trial, which are considered general court expenses and may not be included in the IDER.

The County must identify and report to TIDC the amount of mental health costs included in the FY2023 IDER that were not eligible based on the finding above.

County Response:
The county agrees with your assessment. The fiscal year 2023 data was reviewed to determine any and all cases that were reported were not eligible. As a result of the review, we have determined that nine cases totaling $700 were reported as eligible that were not eligible (see below):

Case No	Files	Amount
MH-2022-00721	12.29.22	$ 62.50
MH-2023-00580	09.20.23	87.50
MH-2023-00330-01	06.27.23	62.50
MH-2023-00285-03	08.15.23	100.00
MH-2023-00205	05.05.23	50.00
MH-2022-00798	10.28.22	100.00
MH-2022-00787	11.04.22	75.00
MH-2022-00771	12.29.22	62.50
MH-2023-00055	04.13.23	100.00
		$ 700.00

Corrective Action Plan:

Texas Government Code Section 79.036(e) has been reviewed with all applicable IDER reporting staff. The reports for 2024 and 2025 no longer have this issue because processes were improved for our data collection and review. However, our processes at this time are still manual and labor intensive which could make us vulnerable to an occasional reporting error. We are continuing looking for ways to automate and improve processes for IDER reporting.

Contact person(s):

Jeff May jeff.may@dentoncounty.gov
Lansing Pedron lansing.pedron@dentoncounty.gov
Sandy Tabor sandy.tabor@dentoncounty.gov

Completion date: *June 4, 2026*

Standard Attorney Fee Schedule and Payment Process

Finding

While testing attorney fee vouchers for compliance with the published fee schedule, one attorney fee voucher was determined to be for an attorney representing multiple defendants in the mental health specialty court. Additionally, the costs associated with the veterans specialty court were not included on the IDER. While TIDC encourages the use of specialty courts, Denton County must follow the contract defender rules outlined in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter B., and these defense-specific costs should be included on the IDER.

Texas Administrative Code Section 174.14, Awarding the Contract, reads as follows:

"In accordance with Article 26.04(h), Code of Criminal Procedure, the contracting authority may approve the recommended contractor(s) and enter into a contract for services. The contracting authority shall enter into a contract only if it complies with these standards and all applicable law governing professional services contracts entered into by counties. A contract shall not be awarded solely on the basis of cost."

Sections 174.15 through 174.25 go on to further identify the elements the defender contract must include. Documentation that the County had a contract outlining the elements required by the contract defender rules was not provided.

Recommendation

Denton County should review the rules required by the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter B, and implement them for both the veterans court and the mental health specialty court.

County Response:

The County agrees with your assessment. It does appear there were some limited defense expenses related to specialty courts that were missed and not included in the 2023 IDER. After looking into this further we conclude this resulted in part because of staff turnover and in part due to some weaknesses in our data collection processes.

Corrective Action Plan:

The Texas Administrative Code, Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter B as well as Article 26.04(h) of the Code of Criminal Procedure have been reviewed with applicable IDER reporting staff with emphasis on our veterans court and our mental health court. In 2024 our data collection processes were improved to help ensure we received the needed data and report it in the correctly. However, the process is still mostly manual and labor intensive which could make us vulnerable to an occasional reporting error. In 2025 the County implemented a new financial system across the County in which we are working to improve our processes even more to ensure data collection and reporting is accurate. Also, we have improved our reporting information so that we will have a much more seamless transition if we need to transfer the duties to another employee.

Contact person(s):

Jeff May	jeff.may@dentoncounty.gov
Lansing Pedron	lansing.pedron@dentoncounty.gov
Sandy Tabor	sandy.tabor@dentoncounty.gov

Completion date: *June 4, 2026*

Conclusion

TIDC appreciated the professionalism and assistance of Denton County officials and staff.
TIDC staff stand ready to provide technical and financial assistance to remedy these issues and ensure full compliance with the Fair Defense Act.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Indigent Defense Expenditure Report

Denton County Indigent Defense Expenditures			
Expenditures	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**
Population Estimate	904,005	957,367	995,510
Juvenile Assigned Counsel	$165,849	$226,861	$255,500
Capital Murder	$69,060	$65,522	$54,048
Adult Non-Capital Felony Assigned Counsel	$2,832,245	$2,728,697	$3,192,675
Adult Misdemeanor Assigned Counsel	$1,225,312	$1,299,831	$1,392,781
Juvenile Appeals	$0	$0	$0
Adult Felony Appeals	$61,457	$0	$61,305
Adult Misdemeanor Appeals	$3,818	$0	$0
Licensed Investigation	$30,312	$36,147	$37,490
Expert Witness	$29,026	$13,825	$56,579
Other Direct Litigation	$208,353	$200,613	$289,353
Total Court Expenditures	$4,625,432	$4,571,496	$5,339,732
Administrative Expenditures	$0	$0	$0
Funds Paid by Participating County to Regional Program	$0	$0	$0
Total Public Defender Expenditures	NA	NA	NA
Total Court and Administrative Expenditures	$4,625,432	$4,571,496	$5,339,732
Formula Grant Disbursement	$436,902	$430,928	$410,097
Reimbursement of Attorney Fees	$447,128	$403,982	$477,327
Reimbursement by State Comptroller for Writs of Habeas Corpus	$0	$0	$0
Total Public Defender Cases	NA	NA	NA
Total Assigned Counsel Cases	6,480	6,684	8,077

Indigent Defense Expenditure Reporting

Source: Texas Indigent Defense Commission records

Denton County				
Year	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Texas 2023**
Population (non-census years are estimates)	904,005	957,367	995,510	30,301,595
Felony Charges Disposed (from OCA report)	3,901	4,280	4,848	293,507
Felony Cases Paid	3,088	2,912	3,829	253,828
% Felony Charges Defended with Appointed Counsel	79%	68%	79%	86%
Felony Trial Court-Attorney Fees	$2,901,305	$2,794,219	$3,246,723	$187,452,018
Total Felony Court Expenditures	$3,126,204	$2,994,898	$3,574,209	$207,426,768
Misdemeanor Charges Disposed (from OCA report)	7,284	8,735	7,267	379,777
Misdemeanor Cases Paid	2,813	3,118	3,432	204,021
% Misdemeanor Charges Defended with Appointed Counsel	39%	36%	47%	54%
Misdemeanor Trial Court Attorney Fees	$1,225,312	$1,299,831	$1,392,781	$59,889,428
Total Misdemeanor Court Expenditures	$1,261,641	$1,345,256	$1,446,376	$60,714,888
Juvenile Charges Disposed (from OCA report)	950	1,095	1,340	18,524
Juvenile Cases Paid	553	654	800	30,261
Juvenile Attorney Fees	$165,849	$226,861	$255,500	$11,722,779
Total Juvenile Expenditures	$172,312	$231,342	$257,843	$11,985,479
Total Attorney Fees	$4,357,741	$4,320,911	$4,956,309	$264,081,061
Total ID Expenditures	$4,625,432	$4,571,496	$5,339,732	$412,351,431
Increase in Total Expenditures over 2001 Baseline	185%	181%	229%	364%
Total ID Expenditures per Population	$5.12	$4.78	$5.36	$13.59
Commission Formula Grant Disbursement	$436,902	$430,928	$410,097	$20,496,469
Cost Recouped from Defendants	$447,128	$403,982	$477,327	$8,746,457

Source: Texas Indigent Defense Commission records

Appendix B – Criteria

Criteria

- Texas Grant Management Standards
- Texas Government Code, Section 79.036, Indigent Defense Information
- Texas Government Code, Section 79.037, Technical Support; Grants
- Code of Criminal Procedure, Art 26.04, Procedures for Appointing Counsel
- Code of Criminal Procedure, Art 26.05, Compensation of Counsel Appointed to Defend
- Texas Administrative Code – Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter A, Rule 174.1
- Texas Administrative Code – Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter A, Rule 174.2
- Texas Administrative Code – Title 1, Part 8, Chapter 174, Subchapter B
- FY2023 Indigent Defense Expenditure Report Manual found at: https://tidc.texas.gov/media/hb5bearm/fy2023-ider-manual-final.pdf

Appendix C – Distribution List

The Honorable Andy Eads
Denton County Judge
1 Courthouse Drive, Suite 3100
Denton, TX 76208
andy.eads@dentoncounty.gov

The Honorable Bruce McFarling
Local Administrative District Judge
1450 E McKinney Street
Denton, TX 76208-4524
bruce.mcfarling@dentoncounty.gov

The Honorable Susan Piel
Local Administrative County Court at Law Judge
1450 E McKinney Street, Suite 1319
Denton, TX 76208-4524
susan.piel@dentoncounty.gov

The Honorable Kimberly McCary
Chair of the Juvenile Board
210 S Woodrow Lane
Denton, TX 76205
kimberly.mccary@dentoncounty.gov

Mr. Jeffry Mays
Denton County Auditor
1 Courthouse Drive, Suite 2000
Denton, TX 76208
Jeff.May@dentoncounty.gov

Mr. Scott Ehlers
Executive Director, Texas Indigent Defense Commission
209 W. 14th Street, Room 202
Austin, TX 78701
SEhlers@tidc.texas.gov

Mr. Wesley Shackelford
Deputy Director, Texas Indigent Defense Commission
209 W. 14th Street, Room 202
Austin, TX 78701
WShackelford@tidc.texas.gov

Mr. Edwin Colfax
Grants Program Manager, Texas Indigent Defense Commission
209 W. 14th Street, Room 202
Austin, TX 78701
EColfax@tidc.texas.gov