



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Mr. David D. Fu
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Dalila Corral Lyons
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Rupert A. Byrdsong
Ms. Rebecca J. Fleming
Mr. Kevin Harrigan
Mr. Shawn C. Landry
Hon. Glenn Mondo
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Hon. Theodore C. Zayner

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

May 6, 2022

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Legislative Counsel
1021 O Street, Suite 3210
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Sue Parker
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 319
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 305
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Keely Martin Bosler
Director, California Department of
Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2020–21, as required by the Budget Act of 2020

Dear Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Contreras, Ms. Parker, and Ms. Bosler:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required by the Budget Act of 2020 (Sen. Bill 74; Stats. 2020, ch. 6), item 0250-101-0932, regarding the fiscal year 2020–21 expenditures for the Trial Court Interpreters Program.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Mr. Douglas Denton, Principal Manager, Language Access Services, at 415-865-7870 or douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

May 6, 2022

Page 2

MH/DGD

Attachment

cc: Eric Dang, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Alf Brandt, Senior Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Shaun Naidu, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Jessie Romine, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Matthew Fleming, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Hans Hemann, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Sandy Uribe, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Jay Dickenson, Chief Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Kimberly Horiuchi, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Zlatko Theodorovic, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Jenniffer Herman, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Mr. David D. Fu
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Dalila Corral Lyons
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Rupert A. Byrdson
Ms. Rebecca J. Fleming
Mr. Kevin Harrigan
Mr. Shawn C. Landry
Hon. Glenn Mondo
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Hon. Theodore C. Zayner

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Report title: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2020–21*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2020 (Sen. Bill 74; Stats. 2020, ch. 6)

Date of report: May 6, 2022

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance in accordance with provision 4 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2020.

The total appropriation for fiscal year (FY) 2020–21 was \$131.381 million, of which \$130.977 million was available for eligible court interpreter expenditures and \$87,000 was available for maintenance of the Court Interpreter Data Collection System.

The FY 2020–21 appropriation included \$257,000 to support interpreter costs related to new judgeships, \$1.114 million for benefits, and a \$9.323 million budget change proposal (BCP) funding for increased program costs. Total court interpreter expenditures reported during FY 2020–21 were \$116.771 million, which was less than the \$130.977 million available by \$14.206 million. Unspent funds were first allocated to make whole those courts with interpreter expenditures in excess of their allocation. The remaining \$11 million reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted program funding to be used for future interpreter expenses. Compared to expenditures in FY 2019–20, total court interpreter expenditures for FY 2020-21 decreased by \$5.198 million (–4.26 percent)

During FY 2020–21, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted court services, which delayed many court hearings; there was also an overall reduction in case filings. Both of these elements likely led to the slight decrease in interpreter expenditures during the reporting year, which resulted in the appropriation for interpreter services being sufficient for eligible court interpreter expenditures during FY 2020–21.

The full report can be accessed at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm. A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-7870.



Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2020–21

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE AND
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
MAY 2022



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Martin Hoshino
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Robert Oyung
Chief Operating Officer

CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

Charlene Depner
Director

LANGUAGE ACCESS SERVICES

Douglas G. Denton
Principal Manager

I. Background

Mandates to Provide Court Interpreting Services

Article I, section 14 of the California Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide that “[a] person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings.” This provision establishes a mandate for courts to provide interpreters in criminal matters to all defendants who have a limited ability to understand or speak English.

Judicial Council and Legislative Actions

Effective January 1, 2015, Assembly Bill 1657 (Stats. 2014, ch. 721) added section 756 to the Evidence Code. Section 756 requires the Judicial Council to “reimburse courts for court interpreter services provided in civil actions and proceedings to any party who is present in court and who does not proficiently speak or understand the English language.” (Evid. Code, § 756(a).) The statute also provides that if appropriated funds are insufficient to provide an interpreter to every party who meets the standard of eligibility, interpreter services in civil cases should be prioritized by case type, as specified.

Also in January 2015, the Judicial Council approved and adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (Language Access Plan).¹ Of the eight major goals identified in the Language Access Plan, Goal 2—Provide Qualified Language Access Services in All Judicial Proceedings—states: “By 2017, and beginning immediately where resources permit, qualified interpreters will be provided in the California courts to LEP [limited-English-proficient] court users in all courtroom proceedings and, by 2020, in all court-ordered, court-operated events.”

This report outlines the expenditures by court for eligible court interpreter services provided by the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2020–21. The report also provides an overview of the expenditures provided in civil cases reported by the courts.²

Statutory Requirement to Report on Expenditures

The Budget Act of 2020 (Sen. Bill 74; Stats. 2020, ch. 6), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for the services of court interpreters. Provision 4 states that “[t]he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4).” Consistent with these requirements, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreter services.

¹ The Language Access Plan is available at www.courts.ca.gov/languageaccess.htm.

² Under federal law, individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing and who require sign language interpreters must receive court interpreter services at no cost in all court proceedings.

Trial Court Trust Fund Program 150037 Funding for FY 2020–21

- The FY 2020–21 appropriation of \$131.381 million included \$257,000 to support interpreter costs related to new judgeships, \$1.114 million for benefits, and \$9.323 million budget change proposal (BCP) funding for increased program costs and to advance the implementation of the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.
- Of the total funding, \$130.977 million was available for court interpreter costs, and \$87,000 was available for the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS).
- Effective with the October 2020 distribution, Judicial Council Budget Services implemented a council-approved, one-time 2020–21 allocation of funding not to exceed the appropriation. Allocated funding was distributed monthly through June 2021.
- In May 2021, the council approved a Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation to reallocate unspent funds to courts with court interpreter expenditures that exceeded their budget allocation.
- During FY 2020–21, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted court services; this delayed many court hearings, and there was also an overall reduction in case filings.³
- Total statewide court interpreter expenditures, as reported by courts in the Phoenix financial system, were \$116.771 million. (See Attachment A for an expenditure overview for FY 2020–21 and Attachment B for a breakdown of expenditures by court.)
- Total expenditures for FY 2020–21 were less than the \$130.977 million available for court interpreter costs by \$14.206 million (see table 1). Unspent funds were first allocated to reimburse those courts with interpreter expenditures in excess of their budget allocation. The remaining \$11 million reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted program funding.
- Compared to expenditures in FY 2019–20, total court interpreter expenditures for FY 2020–21 decreased by \$5.198 million (–4.26 percent). (See tables 1 and 4.)
- Table 1 shows that mandated cases accounted for \$113.214 million of the reported expenditures (97 percent).⁴ Civil cases (including domestic violence cases) accounted for \$3.558 million of the reported expenditures (3 percent).
- Contract interpreter expenditures in FY 2020–21 represented 18.5 percent of total expenditures, reflecting a decrease from FY 2019–20, when contractor expenses were 21.6 percent of the total expenditures (table 2).

³ During the entirety of the time period covered in this report (July 2020 through June 2021), a state of emergency was in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Between March and August of 2020, case filings fell by 39 percent compared to filings in the same period of 2019. See *Trends in Caseloads During COVID-19*, available at <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/Pandemic-Case-Trends.pdf>.

⁴ The provision of interpreter services is mandated for criminal, traffic, juvenile delinquency, juvenile dependency, mental competency hearings with appointed counsel, and other mandated civil cases.

- Compared to FY 2019–20, expenditures for contract interpreters in FY 2020–21 decreased by \$4.779 million (–18.2 percent), and expenditures for court employees in FY 2020–21 decreased by \$418,158 (–0.44 percent).

Table 1. Expenditures by case type, FY 2020–21

Case Type	Amount	Percentage of Total Expenditures
1. Mandated—reported by courts	\$113,213,643	97%
2. Domestic Violence—reported by courts	\$845,200	1%
3. Civil—reported by courts	\$2,712,391	2%
Court expenditures (sum of 1, 2, and 3)	\$116,771,233	100%
FY 2020–21 Appropriation available to the courts	\$130,977,000	(Does not include \$87,000 for CIDCS)
Amount under appropriation	\$14,205,767	

II. Allowable Expenditures

The following expenditures are allowable in the Judicial Branch Court Interpreters Program:

- Certified and registered court interpreters employed by the courts, including salaries, benefits, and travel;⁵
- Court interpreter coordinators who are certified or registered court interpreters, including salaries and benefits;⁶
- Four court interpreter supervisor positions: two in Los Angeles County, one in Orange County, and one in San Diego County. These are the only positions funded with court interpreter funding that include standard operating expenses and equipment; and,
- Contract court interpreters, including per diems (see section III) and travel.

⁵ Only interpreters who pass the Bilingual Interpreter Exam (BIE)—or passed the legal specialist (SC:L) exam previously administered by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) for American Sign Language—and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements are referred to as *certified* interpreters. Languages certified for court interpreters include American Sign Language and 15 spoken languages: Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Farsi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. (Note: Western Armenian and Japanese currently remain certified languages, but there is no BIE available in those languages.) Interpreters of other spoken languages for which there is no state-certifying exam are required to pass the Written Exam and Oral Proficiency Exam (OPE) in both English and their non-English language if available, and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements in order to become a *registered* interpreter. The OPE is available in Spanish and 69 other languages.

⁶ Expenditures are limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 4, of the Budget Act of 2020 to 1.0 personnel year (PY) each for counties in classes 1–15; 0.5 PY each for counties in classes 16–31; and 0.25 PY each for counties in classes 32–58. The Budget Act of 2020 defines county classes based on size of population: counties in classes 1–15 have populations of more than 500,000; classes 16–31 have populations between 130,000 and 500,000; and classes 32–58 have populations of fewer than 130,000.

III. Rates of Pay for Contract Court Interpreters

The Judicial Council first established statewide standards for contract court interpreter compensation in January 1999 at two defined levels, a full-day rate and a half-day rate.

Certified and Registered Contract Court Interpreters

Effective July 1, 2021, the council approved increasing and standardizing the daily compensation rate for certified and registered independent contractor interpreters as follows: \$350 for a full day, \$175 for a half-day, and \$44 hourly.⁷

Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

Effective July 1, 2021, the council approved increasing and standardizing the daily compensation rate for noncertified and nonregistered independent contractor interpreters as follows: \$220 for a full day, \$110 for a half-day, and \$28 hourly.⁸

Noncertified and nonregistered court interpreters who have not taken or passed the required examinations to become certified or registered court interpreters but who demonstrate language proficiency and meet the requirements in place for provisional qualification may be provisionally qualified by the court. They may be used when no certified or registered interpreter is available.⁹

Comparison with Federal Rates

The above contractor rates comply with provision 4 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2020 which states, “[T]he Judicial Council shall set statewide or regional rates and policies for payment of court interpreters, not to exceed the rate paid to certified interpreters in the federal court system.” The current federal rate for certified and registered contract court interpreters is \$418 for a full day, \$226 for a half day, and \$59 per hour for overtime. The federal rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters is \$202 for a full day and \$111 for a half day.¹⁰

⁷ Judicial Council of Cal., Adv. Com. Rep., *Court Interpreters: Payment Policies for Contract Court Interpreters* (Feb. 17, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9189125&GUID=CDB12CF5-C6C6-442D-8019-5FA16603B3E7>.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ The court is required to appoint a *certified* interpreter to interpret in a language designated by the Judicial Council. (Gov. Code, § 68561.) The court is required to appoint a *registered* interpreter to interpret in a language not designated by the Judicial Council. The court *may* appoint a noncertified interpreter if the court (1) on the record finds good cause to appoint a noncertified interpreter *and* finds the interpreter to be qualified, and (2) follows the procedures adopted by the Judicial Council. (Gov. Code, §§ 68561(c), 68564(d) and (e); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.893.) The court may appoint nonregistered interpreters only if (1) a registered interpreter is unavailable and (2) the good cause qualifications and procedures adopted by the Judicial Council under Government Code section 68561(c) have been followed. (See Gov. Code, § 71802(b)(1) and (d).)

¹⁰ Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx.

IV. Expenditures for Employee and Contract Interpreters

Certified and Registered Employee and Contract Interpreters

Table 2 details eligible expenditures for employee-related and contract court interpreter costs.

Total employee-related expenditures represented 81.5 percent of total interpreter expenditures in FY 2020–21. Contract interpreter expenditures in FY 2020–21 represented 18.5 percent of total expenditures, which is a decrease from FY 2019–20, when contractor expenses were 21.6 percent of the total expenditures. Compared to FY 2019–20, expenditures for contract interpreters in FY 2020–21 decreased by \$4.779 million (–18.2 percent), and expenditures for court employees in FY 2020–21 decreased by \$418,158 (–0.44 percent). (See table 2.)

Table 2. Expenditures for certified and registered employee and contract interpreters

Fiscal Year	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21
Total Employee-Related Expenditures	\$82,610,361	\$87,231,671	\$92,362,074	\$95,629,396	\$95,211,238
Percentage of Total	77.84%	76.40%	75.17%	78.4%	81.5%
Total Contractor Expenditures	\$23,524,630	\$26,950,272	\$30,510,247	\$26,339,933	\$21,559,996
Percentage of Total	22.16%	23.60%	24.83%	21.6%	18.5%
Total Expenditures	\$106,134,731	\$114,181,943	\$122,872,321	\$121,969,330	\$116,771,233
Percentage Change Over Prior Year	5.68%	7.58%	7.61%	-0.73%	-4.26%

FY 2015–16 total reimbursements were \$100,432,205.

Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

Table 3 illustrates annual statewide expenditures over the past five years (excluding travel) for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters, and the percentage of the total expenditures for court interpreter services.

During FY 2020–21, statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled \$2.886 million, or 2.47 percent of total statewide expenditures. This is a decrease from FY 2019–20, when these expenditures were 3.41 percent of the total.

Table 3. Expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters and corresponding percentage of total expenditures

Fiscal Year	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21
Noncertified Expenditures	\$2,312,752	\$2,715,378	\$3,195,466	\$2,577,711	\$1,816,758
	2.18%	2.38%	2.60%	2.11%	1.56%
Nonregistered Expenditures	\$1,267,986	\$1,406,780	\$1,788,983	\$1,584,072	\$1,069,242
	1.19%	1.23%	1.46%	1.30%	0.92%
Combined Expenditures	\$3,580,783	\$4,122,157	\$4,984,449	\$4,161,783	\$2,886,000
	3.37%	3.61%	4.06%	3.41%	2.47%

Table 4 compares the top 10 court expenditures incurred in FY 2019–20 and FY 2020–21.

Table 4. Distribution of eligible expenditures to top 10 courts

Superior Court	FY 2019–20 Eligible Expenditures (\$)	FY 2019–20 Percentage of Statewide Total	FY 2020–21 Eligible Expenditures (\$)	FY 2020–21 Percentage of Statewide Total	\$ Change from FY 2019–20	Percentage Change from FY 2019–20
Los Angeles	\$39,032,884	32.0%	\$37,119,284	31.79%	-\$1,913,600	-4.90%
Orange	10,058,682	8.25%	10,013,876	8.58%	-44,806	-0.45%
San Diego	6,178,018	5.07%	5,364,481	4.59%	-813,537	-13.17%
San Bernardino	6,157,161	5.05%	5,995,137	5.13%	-162,024	-2.63%
Riverside	6,130,551	5.03%	6,409,042	5.49%	278,491	4.54%
Santa Clara	5,846,426	4.79%	5,244,318	4.49%	-602,108	-10.30%
Alameda	5,360,994	4.40%	5,024,020	4.30%	-336,974	-6.29%
Sacramento	4,336,528	3.56%	4,347,325	3.72%	10,797	0.25%
Kern	3,957,861	3.24%	3,646,659	3.12%	-311,202	-7.86%
San Francisco	3,771,960	3.09%	3,679,421	3.15%	-92,539	-2.45%
Subtotal	\$90,831,065	74.47%	\$86,843,563	74.37%	-\$3,987,502	-4.39%
Remaining Courts	31,138,265	25.53%	29,927,670	25.63%	-1,210,595	-3.89%
Statewide Total	\$121,969,330	100.00%	116,771,233	100.00%	-\$5,198,097	-4.26%

V. Conclusion

Over \$9 million was added to the annual appropriation for the Court Interpreters Program on an ongoing basis through budget change proposal efforts. During FY 2020–21, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted court services; this delayed many court hearings, and there was also an overall reduction in case filings. Both of these elements likely led to the slight decrease in interpreter expenditures during the reporting year, which resulted in the appropriation for

interpreter services being sufficient for eligible court interpreter expenditures during FY 2020–21. As courts continue to expand interpreter services to include all civil proceedings, and with increased salaries and benefits for court interpreters, the program will rebound and continue the trend of increasing in expenditures for court interpreters for the benefit of California court users.

VI. Attachments

1. Attachment A: 2020–21 Court Interpreter Program 0150037: Expenditure Overview
2. Attachment B: 2020–21 Final Expenditures: Court Interpreter Program 0150037

2020-2021 Court Interpreter Program 0150037**Expenditure Overview**

1. Total Mandated Criminal	\$	113,213,643
2. Total Domestic Violence reported by courts:	\$	845,200
3. Total Civil reported by courts:	\$	2,712,391
Court Total Expenditures (sum of 1, 2, 3)	\$	116,771,233
Court Interpreter Data Collection System	\$	87,000
Total Expenditures	\$	116,858,233

Courts	Mandated Cases -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs				Mandated Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs											Mandated Cases Total Expenditures
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignments	Total Employee-Related Costs	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Telephonic Interpreting	Court Interpreter Services	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs		
	A	B	C	D (A+B+C)	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L (E thru K)	M	N (L + M)	O (D + N)	
Alameda	4,251,781	15,629	-	4,267,410	103,857	362,480	93,951	62,029	91,355	-	-	713,671	17,184	730,855	4,998,264	
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	20,728	-	-	282	-	-	21,010	8,192	29,202	29,202	
Butte	59,803	-	-	59,803	10,188	115,667	-	418	5,573	123	-	131,969	45,482	177,451	237,254	
Calaveras	23,499	-	-	23,499	1,359	16,086	-	678	-	1,415	-	19,538	9,922	29,461	52,960	
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	71,805	1,178	-	-	825	-	73,808	34,265	108,073	108,073	
Contra Costa	1,965,717	874	-	1,966,590	65,085	497,857	26,846	43,652	-	2,627	-	636,067	37,538	673,605	2,640,196	
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	26,502	-	-	-	-	-	26,502	174	26,676	26,676	
El Dorado	20,311	-	-	20,311	-	100,294	-	-	-	170	-	100,464	42,130	142,594	162,905	
Fresno	1,279,588	9,741	57,065	1,346,393	31,509	299,288	18,244	27,306	18,453	-	-	394,800	252,074	646,873	1,993,267	
Glenn	49,927	-	-	49,927	-	78,191	-	105	418	-	-	78,714	58,495	137,209	187,136	
Humboldt	26,819	-	-	26,819	-	93,847	-	500	-	1,410	-	95,756	28,965	124,721	151,540	
Imperial	391,771	36	-	391,806	-	44,332	-	-	-	190	-	44,522	23,493	68,015	459,821	
Inyo	23,118	-	-	23,118	-	24,287	-	-	-	600	-	24,887	7,894	32,781	55,899	
Kern	2,498,123	30,417	-	2,528,540	36,988	589,325	1,658	222,901	159,376	-	-	1,010,248	107,870	1,118,118	3,646,659	
Kings	222,400	-	-	222,400	-	201,597	2,375	-	-	3,375	-	207,347	86,844	294,191	516,591	
Lake	22,836	-	-	22,836	-	121,714	-	-	91,570	-	-	213,284	12,157	225,441	248,277	
Lassen	27,426	-	-	27,426	-	6,521	-	276	-	-	206	7,002	7,274	14,276	41,703	
Los Angeles	36,158,776	154	50,360	36,209,289	119,465	31,186	207,472	211,438	38,150	-	17,327	625,037	284,957	909,995	37,119,284	
Madera	541,947	-	-	541,947	-	53,999	-	30,657	-	-	-	84,656	22,707	107,363	649,311	
Marin	508,607	-	-	508,607	-	149,194	-	15,250	-	-	-	164,444	4,288	168,733	677,339	
Mariposa	7,899	-	-	7,899	-	9,758	-	459	847	-	-	11,064	11,398	22,461	30,360	
Mendocino	124,401	145	-	124,546	-	134,098	-	-	12,759	-	-	146,857	114,204	261,062	385,608	
Merced	305,476	(39)	-	305,437	18,049	401,286	1,335	11,012	23,767	-	133	455,582	190,291	645,873	951,310	
Modoc	-	-	-	-	92	-	2,310	-	-	-	-	2,402	-	2,402	2,402	
Mono	47,495	-	-	47,495	580	4,839	-	-	-	-	-	5,419	1,340	6,760	54,255	
Monterey	1,126,292	76	-	1,126,368	29,866	80,264	124,165	133,507	13,850	-	-	381,652	40,556	422,207	1,548,575	
Napa	333,417	-	-	333,417	-	246,055	-	600	-	-	-	246,655	57,030	303,685	637,101	
Nevada	19,602	-	-	19,602	-	47,127	-	4,243	282	157	-	51,808	15,358	67,166	86,768	
Orange	9,398,535	6,516	38,488	9,443,539	47,666	187,738	46,137	96,780	94,208	-	-	472,529	55,882	528,411	9,971,950	
Placer	260,882	2,177	-	263,059	13,975	126,733	2,996	16,996	9,979	-	-	170,678	40,063	210,741	473,800	
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	5,500	-	-	-	-	-	5,500	-	5,500	5,500	
Riverside	5,239,286	6,709	-	5,245,995	23,142	249,062	62,726	52,058	49,642	516	-	437,146	229,539	666,685	5,912,680	
Sacramento	3,371,772	490	174,322	3,546,584	73,456	231,532	36,504	6,170	31,319	-	-	378,980	4,424	383,404	3,929,988	
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	79,572	-	7,444	-	1,080	-	88,095	25,260	113,356	113,356	
San Bernardino	5,604,714	10,771	3,295	5,618,780	19,847	67,932	44,759	44,908	88,470	10,141	-	276,057	37,817	313,874	5,932,654	
San Diego	4,644,717	1,005	-	4,645,722	50,083	371,285	45,545	111,756	-	1,278	-	579,947	114,515	694,462	5,340,185	
San Francisco	3,073,990	-	8,890	3,082,880	48,025	249,933	-	115,726	16,383	-	-	430,067	33,675	463,742	3,546,623	
San Joaquin	923,390	578	65,774	989,742	27,853	515,285	66,211	82,465	-	-	-	691,815	94,638	786,453	1,776,195	
San Luis Obispo	403,776	52	-	403,828	64,878	112,150	3,491	95	61,800	-	-	242,414	64,382	306,796	710,624	
San Mateo	1,367,424	-	-	1,367,424	48,197	571,925	39,675	55,480	19,300	-	-	734,577	192,198	926,775	2,294,199	
Santa Barbara	1,605,991	31	-	1,606,021	2,178	29,527	55,791	-	21,446	71	-	109,012	10,338	119,350	1,725,371	
Santa Clara	3,181,157	1,828	78,881	3,261,866	70,676	1,206,278	32,974	90,515	36,574	-	-	1,437,017	288,015	1,725,031	4,986,897	
Santa Cruz	847,187	182	-	847,369	26,280	11,128	3,427	10,438	2,640	-	-	53,913	9,267	63,180	910,549	
Shasta	128,392	-	-	128,392	15,047	124,654	5,000	7,456	16,481	37	-	168,675	127,416	296,091	424,483	
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	160	-	-	-	55	-	215	-	215	215	
Siskiyou	1,654	-	-	1,654	-	19,035	-	525	-	327	-	19,887	3,549	23,436	25,090	
Solano	407,591	-	-	407,591	7,265	198,244	20,731	20,969	8,565	-	-	255,774	24,870	280,644	688,235	
Sonoma	898,501	-	-	898,501	16,878	325,903	8,377	21,429	15,228	779	-	388,593	35,931	424,524	1,323,025	
Stanislaus	258,332	3	-	258,334	40,592	445,652	10,049	24,082	15,153	-	-	535,528	318,738	854,266	1,112,600	
Sutter	43,074	-	-	43,074	6,389	93,859	-	29,836	4,187	390	-	134,660	73,994	208,654	251,727	
Tehama	164,267	-	-	164,267	3,497	26,506	-	-	-	-	-	30,002	17,281	47,283	211,551	
Trinity	28,583	-	-	28,583	4,576	9,680	200	-	2,072	-	-	16,528	15,990	32,518	61,102	
Tulare	335,008	-	-	335,008	27,235	889,499	3,681	11,829	23,158	-	-	955,402	216,742	1,172,144	1,507,152	
Tuolumne	25,498	-	-	25,498	-	20,737	-	-	-	-	-	20,737	193	20,930	46,428	
Ventura	832,143	-	-	832,143	8,353	648,604	46,233	16,352	-	-	-	719,542	26,288	745,830	1,577,973	
Yolo	175,049	-	-	175,049	27,237	288,842	2,231	4,527	2,500	-	-	325,336	83,324	408,661	583,710	
Yuba	23,335	-	-	23,335	3,494	30,543	340	1,570	564	906	-	37,418	10,292	47,709	71,044	
Total:	93,281,279	87,374	477,074	93,845,727	1,093,856	10,965,823	1,016,612	1,594,434	979,726	23,096	17,666	15,691,212	3,676,704	19,367,915	113,213,643	

Courts	Domestic Violence -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs				Domestic Violence Plus Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs										Domestic Violence Plus Cases Total Expenditures
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignments	Total Employee-Related Costs	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Telephonic Interpreting	Court Interpreter Services	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs	
	A	B	C	D (A+B+C)	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L (E thru K)	M	N (L + M)	
Alameda	-	-	-	-	1,690	6,136	1,167	-	800	-	-	9,793	55	9,848	9,848
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Butte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	-	-	-	-	2,088	13,942	700	4,306	-	-	-	21,035	1,145	22,180	22,180
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	-	-	-	-	-	8,643	-	-	-	-	-	8,643	3,012	11,655	11,655
Fresno	102,756	-	-	102,756	836	8,250	632	4,572	-	-	-	14,290	8,653	22,944	125,699
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Humboldt	-	-	-	-	-	875	-	-	-	-	-	875	202	1,077	1,077
Imperial	9,487	-	-	9,487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,487
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kings	-	-	-	-	-	8,268	-	-	157	-	-	8,424	2,697	11,122	11,122
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	-	-	-	-	-	1,429	-	-	-	-	-	1,429	2,878	4,307	4,307
Merced	-	-	-	-	1,305	10,148	-	-	-	-	-	11,453	6,300	17,753	17,753
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monterey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	6,747	-	-	6,747	-	904	-	-	-	-	-	904	-	904	7,651
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	1,703	-	223	-	-	-	1,926	872	2,799	2,799
Orange	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Placer	-	-	-	-	850	21,103	-	2,235	3,682	-	-	27,870	4,456	32,327	32,327
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	62,887	-	-	62,887	1,726	6,517	1,804	5,780	7,500	-	-	23,328	8,579	31,907	94,794
Sacramento	40,855	-	-	40,855	2,219	10,260	2,316	1,370	847	-	-	17,012	450	17,462	58,317
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	45,466	-	-	45,466	2,224	2,221	1,200	8,061	1,170	-	-	14,876	2,610	17,487	62,953
San Diego	6,786	-	-	6,786	8,845	6,145	-	2,520	-	-	-	17,510	-	17,510	24,296
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	1,756	14,674	-	16,756	450	-	-	33,636	4,855	38,491	38,491
San Joaquin	8,720	-	-	8,720	1,376	21,194	285	3,852	-	-	-	26,707	3,683	30,390	39,109
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Barbara	-	-	-	-	-	1,475	1,600	-	-	-	-	3,075	180	3,256	3,256
Santa Clara	92,875	265	-	93,141	476	15,226	-	383	2,000	-	-	18,085	1,760	19,845	112,986
Santa Cruz	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-	-	653	-	-	-	-	-	653	791	1,444	1,444
Solano	-	-	-	-	423	11,246	-	719	338	-	-	12,727	1,606	14,332	14,332
Sonoma	6,420	-	-	6,420	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,420
Stanislaus	190	-	-	190	2,303	13,305	-	1,060	1,644	-	-	18,312	10,468	28,781	28,971
Sutter	-	-	-	-	-	986	-	251	-	-	-	1,237	1,478	2,715	2,715
Tehama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tulare	-	-	-	-	-	63,732	650	-	-	-	-	64,381	13,874	78,255	78,255
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	440	-	1,320	-	-	-	1,760	187	1,947	1,947
Ventura	5,375	-	-	5,375	-	10,651	150	-	-	-	-	10,801	156	10,957	16,332
Yolo	-	-	-	-	-	1,361	-	-	-	-	-	1,361	-	1,361	1,361
Yuba	-	-	-	-	457	1,712	-	-	-	281	-	2,450	867	3,316	3,316
Total:	388,565	265	-	388,830	28,575	263,200	10,504	53,406	18,588	281	-	374,555	81,815	456,370	845,200

Courts	Civil Cases -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs				Civil Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs										Civil Cases Total Expenditures
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignments	Total Employee-Related Costs	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Telephonic Interpreting	Court Interpreter Services	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs	
	A	B	C	D (A+B+C)	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L (E thru K)	M	N (L + M)	
Alameda	-	-	-	-	2,892	3,090	2,291	2,034	5,600	-	-	15,908	-	15,908	15,908
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Butte	-	-	-	-	644	31,848	-	-	836	-	-	33,328	12,178	45,506	45,506
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	-	-	-	-	14,158	104,836	2,237	12,235	-	-	-	133,466	4,936	138,402	138,402
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	-	-	-	-	-	19,682	-	-	-	611	-	20,293	9,425	29,718	29,718
Fresno	41,364	-	-	41,364	2,136	14,898	800	14,518	1,409	-	-	33,761	13,271	47,031	88,395
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	348	-	105	-	-	-	453	378	831	831
Humboldt	-	-	-	-	-	12,277	-	-	-	-	-	12,277	653	12,929	12,929
Imperial	44,044	-	-	44,044	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,044
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	12,049	-	-	-	-	-	12,049	4,533	16,582	16,582
Kern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kings	-	-	-	-	-	20,423	1,325	-	-	-	-	21,748	8,977	30,724	30,724
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	-	-	-	-	-	16,055	-	-	1,129	-	-	17,184	18,162	35,346	35,346
Merced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monterey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	3,403	-	44	-	-	-	3,446	871	4,317	4,317
Orange	41,926	-	-	41,926	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41,926
Placer	-	-	-	-	1,164	19,383	-	3,952	4,139	-	-	28,639	5,976	34,615	34,615
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	312,959	-	-	312,959	8,156	20,218	7,635	23,777	2,125	-	-	61,911	26,699	88,610	401,568
Sacramento	237,653	-	-	237,653	23,370	83,331	2,674	6,210	2,287	-	-	117,872	3,496	121,367	359,020
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	(471)	-	-	(471)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(471)
San Diego	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	3,287	26,189	-	52,719	450	-	-	82,645	11,662	94,307	94,307
San Joaquin	28,899	-	-	28,899	2,089	62,571	2,398	11,072	-	-	-	78,130	11,168	89,298	118,196
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	-	-	-	-	4,073	136,690	3,926	10,503	2,250	-	-	157,442	43,812	201,255	201,255
Santa Barbara	-	-	-	-	439	11,971	9,085	-	1,200	-	-	22,695	-	22,695	22,695
Santa Clara	133,106	276	-	133,382	1,254	8,116	-	210	-	-	-	9,580	1,474	11,053	144,435
Santa Cruz	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-	-	2,766	-	175	-	-	-	2,941	779	3,720	3,720
Solano	-	-	-	-	272	30,061	862	12,241	4,043	-	-	47,478	6,478	53,956	53,956
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	2,092	-	-	2,092	27,869	186,813	-	12,111	4,870	-	-	231,663	133,164	364,827	366,919
Sutter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tehama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tulare	-	-	-	-	-	89,415	938	253	-	-	-	90,606	17,017	107,623	107,623
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura	134,833	-	-	134,833	4,768	125,320	7,955	6,759	-	-	-	144,802	9,179	153,981	288,815
Yolo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba	-	-	-	-	282	7,217	-	-	-	1,108	-	8,607	2,501	11,108	11,108
Total:	976,404	276	-	976,680	96,853	1,048,971	42,126	168,917	30,338	1,719	-	1,388,923	346,787	1,735,711	2,712,391