

Source:
THE SPANGENBERG GROUP
50 STATE AND COUNTY EXPENDITURES FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE
SERVICES FY 2002

State	Fiscal Year	State Expenditure	County Expenditure	Total Expenditure	Percentage of State Funds
Alabama**	2002	\$37,698,403	\$0	\$37,698,403	100.0%
Alaska	2002	\$23,493,700	\$0	\$23,493,700	100.0%
Arizona**	2002	\$150,000	\$77,643,965	\$77,793,965	0.002%
Arkansas	2002	\$13,165,489	\$0	\$13,165,489	100.0%
California	2002	\$30,541,000+	\$468,311,799	\$498,852,799	6.1%
Colorado	2002	\$40,629,765	\$0	\$40,629,765	100.0%
Connecticut	2002	\$34,897,045	\$0	\$34,897,045	100.0%
Delaware	2002	\$9,223,500	\$0	\$9,223,500	100.0%
District of Columbia	2002			\$55,140,000 ¹	00.0%
Florida	2002	\$144,800,000	\$35,875,000	\$180,675,000	80.1%
Georgia**	2002	\$9,423,078	\$44,632,008	\$54,055,086	17.4%
Hawaii	2002	\$10,011,173	\$0	\$10,011,173	100.0%
Idaho	2002	\$1,217,700+	\$7,352,599*	\$8,570,299	14.2%
Illinois	2002	\$29,456,856	\$86,759,701*	\$116,216,557	25.3%
Indiana	2002	\$14,168,000	\$16,687,264	\$30,855,264	45.9%
Iowa	2002	\$37,576,468	\$1,166,884	\$38,743,352	97.0%
Kansas	2002	\$15,615,850	\$4,498,419*	\$20,114,269	77.6%
Kentucky**	2002	\$26,739,314	\$1,464,776	\$28,204,090	94.8%
Louisiana**	2001	\$7,800,000	\$23,930,000	\$31,730,000	24.6%
Maine	2002	\$9,624,000	\$0	\$9,624,000	100.0%
Maryland	2002	\$58,528,208	\$0	\$58,528,208	100.0%
Massachusetts**	2002	\$94,427,468	\$0	\$94,427,468	100.0%
Michigan	2002	\$5,950,000+	Not Available	\$5,950,000	N/A
Minnesota	2002	\$54,000,000	\$0	\$54,000,000	100.0%

* Figure represents estimate, see notes for explanation.

** Known states that generate additional state funding from increased fees or alternative sources.

+ No funding from the state at trial level.

Source:
THE SPANGENBERG GROUP
50 STATE AND COUNTY EXPENDITURES FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE
SERVICES FY 2002

State	Fiscal Year	State Expenditure	County Expenditure	Total Expenditure	Percentage of State Funds
Mississippi	2002	\$1,157,825	\$9,216,692*	\$10,374,517	11.2%
Missouri	2002	\$31,601,168	\$0	\$31,601,168	100.0%
Montana	2002	\$4,739,824*	\$4,553,824	\$9,293,648	51.0%
Nebraska	2002	\$660,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,660,000	4.8%
Nevada	2002	\$627,300*	\$23,156,124*	\$23,783,424	2.6%
New Hampshire	2002	\$13,396,398	\$0	\$13,396,398	100.0%
New Jersey**	2002	\$79,695,000	\$0	\$79,695,000	100.0%
New Mexico	2002	\$29,000,000	\$0	\$29,000,000	100.0%
New York**	2002	\$47,261,644	\$217,000,000	\$264,261,644	17.9%
North Carolina	2002	\$73,859,355	\$0	\$73,859,355	100.0%
North Dakota**	2002	\$1,900,000	\$0	\$1,900,000	100.0%
Ohio**	2002	\$42,188,424	\$51,649,078	\$93,837,502	45.0%
Oklahoma	2002	\$16,102,393	\$8,215,748	\$24,318,141	66.2%
Oregon	2002	\$87,806,912	\$0	\$87,806,912	100.0%
Pennsylvania	2000	\$0+	\$86,947,485*	\$86,947,485	0.0%
Rhode Island	2002	\$7,315,800	\$0	\$7,315,800	100.0%
South Carolina**	2001	\$14,836,835	\$7,172,276	\$22,009,111	67.4%
South Dakota**	2002	\$2,060,785	\$4,293,282	\$6,354,067	32.4%
Tennessee	2002	\$42,024,312	\$6,101,405	\$48,125,717	87.3%
Texas**	2002	\$7,540,649	\$106,296,379	\$113,837,028	6.6%
Utah	2002	\$0+	\$6,527,506*	\$6,527,506	0.0%
Vermont	2002	\$7,461,030	\$0	\$7,461,030	100.0%
Virginia	2001	\$76,338,842	\$0	\$76,338,842	100.0%
Washington	2002	\$3,525,123+	\$60,000,000	\$63,525,123	5.5%
West Virginia	2002	\$24,730,658	\$0	\$24,730,658	100.0%
Wisconsin	2002	\$67,420,000	\$0	\$67,420,000	100.0%
Wyoming	2002	\$3,045,644	\$537,467	\$3,583,111	85.0%
State Total	2002	\$1,395,432,938	\$1,372,989,681²	\$2,823,562,619³	50.4⁴%
Federal Expenditure: Criminal	2002			\$485,900,000	

* Figure represents estimate, see notes for explanation.

** Known states that generate additional state funding from increased fees or alternative sources.

+ No funding from the state at trial level.

Source:
THE SPANGENBERG GROUP
50 STATE AND COUNTY EXPENDITURES FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE
SERVICES FY 2002

1. The money appropriated by the federal government to the District of Columbia for indigent defense is neither a state nor a county expenditure, thus it is just listed in the total expenditure column.
2. A number of states with state-funded public defender systems, such as Arkansas, Hawaii and Wyoming, require counties to provide office space for public defender offices. The expenditure figures in the table do not include these costs.
3. This figure includes the \$55,140,000 allocated by the federal government for indigent defense representation in the District of Columbia, and because this amount is neither a state nor a county expenditure, the “State Expenditure” total plus “County Expenditure” total is less than this total expenditure figure.
4. This percentage does not include the funds allocated to the District of Columbia. *See note 3. *Notes on Estimates:*

*In a number of states we were required to estimate the indigent defense expenditure. This is due to a lack of reliable data, either at the state or county level. Below are the states in which the indigent defense expenditures were estimated and the methodology used to make these estimates.

1. In **Illinois, Pennsylvania, Nevada** and **Mississippi** there is no statewide agency that collects county indigent defense expenditure data. However, in recent years, a statewide study on indigent defense has been conducted in each of these states by The Spangenberg Group. In **Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Nevada**, these studies produced a statewide indigent defense expenditure figure for 1999, 2000 and 1999 respectively. Our estimate for the 2002 county indigent defense expenditures in **Illinois** and **Pennsylvania** were arrived at by increasing the reported expenditures by 5% for each year that has elapsed since the state-wide reports were published.

The statewide study in **Mississippi** did not yield a statewide expenditure figure.

2. In **Kansas** and **Montana** we were provided with the state, but not the county, expenditure. To estimate the counties' expenditures in each of these states, we calculated the rate of increase in state funding since 1986. The 1986 figure was taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin: “Criminal Defense for the Poor, 1986.” We took the 1986 county expenditure, as found in the report, and increased it by the same percentage as the state funding increased over the same period (1986 to 2002). As of July 1, 2003, the state assumed 100% of the costs of indigent defense in Montana.

3. In **Idaho** and **Utah** we were unable to find reliable figures for the county indigent defense expenditure. **Utah**'s indigent defense system is entirely county funded. **Idaho**'s state-funded State Appellate Defense system is new since 1986. To estimate the indigent defense expenditure in 2002 for these states we calculated the average percentage increase from 1986 to 2002 for all states that had reliable data. We then applied that rate of increase to the county expenditure for Idaho and Utah in 1986.
4. At the time of our data collection, **Michigan** was unable to provide us with updated county expenditures.