



FY2024

FAMILY PROTECTION REPRESENTATION

Data Report

December 2025

TIDC Members & Staff

CHAIR

Honorable Missy Medary

*Corpus Christi, Presiding Judge,
5th Administrative Judicial Region of Texas*

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

Honorable Jimmy Blacklock

Austin, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Texas

Honorable Brandon Creighton

Conroe, State Senator

Honorable Emily Miskel

Dallas, Justice, Fifth Court of Appeals

Honorable Joseph “Joe” Moody

El Paso, State Representative

Honorable David Schenck

Austin, Presiding Judge, Court of Criminal Appeals,

Honorable John Smithee

Amarillo, State Representative

MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR

Mr. James D. “Jim” Bethke

*San Antonio, Director, Bexar County Managed
Assigned Counsel Office*

Mr. Alex Bunin

*Houston, Chief Public Defender, Harris County Public
Defender Office*

Mr. Jay Cohen

Houston, Blass Law, PLLC

Honorable Valerie Covey

Georgetown, Williamson County Commissioner Precinct 3

Honorable Richard Evans

Bandera, Bandera County Judge

Honorable Missy Medary

*Corpus Christi, Presiding Judge, 5th Administrative
Judicial Region of Texas*

Honorable James R. “J.R.” Woolley, Jr.

Waller, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 2

STAFF

Scott Ehlers

Executive Director

Megan Bradbury

Office Coordinator

Kenitra Brown

Senior Policy Analyst

Edwin Colfax

Director of Grant Funding

William Cox

Director of Public Defense Improvement

Ashley De La Garza

Senior Policy Analyst

Sarah Gammell, Ph.D.

Research Director

Natasha George

Senior Policy Analyst

Linda Gonzalez

OLS Senior Policy Analyst

Cody Huffman

Policy Analyst

Will Jones

Fiscal Analyst

Crystal Leff-Piñon

Director of Family Protection Representation

Joel Lieurance

Senior Policy Analyst

Kristin Meeks

Senior Policy Analyst

Rhonda Rieken

Senior Policy Analyst

Wesley Schackelford

Deputy Director

Debra Stewart

Fiscal Analyst

Doriana Torres

Grants Specialist

Claire Whisler

Communications Specialist

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|---------|
| I. Executive Summary | Page 3 |
| II. Introduction | Page 4 |
| III. FY24 Spending Summary | Page 5 |
| IV. Per Capita Spending | Page 6 |
| V. Statewide Share of Spending | Page 7 |
| VI. Statewide Share of Spending & DFPS Data Comparison... | Page 8 |
| VII. Systems for Providing Legal Representation | Page 10 |
| VIII. Spending Category Breakdown | Page 11 |
| IX. Appointments | Page 12 |
| X. Attorney Practice Time Report | Page 13 |
| XI. Conclusion | Page 15 |
| Appendix | Page 16 |
| End Notes | Page 37 |



Executive Summary

Texas has long valued the importance of family, parental rights, and the safety of children. When the government becomes involved with a family due to allegations of child abuse or neglect, the stakes are high, and it is critical that the necessary legal processes are followed to guarantee that the system meets its duties to children and families. Attorneys for parents and children in these cases serve a critical role in ensuring that the child protection system fulfills its responsibilities to keep children safe and maintain family integrity.

The Texas Indigent Defense Commission (TIDC) first became involved with court-appointed legal representation of children and parents in child protection cases in 2021 to assist with data collection efforts on behalf of the Texas Judicial Council. In September of 2023, after the passage of SB 2120 (88th Legislature)ⁱ, TIDC took on official responsibilities in this space, and the Family Protection Representation (FPR) division at TIDC was launched.

TIDC has been collecting FPR data since November 2021. Over the years, similar themes have emerged in the data, including large variations in spending among the counties and very low spending by a significant number of counties.ⁱⁱ The data collected for FY24 shows similar trends.

The FPR system is fully supported by county funds. The state provides no financial support for attorneys appointed to represent parents and children in child protection cases. TIDC's Legislative Appropriations Request to support FPR during the 89th Legislative session was not approved, and FPR continues to wholly rely on the financial support of county budgets.

The data in this report shows that spending disparities among the counties on FPR is significant. FPR spending should meet the needs of families regardless of where they reside. A family's county of residence should not affect the quality of legal representation they receive, and based on the wide disparities in county spending across the state, there are indicators this could be happening today.

Introduction

When a family is involved in a court case filed by the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), children and many parents have statutory rights to legal representation in Texas.ⁱⁱⁱ Family Protection Representation (FPR) is the publicly funded legal representation of children and parents involved in cases brought against a parent by DFPS.

TIDC has been collecting data regarding FPR since November 2021. This information is key to understanding the landscape of FPR in Texas. Beginning in 2021, counties are required to report their FPR expenditures by November 1.^{iv} Also beginning in 2021, counties must submit their FPR plan to TIDC by November 1 in odd-numbered years.^v Beginning in 2023, attorneys who accept FPR appointments are required to submit their percentage of practice time devoted to the work each year by October 15.^{vi} For FY24, TIDC received FPR expenditure reports and attorney practice time reports. FPR plans will not be reported again until the FY25 report.

Items of Notes in this Report:

- Total spending for FY24 is \$62,100,900.
- Statewide per capita spending is \$2.02.
- The county per capita range in spending is \$0.04 to \$16.96.
- 155 counties in Texas spent \$100,000 or less on FPR in FY24 and account for only 8% of the total share of state spending.
- Statewide total reported spending on appeals is just over \$1 million.
- There is a lack of attorneys who have been licensed in the last 10 years practicing in FPR.

The FPR system in Texas needs reform, financial support, and innovation. The information included in this report is a helpful tool in understanding a better way forward for families involved in DFPS cases.



FY24 Spending Summary

Total Statewide Spending: \$62,100,900

TIDC accepted Family Protection Representation (FPR) Indigent Defense Expenditure Reports (IDER) from 244 counties. Due to unresolved potential errors, TIDC did not accept an FPR IDER from nine counties. Of the 244 accepted reports, 20 counties did not report any FPR expenditures. Additionally, at the writing of this report, one county did not submit a report. Please note, the following expenditure information in this report is based on information from the 244 accepted reports.

Total reported statewide spending is slightly down from reported spending for FY23, but has remained consistent since FY22.




Figure 1

Per Capita Spending

Statewide Per Capita Spending: \$2.02

The statewide range of county per capita spending on FPR spans from \$0.04 to \$16.96.

Although many counties spend between \$2.00 and \$3.00 per capita, a significant number of counties spend less than \$1.00 per capita. Among the counties that reported FPR spending, 41 counties spend less than \$1.00 per capita. Within those 41 counties, 19 counties spend less than \$0.50 per capita.

An analysis of the breakdown of county per capita spending shows wide variation in spending throughout the state.




Figure 2

Statewide Share of Spending

The state has collectively spent over \$60 million each year on FPR over the last four fiscal years, but a significant number of counties spend very small amounts of money on this work.

In FY24, only 11 counties spent over \$1 million on FPR. The top 11 spending counties spent between \$1,000,069 and \$9,164,512. The middle 58 spending counties spent between \$100,121 and \$957,546. The bottom 155 spending counties spent between \$68.00 and \$99,689. Within the bottom spending group, 41 counties spent less than \$20,000 per year on FPR.

Although the counties that spent below \$100,00 represent a significant portion of Texas, this spending only accounts for 8% of the total spending on FPR for FY24.




Figure 3

Statewide Share of Spending & DFPS Data Comparison

Every year, DFPS reports the number of children in conservatorship and family preservation services. Children in conservatorship are in the legal custody of DFPS. Family preservation cases are situations where a parent, either voluntarily or by court order, participates in services, but the child is not in the legal custody of DFPS.

For FY24, DFPS reported there were 28,008 children in the conservatorship of the agency.^{vii} In the same year, 61,062 children were involved in a family preservation case.^{viii}

Most children and many parents involved in conservatorship cases have a right to an attorney.^{ix} Additionally, all children and many parents involved in court-ordered family preservation cases have a right to an attorney.^x For every child with a right to an attorney, there is very often at least one parent who also has a right to an attorney. Each year, tens of thousands of children and parents involved in DFPS cases should have access to counsel pursuant to the Texas Family Code.

When looking at the top, middle, and bottom county spending groups discussed on page 7, and comparing with DFPS numbers of involved children in those same groups of counties, the bottom 155 counties have a higher percentage of children in conservatorship, family preservation, and number of legal removals of children^{xi} than the percentage of their overall spending costs.

A Note on Counties that Reported No Spending

Of the 20 counties that reported no spending, three counties had children in conservatorship, and 11 counties had children involved in a family preservation case.

Statewide Share of Spending & DFPS Data Comparison

| Groups of Counties | Share of Total FPR Spending for FY24 | Share of Children in DFPS Conservatorship in FY24 | Share of Children Legally Removed by DFPS in FY24 | Share of Children involved in Family Preservation Cases in FY24 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Bottom 155 Spending Counties | 8% | 16% | 16% | 14% |
| Middle 58 Spending Counties | 30% | 35% | 34% | 34% |
| Top 11 Spending Counties | 62% | 49% | 50% | 52% |

Table 1

At this time, the exact reasons for the disparity in spending and percentages of children involved in conservatorship and family preservation cases are unknown. However, current data shows that a significant number of families who live in over half of the counties in Texas face child protection cases with legal representation systems that have limited funding.



Systems for Providing Legal Representation

For over ten years, the Texas Family Code has allowed for the legal representation of children and parents in cases brought by DFPS to be provided by Offices of Child or Parent Representation and Managed Assigned Counsel Programs. Texas Family Code § 107.256 allows for the creation of an Office of Parent or Child Representation. Texas Family Code § 107.303 allows for the creation of a managed assigned counsel program.

Although formal representation models such as offices of parent and child representation, public defender offices, and managed assigned counsel programs provide many benefits for families and other child welfare stakeholders, Texas rarely uses these systems to provide family protection representation. In FY24, the overwhelming majority of legal representation for children and parents in child protection cases was delivered through lists of private assigned counsel appointed by each county's local court system. Only five counties in Texas provide family protection representation through a formal county-funded office model. Dallas and El Paso County provide some family protection representation through their public defender offices. Potter and Randall counties report providing representation to children through county-funded employees. Travis County is the only county in the state that operates official Offices of Parent and Child Representation.

Collectively, these county-funded office models cost \$5,077,400.41, which accounts for 8% of the total spending on FPR in FY24.

Further expansion of formalized county-funded office models will be key in supporting a strong family protection representation system that fulfills the statutory duties set out by the Legislature for this work. Supportive funding is necessary to assist counties in achieving models that meet the needs of families involved with DFPS.

Spending Category Breakdown

Beginning with the FY22 Family Protection Representation Indigent Defense Expenditure Report, counties were asked to submit their expenditures and appointments divided into six different categories: custodial parents, non-custodial parents, non-parent conservators, children, adult appeals, and children appeals. For the FY24 report, most counties were able to report expenditure information in the requested categories; however, 11 counties were unable to do so and are not included in the numbers in the chart below.

Collectively, the state spent slightly more on providing legal representation to children than to parents. Non-parent conservators do not have a right to an attorney, and reported spending in this category is very low – only \$3,388.00. As this amount is very low, that category is not reflected in the graphic below. Additionally, reported spending in appeals reflects a small portion of total spending on family protection representation.

Spending Breakdown




Figure 4



Appointments

Child protection cases can be complex and often involve multiple parties. Commonly, a case may require the appointment of a lawyer for a mother, a lawyer for a father, and a lawyer for the children involved in the case. Depending on the circumstances, a child protection case may need many more lawyers appointed than three if there are multiple fathers involved and/or conflicts of interest among siblings. Additionally, child protection cases can last well over a year, and appointments of attorneys on the case can conclude at different times depending on the circumstances of the person the attorney represents. Given these factors, determining an accurate number of appointments each fiscal year has been a challenge.

Counties are asked to report an appointment one time each year an expenditure is paid on the appointment. For example, in a case where the court appoints a lawyer for a mother, a lawyer for a father, and a lawyer for a child, the county should report three appointments for the fiscal year if each of those attorneys is paid for their work on the case in the year. Some counties have experienced challenges reporting appointments; however, over time, the numbers reported appear to be more accurate.

Statewide Number of Appointments Reported: 44,404

Statewide Amount Paid Per Appointment: \$1,398.54

When evaluating county per appointment spending, the range is significant: \$68.00 – \$6,624.00. Within this range, 111 counties paid less than \$1,000 per appointment. Within that group, 31 counties paid less than \$500 per appointment. Although per-appointment spending is a rough estimate, these numbers can be used as a general indicator of what an attorney may receive in one fiscal year for their work representing an appointed client in a child protection case. Some child protection cases can be very complex, require many hours of work, and last well over one year. Payment of \$1,000 for an entire year to represent a court-appointed client in a child protection case is often not enough to cover the true amount of work that is required.

Attorney Practice Time Report

Beginning in October 2023, attorneys who accept appointments from the court to represent parents and/or children in cases brought against a parent by DFPS are required to report the percentage of their practice spent on this work. Reports are now due by October 15 of each year. Reports received in 2024 reflect only the second year of gathering this information, but provide key pieces of data to better understand the landscape of family protection representation. Although not all attorneys who practice FPR submitted a report, the size of the data set provides important insights into the work.

A very small number of attorneys report exclusively dedicating their practice to FPR. As expenditure reports indicate, nearly all FPR work is completed by private assigned counsel. These attorneys very commonly accept cases in various fields of law. The small number of attorneys who report working 100% on FPR shows that the state lacks a strong number of true subject matter experts in the field.

Attorneys reporting some FPR time in 2023: **1,010**

Attorneys reporting 100% FPR time in 2023: **76**

Attorneys reporting some FPR time in 2024: **1,054**

Attorneys reporting 100% FPR time in 2024: **67**

Attorney Practice Time Report

Matching the attorneys who submitted a practice time report with their bar licensure year shows that there are fewer attorneys licensed in the last 10 years who accept FPR appointments than those who have practiced for much longer. The aging bar combined with lower numbers of newer attorneys practicing in this field is a warning that counties may not be able to fulfill their statutory obligations to provide legal representation for children and parents involved in child protection cases in the future if the current system, without additional financial support, continues.

Attorney Practice Time Report & Bar Licensure Year




Figure 5

Conclusion

DFPS bears an immense responsibility to children and families. In Texas, the child protection system must keep children safe while also keeping families together when possible. These interests are paramount to the well-being of children but can sometimes be difficult to meet in practice. Attorneys for children and parents in cases brought by DFPS are an integral and necessary piece of a strong child protection system.

Texas recognizes the importance of attorneys for families in child protection cases and has codified both a parent's and a child's right to counsel in the Texas Family Code.^{xii} Although these rights are codified in Texas statutes, the Legislature has left the financial responsibility for payment of attorneys for parents and children largely up to the counties. The decentralized, county-based nature of the FPR system results in inconsistent pay for attorneys who are willing to do this invaluable work.

Additionally, FPR is largely practiced by private assigned counsel. Texas lacks formal systems for providing FPR in models such as Offices of Parent or Child Representation. Data from FY24 shows that there is a deficit of attorneys who provide FPR and have been licensed in the last 10 years. The shortage of structured systems for representation and inconsistent pay could be contributing factors to difficulties in attracting newer attorneys to this work. As the bar ages and attorneys leave the field, attracting newer attorneys to child protection law will be critical in keeping children safe and keeping families together.

Ultimately, additional funding from the state is needed to fully achieve an FPR system that fulfills its obligations to families.



Appendix A

County Spending & Appointments Table

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Anderson | \$71,853 | 28 |
| Andrews | \$29,760 | 42 |
| Angelina | \$395,127 | 299 |
| Aransas | \$42,586 | 53 |
| Archer | \$16,899 | 8 |
| Armstrong | \$6,100 | 10 |
| Atascosa | \$99,539 | 117 |
| Austin | \$11,287 | 19 |
| Bailey | \$13,440 | 52 |
| Bandera | \$114,900 | 59 |
| Bastrop | \$361,495 | 249 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Bee | \$114,858 | 18 |
| Bell | \$1,280,559 | 998 |
| Bexar | \$4,385,517 | 4709 |
| Blanco | \$35,118 | 31 |
| Borden | \$0 | 0 |
| Bosque | \$21,023 | 31 |
| Bowie | \$193,391 | 173 |
| Brazoria | \$545,580 | 365 |
| Brazos | \$463,699 | 386 |
| Brewster | \$11,330 | 3 |
| Briscoe | \$3,640 | 4 |
| Brooks | \$18,482 | 14 |
| Brown | \$100,120 | 67 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Burleson | \$34,895 | 46 |
| Burnet | \$182,774 | 168 |
| Caldwell | \$100,419 | 120 |
| Calhoun | \$34,875 | 20 |
| Callahan | \$63,723 | 49 |
| Cameron | \$455,475 | 329 |
| Camp | \$78,254 | 44 |
| Carson | \$8,295 | 13 |
| Cass | \$73,550 | 236 |
| Castro | \$10,687 | 19 |
| Chambers | \$61,665 | 39 |
| Cherokee | \$90,321 | 102 |
| Childress | \$1,162 | 3 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Clay | \$30,878 | 17 |
| Cochran | \$3,600 | 5 |
| Coke | \$5,542 | 1 |
| Coleman | \$49,127 | 30 |
| Collin | \$1,000,069 | 524 |
| Collingsworth | \$1,550 | 4 |
| Colorado | \$4,775 | 5 |
| Comal | \$406,215 | 305 |
| Comanche | \$107,813 | 132 |
| Concho | \$0 | 0 |
| Cooke | \$74,490 | 40 |
| Coryell | \$204,601 | 199 |
| Cottle | \$16,961 | 8 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Crane | \$0 | 0 |
| Crockett | \$13,248 | 2 |
| Crosby | \$12,493 | 24 |
| Culberson | \$9,828 | 3 |
| Dallam | \$17,560 | 35 |
| Dallas | \$4,313,967 | 2,424 |
| Dawson | \$4,013 | 7 |
| Deaf Smith | \$12,857 | 30 |
| Delta | \$2,225 | 6 |
| Denton | \$2,246,747 | 439 |
| DeWitt | \$86,317 | 47 |
| Dickens | \$2,556 | 3 |
| Donley | \$10,412 | 11 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Duval | \$23,075 | 60 |
| Eastland | \$129,164 | 317 |
| Ector | \$356,652 | 722 |
| Edwards | \$777 | 1 |
| El Paso | \$817,741 | 619 |
| Ellis | \$292,217 | 195 |
| Erath | \$45,906 | 114 |
| Falls | \$142,663 | 80 |
| Fannin | \$93,994 | 63 |
| Fayette | \$31,897 | 22 |
| Fisher | \$4,241 | 4 |
| Floyd | \$5,040 | 18 |
| Foard | \$0 | 0 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Fort Bend | \$626,129 | 182 |
| Franklin | \$3,750 | 30 |
| Freestone | \$15,011 | 18 |
| Frio | \$62,817 | 127 |
| Gaines | \$9,315 | 13 |
| Galveston | \$747,852 | 499 |
| Garza | \$7,922 | 12 |
| Gillespie | \$51,559 | 30 |
| Glasscock | \$0 | 0 |
| Goliad | \$9,199 | 6 |
| Gonzales | \$49,675 | 84 |
| Gray | \$85,664 | 83 |
| Grayson | \$154,616 | 157 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Gregg | \$267,222 | 317 |
| Grimes | \$13,679 | 15 |
| Guadalupe | \$149,924 | 220 |
| Hale | \$83,486 | 72 |
| Hall | \$11,140 | 11 |
| Hamilton | \$48,692 | 50 |
| Hansford | \$5,890 | 7 |
| Hardeman | \$2,110 | 5 |
| Hardin | \$219,420 | 119 |
| Harris | \$9,164,511 | 4795 |
| Harrison | \$72,620 | 115 |
| Hartley | \$2,045 | 8 |
| Haskell | \$28,702 | 31 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Hays | \$402,488 | 528 |
| Hemphill | \$5,840 | 10 |
| Henderson | \$420,258 | 230 |
| Hidalgo | \$745,002 | 592 |
| Hill | \$201,450 | 150 |
| Hockley | \$33,230 | 40 |
| Hood | \$140,084 | 245 |
| Houston | \$19,829 | 13 |
| Howard | \$59,398 | 58 |
| Hudspeth | \$1,728 | 2 |
| Hunt | \$284,044 | 85 |
| Hutchinson | \$99,638 | 124 |
| Irion | \$0 | 0 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Jack | \$19,243 | 21 |
| Jackson | \$41,366 | 19 |
| Jasper | \$60,611 | 138 |
| Jeff Davis | \$0 | 0 |
| Jefferson | \$339,435 | 541 |
| Jim Hogg | \$7,200 | 16 |
| Jim Wells | \$60,609 | 160 |
| Johnson | \$321,544 | 430 |
| Jones | \$50,328 | 24 |
| Karnes | \$19,690 | 26 |
| Kaufman | \$374,850 | 210 |
| Kenedy | \$0 | 0 |
| Kent | \$0 | 0 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Kerr | \$112,388 | 92 |
| Kimble | \$16,448.81 | 9 |
| King | \$0 | 0 |
| Kinney | \$0 | 0 |
| Kleberg | \$73,975 | 261 |
| Knox | \$26,285 | 6 |
| Lamar | \$120,820 | 613 |
| Lamb | \$21,995 | 35 |
| Lampasas | \$122,659 | 112 |
| Lavaca | \$26,046 | 102 |
| Lee | \$24,520 | 31 |
| Leon | \$8,046 | 6 |
| Liberty | \$154,320 | 109 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Limestone | \$60,317 | 48 |
| Lipscomb | \$560 | 1 |
| Live Oak | \$24,775 | 7 |
| Llano | \$122,763 | 119 |
| Loving | \$0 | 0 |
| Lubbock | \$957,545 | 974 |
| Lynn | \$28,008 | 26 |
| Madison | \$38,112 | 41 |
| Marion | \$18,728 | 27 |
| Martin | \$10,454 | 11 |
| Mason | \$680 | 1 |
| Matagorda | \$146,788 | 173 |
| McCulloch | \$66,371 | 45 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-------------|--------------|
| McLennan | \$1,035,360 | 1,092 |
| McMullen | \$0 | 0 |
| Medina | \$171,670 | 87 |
| Menard | \$68 | 1 |
| Midland | \$99,416 | 96 |
| Milam | \$87,307 | 46 |
| Mills | \$19,837 | 12 |
| Mitchell | \$23,334 | 33 |
| Montague | \$98,619 | 52 |
| Montgomery | \$729,582 | 677 |
| Moore | \$20,200 | 28 |
| Morris | \$91,799 | 41 |
| Motley | \$5,820 | 4 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| Nacogdoches | \$29,858 | 26 |
| Navarro | \$128,096 | 54 |
| Newton | \$47,608 | 33 |
| Nolan | \$79,050 | 104 |
| Ochiltree | \$13,300 | 14 |
| Oldham | \$880 | 2 |
| Orange | \$227,028 | 196 |
| Palo Pinto | \$54,073 | 113 |
| Panola | \$60,275 | 66 |
| Parker | \$593,234 | 222 |
| Parmer | \$16,453 | 16 |
| Pecos | \$46,157 | 41 |
| Polk | \$85,913 | 106 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Potter | \$468,533 | 853 |
| Presidio | \$3,830 | 1 |
| Randall | \$454,391 | 387 |
| Reagan | \$2,295 | 3 |
| Real | \$0 | 0 |
| Red River | \$14,844 | 41 |
| Reeves | \$16,367 | 24 |
| Refugio | \$16,235 | 6 |
| Roberts | \$0 | 0 |
| Robertson | \$191,056 | 133 |
| Rockwall | \$68,861 | 76 |
| Runnels | \$20,354 | 13 |
| Rusk | \$61,150 | 136 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|---------------|-----------|--------------|
| Sabine | \$4,307 | 8 |
| San Augustine | \$15,810 | 8 |
| San Patricio | \$95,797 | 92 |
| San Saba | \$21,065 | 35 |
| Schleicher | \$0 | 0 |
| Scurry | \$84,641 | 63 |
| Shackelford | \$0 | 0 |
| Shelby | \$28,742 | 58 |
| Sherman | \$9,160 | 16 |
| Smith | \$950,000 | 877 |
| Somervell | \$29,092 | 44 |
| Starr | \$150,907 | 103 |
| Stephens | \$28,441 | 37 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Sterling | \$4,923 | 2 |
| Stonewall | \$0 | 0 |
| Sutton | \$3,408 | 3 |
| Swisher | \$31,700 | 36 |
| Tarrant | \$3,363,011 | 2,403 |
| Taylor | \$2,484,067 | 1,421 |
| Terrell | \$0 | 0 |
| Terry | \$18,900 | 24 |
| Throckmorton | \$0 | 0 |
| Titus | \$84,295 | 66 |
| Tom Green | \$378,975 | 158 |
| Travis | \$7,905,155 | 1,724 |
| Trinity | \$35,900 | 57 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Tyler | \$79,328 | 60 |
| Upshur | \$62,398 | 203 |
| Upton | \$2,072 | 4 |
| Uvalde | \$21,383 | 27 |
| Val Verde | \$92,513 | 40 |
| Van Zandt | \$272,978 | 196 |
| Victoria | \$305,794 | 153 |
| Walker | \$22,465 | 18 |
| Waller | \$37,602 | 31 |
| Ward | \$30,580 | 38 |
| Washington | \$46,199 | 44 |
| Webb | \$45,530 | 41 |
| Wharton | \$125,996 | 123 |

| County | Spending | Appointments |
|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Wheeler | \$8,280 | 11 |
| Wichita | \$571,201 | 1,282 |
| Wilbarger | \$50,295 | 49 |
| Willacy | \$32,650 | 72 |
| Williamson | \$1,046,395 | 559 |
| Wilson | \$39,264 | 49 |
| Winkler | \$8,885 | 12 |
| Wise | \$292,822 | 173 |
| Wood | \$139,284 | 142 |
| Yoakum | \$9,600 | 9 |
| Young | \$37,304 | 25 |
| Zapata | \$11,825 | 17 |

Appendix B

Unapproved Reports & No Report Submission

Counties that submitted a family protection representation expenditure report, but the report was not approved due to unresolved possible errors in the report:

Baylor

Dimmitt

Hopkins

Kendall

Maverick

Nueces

Rains

San Jacinto

Zavala

Counties that did not submit a family protection representation expenditure report:

La Salle

Appendix B

Figures & Tables

| | |
|---|---------|
| Figure 1 | |
| <i>Statewide Spending Graph</i> | Page 5 |
| Figure 2 | |
| <i>Per Capita Spending Graph</i> | Page 6 |
| Figure 3 | |
| <i>Statewide Share of Spending Pie Chart</i> | Page 7 |
| Table 1 | |
| <i>Statewide Share of Spending & Children in Conservatorship, Children Removed, and Children in Family Preservation Table</i> | Page 9 |
| Figure 4 | |
| <i>Spending Breakdown Graph</i> | Page 11 |
| Figure 5 | |
| <i>Attorney Practice Time & Bar Licensure Year Graph</i> | Page 14 |

End Notes

- i. <https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/88R/billtext/pdf/SB02120F.pdf#navpanes=0>
- ii. See FY21, FY22, and FY23 data reports at <https://www.tidc.texas.gov/family-representation/>
- iii. See Texas Family Code §§ 107.012, 107.0125, 107.013, 161.003, and 264.203.
- iv. Texas Government Code § 79.0365
- v. Texas Family Code § 79.0365
- vi. Texas Family Code §107.0042
- vii. See https://www.dfps.texas.gov/About_DFPS/Data_Book/Child_Protective_Services/Conservatorship/Children_in_Conservatorship.asp
- viii. See https://www.dfps.texas.gov/About_DFPS/Data_Book/Child_Protective_Services/Family_Preservation/Children_Served.asp
- ix. See Texas Family Code §§ 107.012, 107.0125, 107.013, 161.003.
- x. See Texas Family Code § 264.203.
- xi. See https://www.dfps.texas.gov/About_DFPS/Data_Book/Child_Protective_Services/Conservatorship/Removals.asp for numbers of removals of children in FY24.
- xii. See Texas Family Code §§ 107.012, 107.0125, 107.013, 161.003, and 264.203.