



# 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

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

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER  
*Chair, Executive and Planning Committee*

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

HON. KENNETH K. SO  
*Chair, Policy Coordination and  
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.  
*Chair, Rules and Projects Committee*

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH  
*Chair, Technology Committee*

*Hon. Marla O. Anderson  
Hon. Richard Bloom  
Hon. C. Todd Botke  
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie  
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile  
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie  
Hon. Ming W. Chin  
Hon. Samuel K. Feng  
Ms. Rachel W. Hill  
Hon. Harold W. Hopp  
Hon. James M. Humes  
Ms. Audra Ibarra  
Hon. HannahBeth Jackson  
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly  
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons  
Hon. Gary Nadler  
Ms. Gretchen Nelson*

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

*Mr. Jake Chatters  
Ms. Kimberly Flener  
Hon. Scott M. Gordon  
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas  
Hon. Shama Hakim Mesiwala  
Hon. Stuart M. Rice  
Mr. Michael M. Roddy  
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann*

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO  
*Administrative Director,  
Judicial Council*

May 28, 2018

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine  
Legislative Counsel  
State Capitol, Room 3021  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 3196  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Daniel Alvarez  
Secretary of the Senate  
State Capitol, Room 400  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Michael Cohen, Director  
California Department of Finance  
915 L Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

*Re: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year  
2016–17, as required by the Budget Act of 2016*

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine, Mr. Alvarez, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Cohen:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required by the Budget Act of 2016 (Stats. 2016, ch. 23), item 0250-101-0932, regarding the fiscal year 2016–17 expenditures for the Trial Court Interpreters Program.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Ms. Olivia Lawrence, Principal Manager, Language Access Services, at 415-865-4227 or [olivia.lawrence@jud.ca.gov](mailto:olivia.lawrence@jud.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino  
Administrative Director  
Judicial Council

May 28, 2018

Page 2

MH/OL/ssw

Attachment

cc: Eric Dang, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins  
Alf Brandt, Senior Counsel, Office of Speaker Anthony Rendon  
Misty Feusahrens, Special Assistant, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon  
Anita Lee, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office  
Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office  
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee  
Mike Petersen, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office  
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Paul Dress, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget  
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk  
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council  
Laura Speed, Supervising Attorney, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council  
Peter Allen, Director, Public Affairs, Judicial Council  
Yvette Casillas-Sarcos, 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

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

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER  
*Chair, Executive and Planning Committee*

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

HON. KENNETH K. SO  
*Chair, Policy Coordination and  
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.  
*Chair, Rules and Projects Committee*

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH  
*Chair, Technology Committee*

Hon. Maria O. Anderson  
Hon. Richard Bloom  
Hon. C. Todd Botke  
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie  
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile  
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie  
Hon. Ming W. Chin  
Hon. Samuel K. Feng  
Ms. Rachel W. Hill  
Hon. Harold W. Hopp  
Hon. James M. Humes  
Ms. Audra Ibarra  
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson  
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly  
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons  
Hon. Gary Nadler  
Ms. Gretchen Nelson

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

Mr. Jake Chatters  
Ms. Kimberly Flener  
Hon. Scott M. Gordon  
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas  
Hon. Shama Hakim Mesiwala  
Hon. Stuart M. Rice  
Mr. Michael M. Roddy  
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO  
*Administrative Director,  
Judicial Council*

Report title: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2016–17*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2016 (Stats. 2016, ch. 23)

Date of report: March 29, 2018

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance in accordance with provision 3 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2016.

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The total appropriation for fiscal year (FY) 2016–17, including \$87,000 for maintenance of the Court Interpreters Data Collection System, was \$103,458,000, of which \$103,371,000 was available for reimbursement of eligible court interpreter expenditures.


The appropriation increased by \$7,603,000 over the prior year expenditure of \$95,855,000 to account for an increase in the cost of employee interpreter benefits and funds for expansion into civil proceedings. Total court interpreter expenditures reported for FY 2016–17 eligible for reimbursement from Trial Court Trust Fund Program 0150037 was \$106,134,735—an increase of \$5,702,531—representing a 5.68 percent increase over FY 2015–16. This exceeded the appropriation by \$2,763,735.

The increase in expenditures, paid for by surpluses in the interpreter budget over several years, may in part be attributed to an increased use of independent contract interpreters as courts continue to expand interpreter services in civil matters under Assembly Bill 1657 (Stats. 2014, ch. 721). For example, there was a \$4,034,744 increase in total contractor-related costs, representing a 20.70 percent increase over FY 2015–16.

The full report can be accessed here: [www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm).

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-4288.





# **Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2016–17**

---

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE  
MARCH 2018



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA  

---

COURT INTERPRETERS PROGRAM

## **JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA**

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

**Mr. Martin Hoshino**  
*Administrative Director  
Judicial Council*

### **OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION**

**Mr. Robert Oyung**  
*Chief Operating Officer*

### **COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES**

**Mr. Bob Lowney**  
*Director*

#### **Language Access Services Court Interpreters Program**

**Ms. Olivia Lawrence**  
*Principal Manager*

**Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf**  
*Primary Author of Report*

## 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) specifies that a court may provide an interpreter in any civil action or proceeding at no cost to the parties, regardless of the income of the parties, and lists case types in priority and preference order to be used in allocating interpreter resources when courts have insufficient resources to provide interpreters for all limited English proficiency (LEP) persons in all case types.<sup>1</sup>

Also in January 2015, the Judicial Council approved and adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (Language Access Plan). 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 court users in all courtroom proceedings and, by 2020, in all court-ordered, court-operated events.”<sup>2</sup>

This report outlines the expenditures by court for reimbursable court interpreter services provided by the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2016–17. This report also provides an overview of the expenditures provided in civil cases reported by the courts.<sup>3</sup>

### Statutory Requirement to Report on Expenditures

The Budget Act of 2016 (Stats. 2016, ch. 23), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for the services of court interpreters. Provision 3 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the full text of AB 1657, see [http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201320140AB1657](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB1657).

<sup>2</sup> The Language Access Plan is available at [www.courts.ca.gov/languageaccess.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/languageaccess.htm).

<sup>3</sup> 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 2016–17

- The total appropriation for FY 2016–17 for reimbursable court interpreter expenses, including \$87,000 for the maintenance of the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS), was \$103,458,000.
- The FY 2016–17 appropriation exceeded the previous year’s appropriation of \$95,855,000 by \$7,603,000.
- Of the total appropriation in FY 2016–17, \$103,371,000 was available to the courts for expenditures related to the provision of court interpreter services.
- The increased allocation of \$7,603,000 over FY 2015–16 accounted for court interpreter employee benefits as a result of collective bargaining efforts and provided funds for expansion into civil proceedings.
- The total statewide court interpreter expenditures incurred during FY 2016–17 eligible to be reimbursed from TCTF Program 150037 was \$106,134,735. (See Attachment 1 for a breakdown of expenditures by court.)
- Civil cases accounted for \$5,354,269 of the reported expenditures eligible for reimbursement. See Table 1.
- Court interpreter reimbursed expenditures increased by \$5,702,531 (5.68 percent) over FY 2015–16, and exceeded the appropriation by \$2,763,735.

**Table 1. Expenditures by case type FY 2016–17**

Case Type	Amount	% of Total Reimbursement
<b>1. Criminal (mandated)</b>	<b>\$100,780,466</b>	<b>94.96</b>
<b>2. Domestic Violence—reported by courts</b>	<b>\$1,424,228</b>	<b>1.34</b>
o Domestic Violence and Family Law w/ DV	1,137,685	
o Civil Harassment	119,508	
o Elder Abuse	9,985	
o Case type not specified	157,050	
<b>3. Civil—reported by courts</b>	<b>\$3,930,041</b>	<b>3.70</b>
o Unlawful Detainer	1,137,530	
o Parental Termination	10,779	
o Conservatorship/Guardianship	151,516	
o Custody/Visitation	81,370	
o Other Family Law	2,095,550	
o Other Civil	322,513	
o Case type not specified	130,783	
<b>4. Total Civil</b>	<b>\$5,354,269</b>	
<b>Court reimbursements (sum of 1 &amp; 4)</b>	<b>\$106,134,735</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Appropriation available to the courts FY 2015–16</b>	<b>\$103,371,000</b>	(Does not include \$87,000 for CIDCS)
<b>Amount over appropriation</b>	<b>\$2,763,735</b>	



## II. Allowable Expenditures

The following expenditures qualify for reimbursement under TCTF Program 150037:

- Contract court interpreters, including per diems (see section III) and travel;
- Certified and registered court interpreters employed by the courts, including salaries, benefits, and travel;
- Court interpreter coordinators who are certified or registered court interpreters, including salaries and benefits;<sup>4</sup> and,
- 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 under TCTF Program 150037 that include funding for standard operating expenses and equipment.

## 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 September 1, 2007, the Judicial Council set the statewide standard pay rate for certified and registered independent contractor interpreters to \$282.23 for a full day and \$156.56 for a half day. The rate has remained unchanged since 2007.

### Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

The statewide standard rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters is \$175 for a full day and \$92 for a half day. The rate was established by the Judicial Council in July 1999.

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.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 3, of the Budget Act of 2014 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 2014 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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).)

Rates paid to contract interpreters often exceed the statewide standard because each assignment must be negotiated by the trial court and is subject to current market rates, travel and lodging expenditures, and supply and demand.

### **Comparison With Federal Rates**

Provision 3 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2016 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 contract court interpreters is \$418 for a full day, \$226 for a half day for certified and registered interpreters, 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.<sup>6</sup>

California employee court interpreters negotiate salaries, benefits, and working conditions regionally. The federal system relies almost exclusively on contract interpreters. In contrast, court interpreter assignments in California courts are largely performed by employee court interpreters as illustrated in Table 2.

## **IV. Expenditures for Employee and Contract Interpreters**

### **Certified and Registered Employee and Contract Interpreters**

Table 2 details reimbursed expenditures for employee-related and contract court interpreter costs. Total employee-related expenditures represented 77.84 percent of total interpreter reimbursements in FY 2016–17. Although total dollar expenditures increased, the proportionate share of employee-related interpreter costs versus contractors has decreased over the past three years.

Contract interpreter expenditures represented 22.16 percent of total reimbursements. As a percentage of total expenditures, contractor costs are higher than in previous years. This increase may be due to the expansion of interpreter services to cases in civil matters, where interpretation of languages of lesser diffusion, as well as languages not provided by current employees, is required. It should be noted that expenditures for all contract interpreters increased by \$4,034,744 (20.70 percent) versus a \$1,667,786 increase (2.06 percent) for court employees. (See Attachment 1.)

---

<sup>6</sup> Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at [www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx](http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx).

**Table 2. Expenditures for certified and registered employee and contract interpreters <sup>7</sup>**

Fiscal Year	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Total Employee-Related Expenditures	\$73,871,935	\$75,939,519	\$78,573,771	\$80,942,575	\$82,610,361
% of Total	84.13	84.35	83.14	80.59	77.84
Total Contractor Expenditures	\$13,936,585	\$14,089,215	\$15,934,550	\$19,489,630	\$23,524,630
% of Total	15.87	15.65	16.86	19.41	22.16
Total Expenditures	\$87,808,520	\$90,028,734	\$94,508,321	\$100,432,204	\$106,134,735
% Change Over Prior Year	-1.55*	5.31	2.20	6.27	5.68

\* FY 2011–12 reimbursements: \$89,187,485.

**Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters**

During FY 2016–17, statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled \$3,580,783, or 3.37 percent of total statewide expenditures.

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

**Table 3. Expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters**

Fiscal Year	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Noncertified Expenditures	\$1,338,401	\$1,233,769	\$1,493,856	\$1,844,648	\$2,312,752
	1.52%	1.37%	1.58%	1.81%	2.18%
Nonregistered Expenditures	\$681,188	\$745,004	\$922,538	\$1,007,345	\$1,267,986
	0.78%	0.83%	0.98%	1.00%	1.19%
Combined Expenditures	\$2,019,589	\$1,978,733	\$2,416,394	\$2,851,993	\$3,580,783
	2.30%	2.14%	2.56%	2.84%	3.37%

<sup>7</sup> Table 2 and table 3 expenditures for FY 2013–14 do not include \$2,442,546 for court interpreter services for appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases with a domestic violence issue, elder or dependent adult abuse cases, or for expenditures for indigent parties in civil cases as authorized by the Judicial Council in January 2014 and later updated in light of the enactment of AB 1657. Itemization by interpreter category was not available for purposes of this analysis.

Table 4 lists the top 10 court reimbursements for allowable court interpreter expenditures incurred in FY 2016–17 as compared to those in FY 2015–16.

**Table 4. Distribution of reimbursed expenditures to top 10 courts**

Superior Court	FY 2016–17 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$)	FY 2016–17 % of Statewide Total	FY 2015–16 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$)	FY 2015–16 % of Statewide Total	\$ Change vs. FY 2015–16	% Change vs. FY 2015–16
Los Angeles	35,572,597	33.52	34,277,745	34.13	1,294,852	3.78
Orange	9,949,977	9.37	9,489,872	9.45	460,105	4.85
San Diego	5,707,460	5.38	5,504,139	5.48	203,321	3.69
Santa Clara	5,642,590	5.32	3,912,593	4.96	1,729,997	44.22
San Bernardino	5,380,676	5.07	4,982,3087	4.44	398,368	8.00
Riverside	4,983,660	4.70	4,250,595	3.90	733,065	17.25
Alameda	4,478,964	4.22	4,456,297	3.51	22,667	0.51
Sacramento	3,368,510	3.17	3,520,238	4.23	-151,728	-4.31
San Francisco	3,237,672	3.05	2,905,107	2.89	332,565	11.45
Kern	3,029,399	2.85	2,769,676	2.76	259,723	9.38
Subtotal	\$81,351,504	76.65%	\$76,068,569	75.74%	\$5,282,934	6.94%
Remaining Courts	24,783,231	23.35	24,363,634	24.26	419,597	1.72
Statewide Total	\$106,134,735	100.00%	\$100,432,204	100.00%	\$5,702,531	5.68%

**VI. Conclusion**

In FY 2016–17, the state appropriation fell short in providing the courts with full reimbursement of their reported allowable court interpreter expenditures. Currently, reimbursements that exceed the appropriation are absorbed by the cumulative savings in the TCTF Program 150037 fund. It is anticipated that as courts continue to expand services to include all civil proceedings, and with ongoing collective bargaining agreements resulting in higher salaries and benefits and the increased use of contract interpreters, we will continue to see increases in expenditures for the use of court interpreters.

**VII. Attachments**

1. FY 2016–17 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures—All Case Types
2. FY 2016–17 Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures—Civil Cases

**FY 2016-17 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
All Case Types**

Courts	All Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs									
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignments	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	CIP Arbitration Awards	Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount	Supervisor Salaries, Benefits & OE&E (\$12,500/FTE)	Total Employee-Related Costs		
Alameda	3,244,590	24,788	-	3,269,378	-	406,660	-	3,676,038		
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Butte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Colusa	-	240	-	240	-	-	-	240		
Contra Costa	1,449,648	2,084	-	1,451,733	-	105,730	-	1,557,463		
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
El Dorado	130,838	7,281	-	138,119	-	-	-	138,119		
Fresno	1,205,732	7,112	43,720	1,256,564	-	152,539	-	1,409,103		
Glenn	-	5	-	5	-	-	-	5		
Humboldt	105,280	154	-	105,434	-	-	-	105,434		
Imperial	460,811	490	-	461,301	-	-	-	461,301		
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Kern	2,412,913	8,451	-	2,421,364	-	-	-	2,421,364		
Kings	207,110	-	-	207,110	-	-	-	207,110		
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Los Angeles	33,079,476	39,128	185,869	33,304,472	-	-	275,874	33,580,346		
Madera	374,593	-	-	374,593	-	-	-	374,593		
Marin	365,087	438	-	365,525	-	-	-	365,525		
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Mendocino	125,566	108	-	125,674	-	-	-	125,674		
Merced	417,035	1,069	-	418,104	-	-	-	418,104		
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Mono	23,453	-	-	23,453	-	-	-	23,453		
Monterey	684,835	29	-	684,864	-	-	-	684,864		
Napa	267,626	-	-	267,626	-	-	-	267,626		
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Orange	7,702,429	3,132	57,016	7,762,577	-	-	164,179	7,926,756		
Placer	219,975	-	-	219,975	-	-	-	219,975		
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Riverside	4,158,695	3,584	-	4,162,279	-	-	-	4,162,279		
Sacramento	2,553,574	8,572	261,547	2,823,694	-	-	-	2,823,694		

**FY 2016-17 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
All Case Types**

Courts	All Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs									
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignments	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	CIP Arbitration Awards	Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount	Supervisor Salaries, Benefits & OE&E (\$12,500/FTE)	Total Employee-Related Costs		
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
San Bernardino	4,684,755	2,047	26,014	4,712,816	-	168,409	-	4,881,225		
San Diego	4,476,226	3,661	20,629	4,500,517	-	-	93,944	4,594,461		
San Francisco	1,773,380	86	9,410	1,782,876	-	-	-	1,782,876		
San Joaquin	878,839	322	61,059	940,221	-	-	-	940,221		
San Luis Obispo	533,009	621	-	533,630	-	-	-	533,630		
San Mateo	1,100,612	691	-	1,101,303	-	-	-	1,101,303		
Santa Barbara	1,321,709	6,360	-	1,328,069	-	-	-	1,328,069		
Santa Clara	2,651,028	1,980	51,169	2,704,177	-	-	-	2,704,177		
Santa Cruz	730,811	-	-	730,811	-	-	-	730,811		
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Solano	232,211	549	-	232,760	-	41,911	-	274,671		
Sonoma	822,612	10	975	823,597	-	-	-	823,597		
Stanislaus	226,450	256	-	226,705	-	-	-	226,705		
Sutter	168,062	403	-	168,465	-	-	-	168,465		
Tehama	113,943	-	-	113,943	-	-	-	113,943		
Trinity	-	674	-	674	-	-	-	674		
Tulare	387,344	-	-	387,344	-	-	-	387,344		
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Ventura	804,914	-	-	804,914	-	114,158	-	919,072		
Yolo	84,202	-	-	84,202	-	65,849	-	150,051		
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>80,179,374</b>	<b>124,325</b>	<b>717,410</b>	<b>81,021,109</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,055,255</b>	<b>533,997</b>	<b>82,610,361</b>		

**FY 2016-17 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
All Case Types**

Courts	All Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs										All Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures
	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	
Alameda	58,241	280,734	105,537	98,057	114,215	-	-	656,785	146,141	802,925	4,478,964
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	438	-	438	-	438	438
Amador	-	12,574	-	-	206	-	-	12,780	12,336	25,116	25,116
Butte	3,636	80,387	-	1,939	3,664	484	-	90,110	106,661	196,771	196,771
Calaveras	-	2,365	157	3,256	-	-	-	5,778	5,213	10,990	10,990
Colusa	-	66,092	157	-	-	949	-	67,198	26,389	93,587	93,587
Contra Costa	48,898	529,583	27,622	115,694	-	1,721	-	723,520	67,688	791,207	2,348,670
Del Norte	-	26,402	-	-	-	-	-	26,402	7,954	34,355	34,355
El Dorado	-	28,118	-	-	-	133	-	28,252	14,328	42,580	180,699
Fresno	11,849	267,067	10,679	98,908	43,122	-	-	431,625	238,264	669,889	2,078,992
Glenn	-	24,584	-	19,328	-	-	-	43,912	20,624	64,536	64,541
Humboldt	-	23,445	-	-	-	454	-	23,899	46,774	70,673	176,107
Imperial	-	38,739	-	847	-	249	-	39,834	7,216	47,050	508,351
Inyo	-	21,528	-	-	-	606	-	22,135	11,685	33,819	33,819
Kern	45,749	269,196	5,811	68,570	106,839	-	-	496,164	111,870	608,034	3,029,399
Kings	-	161,065	11,879	-	3,144	-	-	176,089	37,149	213,238	420,348
Lake	-	94,507	-	-	470	-	-	94,977	29,328	124,304	124,304
Lassen	(683)	5,927	-	1,668	-	-	207	7,120	10,933	18,052	18,052
Los Angeles	230,836	552,976	291,032	356,238	254,540	1,248	-	1,686,870	305,381	1,992,251	35,572,597
Madera	-	83,760	-	45,834	-	-	-	129,594	56,737	186,331	560,924
Marin	-	72,300	-	11,954	-	-	-	84,254	16,637	100,891	466,416
Mariposa	-	10,331	276	267	1,529	-	-	12,403	16,781	29,184	29,184
Mendocino	19,128	45,727	-	-	4,634	-	-	69,489	103,095	172,584	298,257
Merced	10,275	172,607	3,790	17,094	22,712	-	1,930	228,408	159,993	388,401	806,505
Modoc	-	282	3,885	-	-	-	-	4,167	890	5,058	5,058
Mono	-	600	-	1,200	-	-	-	1,800	3,397	5,197	28,650
Monterey	25,828	113,594	55,894	100,248	14,355	-	-	309,919	31,333	341,251	1,026,115
Napa	-	270,428	-	-	-	-	-	270,428	48,576	319,004	586,630
Nevada	2,523	22,975	-	-	1,163	730	-	27,391	6,396	33,788	33,788
Orange	144,664	1,203,959	98,743	179,791	320,674	-	-	1,947,829	75,392	2,023,222	9,949,977
Placer	23,949	83,265	8,334	40,979	9,370	110	-	166,008	76,155	242,162	462,137
Plumas	1,209	2,502	-	-	-	-	-	3,711	8,764	12,475	12,475
Riverside	36,210	306,165	14,301	53,958	106,170	825	-	517,630	303,751	821,381	4,983,660
Sacramento	104,528	186,120	50,805	77,566	7,312	-	-	426,332	118,485	544,817	3,368,510

**FY 2016-17 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
All Case Types**

Courts	All Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs											All Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures
	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	Travel, Mileage, Meals & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs		
San Benito	-	91,170	-	5,305	-	-	-	96,475	-	96,475	96,475	
San Bernardino	38,408	156,096	49,504	25,206	182,624	257	-	452,095	47,356	499,451	5,380,676	
San Diego	126,763	549,117	97,306	149,180	156	894	-	923,416	189,583	1,112,999	5,707,460	
San Francisco	91,979	889,734	56,471	174,876	84,930	-	-	1,297,990	156,807	1,454,796	3,237,672	
San Joaquin	36,594	336,227	26,633	56,841	-	-	-	456,295	75,098	531,393	1,471,614	
San Luis Obispo	8,434	31,745	1,819	-	45,710	-	-	87,708	33,704	121,412	655,042	
San Mateo	34,508	362,780	14,801	87,677	15,351	50	-	515,165	163,574	678,739	1,780,042	
Santa Barbara	16,046	172,805	135,977	4,425	29,067	222	-	358,542	88,254	446,796	1,774,865	
Santa Clara	39,366	1,560,952	82,173	146,587	128,364	-	-	1,957,442	980,970	2,938,412	5,642,590	
Santa Cruz	11,263	10,324	1,365	1,208	13,600	-	-	37,761	10,716	48,477	779,289	
Shasta	31,682	52,262	-	25,197	12,228	35	-	121,404	131,939	253,343	253,343	
Sierra	-	910	-	-	-	-	5,849	6,759	191	6,949	6,949	
Siskiyou	-	41,974	-	175	-	333	-	42,483	26,604	69,086	69,086	
Solano	12,158	126,149	10,697	53,009	25,346	-	-	227,359	20,414	247,772	522,443	
Sonoma	16,045	147,525	3,812	17,525	25,773	299	-	210,979	34,580	245,559	1,069,155	
Stanislaus	16,001	135,728	5,720	58,493	6,357	-	339,304	561,603	177,481	739,084	965,789	
Sutter	2,474	50,711	2,272	30,485	6,112	-	-	92,054	65,492	157,547	326,012	
Tehama	2,958	1,003	-	-	282	-	-	4,243	4,172	8,414	122,357	
Trinity	1,912	6,765	-	-	-	-	-	8,678	5,569	14,247	14,921	
Tulare	42,472	864,318	34,363	94,200	17,689	-	-	1,053,041	221,749	1,274,790	1,662,134	
Tuolumne	-	3,083	-	15,188	564	-	-	18,835	6,236	25,071	25,071	
Ventura	28,946	648,794	48,400	59,624	-	-	-	785,764	72,649	858,413	1,777,484	
Yolo	13,759	329,701	6,898	13,668	24,390	376	-	388,792	186,418	575,210	725,261	
Yuba	13,712	19,810	875	488	-	1,267	-	36,152	18,223	54,375	54,375	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,352,321</b>	<b>11,649,590</b>	<b>1,267,986</b>	<b>2,312,752</b>	<b>1,632,662</b>	<b>11,682</b>	<b>347,290</b>	<b>18,574,284</b>	<b>4,950,090</b>	<b>23,524,374</b>	<b>106,134,735</b>	



Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
Civil Cases

Court	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	Total Employee-Related Costs
Alameda	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-
Butte	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	-	-	-	-
Fresno	-	-	-	-
Glenn	-	-	-	-
Humboldt	-	-	-	-
Imperial	51,254	-	51,254	51,254
Inyo	-	-	-	-
Kern	-	-	-	-
Kings	1,418	-	1,418	1,418
Los Angeles	2,858,885	-	2,858,885	2,858,885
Madera	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	-	-	-	-
Merced	-	-	-	-
Mono	-	-	-	-
Napa	13,801	-	13,801	13,801
Orange	115,660	-	115,660	115,660
Placer	1,036	-	1,036	1,036
Plumas	-	-	-	-
Riverside	227,759	-	227,759	227,759
Sacramento	23,752	-	23,752	23,752
San Bernardino	90,522	-	90,522	90,522
San Diego	10,095	-	10,095	10,095
San Francisco	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	27,401	-	27,401	27,401
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	-	-	-	-
Santa Barbara	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	181,381	-	181,381	181,381
Santa Cruz	3,049	-	3,049	3,049
Shasta	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-
Solano	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	18,697	-	18,697	18,697

FY 2016-2017  
 Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
 Civil Cases

Court	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	Total Employee-Related Costs
Stanislaus	705	-	705	705
Sutter	-	48	48	48
Tulare	-	-	-	-
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-
Ventura	-	-	-	-
Yolo	-	-	-	-
Yuba	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>3,625,416</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3,625,464</b>	<b>3,625,464</b>

Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
Civil Cases

Court	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	Civil Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures
Alameda	1,328	4,079	4,292	2,636	-	-	-	12,336	2,968	15,303	15,303
Amador	-	2,970	-	-	-	-	-	2,970	2,307	5,278	5,278
Butte	157	1,228	-	-	-	-	-	1,384	2,086	3,470	3,470
Contra Costa	5,779	109,688	5,451	19,496	-	-	-	140,414	12,798	153,212	153,212
El Dorado	-	1,844	-	-	-	-	-	1,844	1,037	2,881	2,881
Fresno	721	6,696	350	29,375	-	-	-	37,143	329	37,472	37,472
Glenn	-	-	-	1,328	-	-	-	1,328	788	2,116	2,116
Humboldt	-	947	-	-	-	-	-	947	1,726	2,673	2,673
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51,254
Inyo	-	5,757	-	-	-	-	-	5,757	3,219	8,976	8,976
Kern	-	170,760	-	-	-	-	-	170,760	-	170,760	170,760
Kings	-	2,458	362	-	-	-	-	2,820	442	3,263	4,681
Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,858,885
Madera	-	8,183	-	1,650	-	-	-	9,833	3,356	13,189	13,189
Mendocino	623	4,665	-	-	861	-	-	6,148	10,766	16,914	16,914
Merced	-	8,687	-	513	1,003	-	-	10,203	5,641	15,844	15,844
Mono	-	-	-	285	-	-	-	285	-	285	285
Napa	-	14,594	-	-	-	-	-	14,594	313	14,907	28,708
Orange	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115,660
Placer	2,297	9,558	-	7,872	4,611	-	-	24,338	12,243	36,581	37,617
Plumas	604	-	-	-	-	-	-	604	1,538	2,142	2,142
Riverside	2,733	13,586	1,550	5,435	2,100	-	-	25,404	11,301	36,705	264,464
Sacramento	9,864	24,626	4,706	27,387	744	-	-	67,326	18,538	85,864	109,616
San Bernardino	1,654	8,494	1,407	1,309	-	-	-	12,863	1,629	14,493	105,015
San Diego	5,163	10,836	2,209	7,543	-	-	-	25,750	-	25,750	35,845
San Francisco	18,368	146,867	8,277	122,065	40,600	-	-	336,177	40,363	376,540	376,540
San Joaquin	3,235	38,251	2,582	4,866	-	-	-	48,933	8,201	57,134	84,536
San Luis Obispo	400	2,099	-	-	-	-	-	2,499	-	2,499	2,499
San Mateo	836	42,316	762	5,969	2,047	-	-	51,929	27,258	79,188	79,188
Santa Barbara	250	26,730	2,803	180	7,521	-	-	37,484	5,650	43,134	43,134
Santa Clara	4,088	57,793	10,054	21,363	7,961	-	-	101,258	14,392	115,650	297,031
Santa Cruz	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,049
Shasta	5,267	19,859	-	6,697	6,233	-	-	38,056	44,498	82,554	82,554
Siskiyou	-	313	-	-	-	-	-	313	-	313	313
Solano	2,223	16,584	2,283	14,219	5,268	-	-	40,577	4,915	45,492	45,492
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,697

**Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures  
Civil Cases**

Court	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	Civil Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures
Stanislaus	2,805	15,569	353	2,381	500	-	24,059	45,667	18,048	63,715	64,420
Sutter	-	6,135	1,988	7,661	157	-	-	15,940	9,632	25,572	25,620
Tulare	-	2,971	263	-	-	-	-	3,233	1,222	4,455	4,455
Tuolumne	-	278	-	526	564	-	-	1,368	439	1,807	1,807
Ventura	3,405	113,358	9,710	11,369	-	-	-	137,841	13,210	151,051	151,051
Yolo	157	4,645	-	157	-	376	-	5,334	-	5,334	5,334
Yuba	470	3,086	-	-	-	403	-	3,959	2,330	6,289	6,289
<b>Total:</b>	<b>72,425</b>	<b>906,509</b>	<b>59,400</b>	<b>302,281</b>	<b>80,169</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>24,059</b>	<b>1,445,622</b>	<b>283,184</b>	<b>1,728,805</b>	<b>5,354,269</b>