

inter...interlocal agreement to provide indigent defense services. And then on top of that, this...the commission that we've been debating would supplement those services and that is that the...once that base level of services provided by the local subdivision, by the county or judicial district, that then the additional services could be provided by the commission. An example of how this would work is that, we can use Richardson County as an example, they ran into the problem that they have a case that they have two major persons charged with two major crimes or two persons charged with major crimes, I should say. The county is providing the defense, would provide the defense through its public defender system or if it was in a district public defender system, or through an interlocal agreement, that they would have that in place, but they don't provide defense for the first one. The second one which would have a...which is the public defender's office would be conflicted out of, they would have a conflict of interest, they couldn't represent both sides. Rather, at that point, than having a county appoint a private attorney and pay the higher rates, the court could then appoint the commission to provide an attorney to represent that codefendant. By doing that, you still have the county paying, having the primary responsibility for defense, but you still cut that bill basically in half because you have someone at the state level coming to provide the conflict of interest defense. And what that does is it ensures then that, by doing it in this manner, it ensures that the county continues to have the first line or the primary responsibility for providing indigent defense, yet it still provides a mechanism that state funding can be applied for or state services can be applied for to get around...or to provide for that situation that all counties fear which is a major crime like this that results in those enormous costs to that county. It does leave in place, basically, the structure of 646, it just makes it clear that this is kind of a...it's a safety net. It's a type of thing that sits on top of our existing system and provides that supplemental defense as opposed to very clearly defined duties, I should add, that it is very clearly there for supplementary purposes available to those counties which take those steps to, basically, ensure against this type of thing occurring and they ensure against this type of thing occurring, the huge expense occurring, by doing one of those three things. They either have a public defender's office established which then the county doesn't have to...the risk is on the attorney if the public defender who then is either full time or however it is set up, whether it is part time, but would have the obligation to defend and so there is, the county