



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 28, 2012

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Branch Report to the Legislature: Court Interpreter Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	February 28, 2012
Recommended by	Date of Report
Chad Finke, Director	February 1, 2012
Court Programs and Services Division	Contact
	Jacquie Ring, 415-865-8953
	jacquie.ring@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommends that the Judicial Council approve the annual report on trial court interpreter expenditures for submission to the Legislature. This report to the Legislature is required by the Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712).

Recommendation

The Administrative Office of the Courts recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve, effective February 28, 2012, the report to the Legislature summarizing the FY 2010-2011 trial court interpreter expenditures in conformance with the requirements of the Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712); and
2. Direct the AOC to submit the report to the Legislature.

Previous Council Action

The Administrative Director of the Courts has routinely approved the annual *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report* for submission to the Legislature. Previous reports can be found at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/2686.htm>.

Rationale for Recommendation

The Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule 4 provides appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 4 states that “the Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures” from Schedule 4. In fulfillment of that provision, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreters.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This report was not circulated for comment. The information on expenditures in this report to the Legislature was provided by the Finance Division of the AOC.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

There are no costs or operational impacts associated with the approval of this report.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The report fulfills the requirements of The Budget Act of 2010.

Attachments

1. *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2010-2011*



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

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

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts

CHRISTINE PATTON
Interim Chief Deputy Director

February 1, 2012

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

Mr. Gregory Schmidt
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 400
Sacramento, California 95814

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

Re: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2010–2011*, Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712)

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Wilson:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required under the Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712), Item 0250-101-0932, *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2010–2011*.

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Mr. Gregory Schmidt
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
February 1, 2012
Page 2

Summary of the report:

- The amount of \$92,794,000 was appropriated for court interpreter services (program 45.45) for fiscal year 2010–2011.
- Court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures totaled \$89,951,954 in FY 2010–2011.
- Eligible expenditures were \$2,842,046 less than the appropriation for FY 2010–2011.
- Eligible court interpreter program expenditures increased from FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011 by \$1,996,887, or 2.27 percent.
- The increase in eligible court interpreter program expenditures is primarily attributable to the discontinuation of the statewide court closure days that occurred during FY 2009–2010.
- At its July 22, 2011 meeting, as part of the report on trial court allocations for FY 2011–2012, the Judicial Council approved utilizing \$3 million of the \$4,838,933 savings from the FY 2009–2010 court interpreter program fund to assist in offsetting part of the trial court budget reductions. The \$1,838,933 remains available for eligible court interpreter program costs.
- Total staff expenditures (\$72 million) accounted for 79.78 percent of the eligible expenditures for FY 2010–2011 and total contractor costs (\$18 million) for 20.22 percent.
- Eligible expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represented 3.65 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 18.06 percent of total contractor costs.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Chad Finke, Director, Court Programs and Services Division, at 415-865-8925 or chad.finke@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Ronald G. Overholt
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Mr. Gregory Schmidt
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
February 1, 2012
Page 3

RGO/CF/JR

Attachment

cc: Members of the Judicial Council

Mr. Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Ms. Jolie Onodara, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Mr. Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Mr. Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office
Mr. Chuck Nicol, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Ms. Christine Patton, Interim AOC Chief Deputy Director
Ms. Jody Patel, AOC Regional Administrative Director
Mr. Curtis L. Child, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs
Ms. Anita Lee, Policy and Budget Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Mr. Peter Allen, Manager, Office of Communications, AOC Executive Office
Judicial Administration Library (2 copies)



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

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

JODY PATEL
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts

CURT SODERLUND
Interim Chief Deputy Director

Report Summary

Report title: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2010–2011*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712)

Date of report: February 1, 2012

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with the Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712).

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

In fiscal year 2010–2011, \$92,794,000 was appropriated for court interpreter services (program 45.45), and court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures totaled \$89,951,954. These expenditures were \$2,842,046 less than the appropriation but \$1,996,887 (or 2.27%) more than expenditures in FY 2009–2010, an increase primarily attributable to the discontinuation of the statewide court closure days that occurred during FY 2009–2010. In July 2011 the Judicial Council approved using \$3 million of the \$4,838,933 savings from the FY 2009–2010 court interpreter program fund to assist in offsetting part of the trial court budget reductions; \$1,838,933 remains available for eligible court interpreter program costs. In FY 2010–2011, total staff expenditures (\$72 million) accounted for 79.78 percent of the eligible expenditures and total contractor costs (\$18 million) for 20.22 percent. Expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represented 3.65 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 18.06 percent of total contractor costs.

The full report can be accessed here: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm> . For a printed copy, call 415-865-8925.

Judicial Council Members

As of February 14, 2012

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

Hon. Teri L. Jackson
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco*

Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District, Division Two*

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman
*Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Plumas*

Hon. Stephen H. Baker
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta*

Ms. Miriam Aroni Krinsky
*UCLA School of Public Affairs
(Lecturer)*

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Ms. Edith R. Matthai
Attorney at Law

Ms. Angela J. Davis
Assistant United States Attorney

Hon. Douglas P. Miller
*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two*

Hon. Emilie Harris Elias
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles*

Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa*

Hon. Noreen Evans
Member of the California State Senate

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.
Attorney at Law

Hon. Mike Feuer
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Kenneth K. So
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego*

Hon. James E. Herman
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara*

Hon. Sharon J. Waters
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside*

Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.
*Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District*

Judicial Council Members

As of February 14, 2012

Hon. David S. Wesley
*Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles*

Hon. David Rosenberg
*Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo*

Hon. Erica R. Yew
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara*

Hon. David M. Rubin
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego*

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Sue Alexander
*Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda*

Ms. Kim Turner
*Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Marin*

Mr. Alan Carlson
*Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange*

Mr. David H. Yamasaki
*Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara*

Hon. David F. De Alba
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento*

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Ms. Jody Patel
*Interim Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council*

Hon. Terry B. Friedman (Ret.)

Hon. Robert James Moss
*Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange*

Mr. Frederick K. Ohlrich
Clerk of the California Supreme Court

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

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

Jody Patel
Interim Administrative Director of the Courts


Curt Soderlund
Interim Chief Deputy Director

COURT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES DIVISION

Chad Finke
Director

Court Interpreters Program, Jacquie Ring
Supervising Court Services Analyst

Nzinga Nyagua
Primary Author



Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2010–2011

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
FEBRUARY 2012



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

I. Summary

- The amount of \$92,794,000 was appropriated for court interpreter services (program 45.45) for fiscal year 2010–2011.
- Court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures totaled \$89,951,954 in FY 2010–2011.
- Eligible expenditures were \$2,842,046 less than the appropriation for FY 2010–2011.
- Eligible court interpreter program expenditures increased from FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011 by \$1,996,887, or 2.27 percent.
- The increase in eligible court interpreter program expenditures is primarily attributable to the discontinuation of the statewide court closure days that occurred during FY 2009–2010.
- At its July 22, 2011 meeting, as part of the report on trial court allocations for FY 2011–2012, the Judicial Council approved utilizing \$3 million of the \$4,838,933 savings from the FY 2009–2010 court interpreter program fund to assist in offsetting part of the trial court budget reductions. The \$1,838,933 remains available for eligible court interpreter program costs.
- Total staff expenditures (\$72 million) accounted for 79.78 percent of the eligible expenditures for FY 2010–2011 and total contractor costs (\$18 million) for 20.22 percent.
- Eligible expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represented 3.65 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 18.06 percent of total contractor costs.

II. 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 establishes a mandate for the courts to provide interpreters to all defendants in criminal matters who have limited ability to understand or speak English. Further state court rulings subsequent to the constitutional amendment have established the right to a court interpreter in delinquency and some family law matters for individuals with limited English proficiency. In addition to the constitutional mandate and state court rulings, under federal law, individuals with hearing disabilities who require sign language interpreters must receive court interpreter services free of charge in all court proceedings.

Statutory Requirement to Report on Expenditures

The Budget Act of 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule 4 provides appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 4 states that “the Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures” from Schedule 4. In fulfillment of that provision, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreters.

Program Funding

- For FY 2010–2011, the Budget Act of 2010 appropriated \$92,794,000 for the provision of court interpreter services, exactly the same amount as the previous year’s appropriation. During FY 2010–2011, eligible expenditures totaled \$89,951,954, or \$2,842,046 less than the amount appropriated.

- On October 29, 2010, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation that the \$4,838,933 savings from FY 2009–2010 and any future program savings be set aside to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs. At its July 22, 2011 meeting, as part of the report on trial court allocations for FY 2011–2012, the Judicial Council approved utilizing \$3 million of the \$4,838,933 savings from the FY 2009–2010 court interpreter program fund to assist in offsetting part of the trial court budget reductions. The \$1,838,933 remains available for eligible court interpreter program costs.

III. Eligible Expenditures

Program expenditures that qualify for reimbursement are limited to the following four items:

1. Contract court interpreters and their per diems, including travel;
2. Certified and registered court interpreters employed by the courts, including their salaries, benefits, and travel;
3. Court interpreter coordinators;¹ and
4. 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 the program that include funding for standard operating expenses and equipment (OE&E).

The Judicial Council does not reimburse trial courts for the cost of supervisors, administrative overhead, or any OE&E except for the contractual services, travel, and standard complementary items noted above in items 1, 2, and 4. Trial courts must absorb all other OE&E costs and, except as noted in item 4 above, all supervisory expenditures associated with staff interpreters and court interpreter coordinators.

Attachment 1 is a summary by court of the major reimbursable categories in items 1– 4 above.

IV. Rates of Pay for Court Interpreters

The Judicial Council first established statewide standards for court interpreter compensation in January 1999 at two defined levels, a full-day rate and a half-day rate. Three increases in pay for certified and registered interpreters have been authorized since then, effective on July 1, 1999; July 1, 2000; and September 1, 2007.

A significant change to the provision of interpreter services was the enactment of Senate Bill 371 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1047), which required trial courts to establish staff interpreter positions and offer employment to certified and registered court interpreters under prescribed conditions. As a result, trial courts began hiring contract interpreters as staff interpreters. The council's standard interpreter pay rates apply only to contract interpreters, not to staff interpreters.

¹ Limited by item No. 0250-101-0932, provision 4 of the Budget Act of 2010 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 2010 defines county classes based on size of population: counties in classes 1–15 have populations greater than 500,000, classes 16–31 have populations between 130,000 and 500,000, and classes 32–58 have populations less than 130,000.

Statewide Standard Rate for Certified and Registered Contract Court Interpreters

Effective September 1, 2007, the Judicial Council increased the statewide standard pay rate for certified and registered interpreters to \$282.23 for a full day and \$156.56 for a half day. The full-day rate of \$282.23 represents a 41 percent increase over the original January 1999 rate of \$200.

Interpreters who pass the Court Interpreter Certification Examination or the required exam for American Sign Language and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements are referred to as certified interpreters. Currently, California recognizes 15 designated languages: American Sign Language (ASL), Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. (Effective January 1, 2011, Farsi is recognized as a designated language. However, interpreters currently enrolled on the Master List of Court Interpreters will remain registered interpreters until a bilingual oral interpreting exam for certified status is developed.)

An interpreter of a spoken language not designated for certification status is required to pass an English Fluency Examination and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements in order to become a registered interpreter of a nondesignated language.

Statewide Standard for Noncertified and Nonregistered Interpreters

During FY 2010–2011, the statewide standard rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters remained \$175 for a full day and \$92 for a half day, the same rate established by the Judicial Council in July 1999. However, the actual rates paid to contract interpreters, whether certified/registered or noncertified/nonregistered, often exceed these standards because each assignment must be individually negotiated by the local court subject to the realities of supply and demand—particularly for contractors who interpret less commonly spoken languages.

Comparison with Federal Rates

Compensation for California employee court interpreters is comparable to federal rates. California employee court interpreters receive health and retirement benefits that increase the total value of their compensation by 30–35 percent. The current federal rates for contract court interpreters are \$388/full day and \$210/half day for certified interpreters and \$187/full day and \$103/half day for noncertified interpreters. While the federal system relies almost exclusively on contract interpreters, most court interpreter assignments in California are performed by staff interpreters.

V. FY 2010–2011 Reimbursed Expenditures

Shift from Contract Interpreters to Staff Interpreters

Table 1 details reimbursed expenditures by year for staff and contract court interpreters. Total staff expenditures, which represented 75.96 percent of interpreter costs in FY 2005–2006, increased to 79.78 percent of interpreter costs in FY 2010–2011. Conversely, contract expenditures decreased from 24.04 percent to 20.22 percent. These figures illustrate that, since FY 2005–2006, around 75 percent of reimbursed expenditures have gone to cover staff costs and 25 percent to cover contractor costs. This percentage shift toward staff expenditures continued during FY 2010–2011.

Table 1. Shift of Reimbursed Expenditures From Contract to Staff Costs					
Fiscal Year	2005–2006	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010-11
Total Staff Expenditures	\$57,661,117 -75.96%	\$65,109,655 -73.59%	\$69,842,707 -74.53%	\$68,042,596 -77.36%	\$71,763,311 -79.78%
Total Contractor Expenditures	\$18,249,522 -24.04%	\$23,363,502 -26.41%	\$23,862,667 -25.47%	\$19,912,471 -22.64%	\$18,188,643 -20.22%
Total	\$75,910,639	\$88,473,157	\$93,705,374	\$87,955,067	\$89,951,154

Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

During FY 2010–2011, statewide per diems for noncertified contract interpreters equaled \$2,488,385 or 2.77 percent of total statewide expenditures. Statewide expenditures on per diems for nonregistered contract interpreters equaled \$797,239, or 0.88 percent of total statewide expenditures. Per diem expenditures for both noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled 3.65 percent of all statewide interpreter costs. Columns K and L of Attachment 1 detail nonregistered and noncertified contract interpreter per diem expenditures for FY 2010–2011 for each of the 58 county trial courts.

Table 2 below shows annual statewide expenditures over the past three years for compensation (excluding travel) of noncertified and nonregistered interpreters, and their percentages of total eligible expenditures for court interpreter services. The annual percentages have decreased from 4.77 percent in FY 2008–2009 to 3.65 percent in FY 2010–2011.


Table 2. Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters and Percentage of Total Expenditures			
Fiscal Year	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010-2011
Noncertified Expenditures	\$3,408,555 -3.64%	\$2,816,013 -3.20%	\$2,488,385 -2.77%
Nonregistered Expenditures	\$1,058,954 -1.13%	\$862,814 -0.98%	\$797,239 -0.88%
Combined Expenditures	\$4,467,509 -4.77%	\$3,678,827 -4.18%	\$3,285,624 -3.65%

Increase in Total Court Interpreter Expenditures

Allowable court interpreter expenditures increased from FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011 by \$1,996,887, or 2.27 percent. The increase is attributable primarily to the discontinuation of the 10 statewide court closure days instituted by the Judicial Council in FY 2009–2010 due to the severe budget situation. Table 3 shows the annual percentage changes in statewide reimbursed expenditures from FY 2005–2006 to FY 2010–2011.

Table 3. Percentage Change in Statewide Reimbursed Expenditures				
FY 2005–2006 to FY 2006–2007	FY 2006–2007 to FY 2007–2008	FY 2007–2008 to FY 2008–2009	FY 2008–2009 to FY 2009–2010	FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011
9.55%	6.38%	5.91%	-6.14%	2.27%

Chart 1 depicts total reimbursed court interpreter expenditures since FY 2005–2006.



VI. Distribution of Reimbursed Expenditures by Largest Court Providers

Table 4 lists the 11 courts that received the largest reimbursements for eligible court interpreter costs in FY 2010–2011. These 11 courts accounted for \$70,337,615, more than 78 percent of the state’s total reimbursed expenditures for court interpreters. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County alone accounted for 35.27 percent of reimbursed expenditures, while southern California’s five largest superior courts—those of Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties—together accounted for 59.8 percent of the state’s reimbursements.

Table 4. Reimbursed Expenditures by the 11 Largest Providers of Court Interpreters		
Superior Court	FY 2009–2010 Reimbursed Expenditures	Percentage of Statewide Total
Los Angeles	\$31,727,071	35.27%
Orange	\$8,041,526	8.94%
San Diego	\$5,916,464	6.58%
San Bernardino	\$4,746,510	5.28%
Riverside	\$3,355,916	3.73%
Sacramento	\$3,311,496	3.68%
Alameda	\$3,258,801	3.62%
Santa Clara	\$3,110,729	3.46%
Kern	\$2,399,914	2.67%
Fresno	\$2,330,668	2.59%
San Francisco	\$2,138,520	2.38%
Subtotal	\$70,337,615	78.19%
Statewide Total	\$89,951,954	100.00%

VII. Conclusion

In FY 2010–2011, the state appropriation was sufficient to provide all courts with full reimbursement of their allowable court interpreter costs. The overall statewide increase in expenditures by 2.27 percent from FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011 is attributable to the discontinuation of court closures approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2009–2010.

Although California’s economic future remains uncertain, it is vitally important that all Californians have meaningful access to justice regardless of their ability to communicate in English. It is essential that there be adequate funding for court interpreter services so individuals with limited English proficiency are able to participate fully in their court proceedings. The Judicial Council will work with the Governor and Legislature to ensure the availability of sufficient resources to meet the statewide need for court interpreters.

VIII. Attachments

1. FY2010–2011 Court Interpreters Program 45.45 Year-End Reimbursed Expenditures

**FY 2010-2011 Court Interpreters
Program 45.45 Year-End Reimbursed Expenditures**

Attachment 1

Court	Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs								Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs								Total Reimbursed Expenditures (H + P)
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignment Costs	Total Staff Interpreter Salary, Benefits & Travel	CIP Arbitration Awards	Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount	Supervisor's Salaries, Benefits & OE&E (\$12,000/FTE)	Total Employee Related Reimbursable Costs	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals & Lodging	Total Contractor Costs	
	A	B	C	D (A + B + C)	E	F	G	H (D + E + F + G)	I	J	K	L	M	N (I thru M)	O	P (N + O)	
Los Angeles	28,106,534	217,097	329,461	28,653,092	-	89,233	310,714	29,053,039	183,392	1,420,642	151,450	108,652	728,832	2,592,968	81,064	2,674,032	31,727,071
Orange	5,877,064	11,840	76,406	5,965,310	-	77,192	141,927	6,184,429	46,289	1,092,876	106,354	426,942	149,129	1,821,590	35,507	1,857,097	8,041,526
San Diego	5,067,133	4,793	101,253	5,173,179	-	89,233	51,768	5,314,180	86,585	113,078	90,723	156,949	84,081	531,416	70,868	602,284	5,916,464
San Bernardino	3,979,020	698	-	3,979,718	-	89,233	-	4,068,951	69,821	417,404	24,378	3,764	81,596	596,963	80,596	677,559	4,746,510
Riverside	2,472,040	3,054	-	2,475,094	-	68,395	-	2,543,489	31,995	444,780	12,771	10,480	184,146	684,172	128,255	812,427	3,355,916
Sacramento	2,555,826	13,387	174,593	2,743,806	-	89,233	-	2,833,039	72,099	214,659	12,182	63,826	42,588	405,354	73,103	478,457	3,311,496
Alameda	2,347,035	23,160	-	2,370,195	-	89,233	-	2,459,428	103,136	343,340	95,707	61,107	98,384	701,638	97,735	799,373	3,258,801
Santa Clara	2,061,075	3,357	16,323	2,080,755	-	89,233	-	2,169,988	13,217	432,355	49,773	305,571	38,893	839,809	100,932	940,741	3,110,729
Kern	1,624,570	18,567	128	1,643,265	-	89,233	-	1,732,498	83,025	198,801	25,007	235,071	28,922	570,826	96,590	667,416	2,399,914
Fresno	1,861,227	14,677	68,349	1,944,253	-	89,233	-	2,033,486	27,182	149,231	10,599	69,114	34,496	290,622	6,560	297,182	2,330,668
San Francisco	1,459,952	11	9,713	1,469,676	-	89,233	-	1,558,909	58,100	336,871	22,566	65,586	62,814	545,937	33,674	579,611	2,138,520
San Mateo	1,175,194	-	-	1,175,194	-	89,233	-	1,264,427	64,354	207,062	8,162	135,749	4,792	420,119	28,920	449,039	1,713,466
Ventura	644,829	1,871	-	646,700	-	89,233	-	735,933	17,487	727,706	18,312	12,396	13,112	789,013	51,284	840,297	1,576,230
Sonoma	1,163,634	122	86,528	1,250,284	-	44,617	-	1,294,901	24,544	35,143	7,616	30,711	34,444	132,458	22,373	154,831	1,449,732
Tulare	738,377	22	-	738,399	-	44,617	-	783,016	46,631	297,180	12,942	122,185	31,357	510,295	90,843	601,138	1,384,154
Contra Costa	854,986	432	-	855,418	-	48,883	-	904,301	36,110	248,349	22,837	78,144	17,695	403,135	32,490	435,625	1,339,926
San Joaquin	612,210	1,298	73,747	687,255	-	89,233	-	776,488	46,129	381,339	7,800	11,828	12,960	460,056	86,163	546,219	1,322,707
Santa Barbara	853,746	628	1,161	855,535	-	44,617	-	900,152	2,442	207,305	31,196	2,152	23,790	266,885	33,949	300,834	1,200,986
Monterey	542,038	293	-	542,331	-	44,617	-	586,948	13,863	105,931	16,527	54,510	16,850	207,681	47,496	255,177	842,125
Merced	119,427	3,169	-	122,596	-	44,617	-	167,213	44,180	253,994	17,733	167,144	12,279	495,330	148,638	643,968	811,181
Stanislaus	425,379	-	-	425,379	-	44,617	-	469,996	8,899	70,563	9,619	28,071	14,885	132,037	28,620	160,657	630,653
Santa Cruz	499,802	150	-	499,952	-	44,617	-	544,569	6,145	37,694	4,701	656	11,000	60,196	13,621	73,817	618,386
Yolo	100,806	-	-	100,806	-	32,565	-	133,371	47,251	240,778	4,521	20,757	3,684	316,991	148,471	465,462	598,833
Marin	458,636	-	-	458,636	-	44,617	-	503,253	-	33,384	-	11,052	-	44,436	32,268	76,704	579,957
Imperial	422,801	1,785	-	424,586	-	-	-	424,586	-	106,041	-	-	-	106,041	41,963	148,004	572,590
Napa	295,301	122	-	295,423	-	19,007	-	314,430	-	119,654	-	92	-	119,746	20,105	139,851	454,281
San Luis Obispo	260,924	366	-	261,290	-	44,617	-	305,907	5,581	97,630	4,643	1,221	20,322	129,397	18,052	147,449	453,356
Madera	250,136	87	-	250,223	-	20,814	-	271,037	-	55,522	-	82,615	-	138,137	20,962	159,099	430,136
Placer	-	-	-	-	-	44,617	-	44,617	14,331	192,449	1,765	29,791	15,302	253,638	122,202	375,840	420,457
Solano	202,969	-	-	202,969	-	33,491	-	236,460	5,137	15,638	11,898	80,445	12,548	125,666	16,708	142,374	378,834
Sutter	236,712	93	-	236,805	-	17,009	-	253,814	6,680	11,188	1,243	3,143	4,807	27,061	16,503	43,564	297,378
Kings	160,071	1,960	-	162,031	-	22,308	-	184,339	-	68,532	5,084	824	8,794	83,234	22,803	106,037	290,376
Mendocino	115,857	-	-	115,857	-	17,169	-	133,026	15,734	60,809	-	-	3,131	79,674	68,997	148,671	281,697
El Dorado	110,035	449	346	110,830	-	5,821	-	116,651	-	65,324	-	6,687	3,375	75,386	9,461	84,847	201,498
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	44,617	-	44,617	12,054	37,329	-	7,774	19,661	76,818	75,163	151,981	196,598
Butte	-	-	-	-	-	32,005	-	32,005	9,063	52,595	2,045	3,541	6,528	73,772	90,812	164,584	196,589
Tehama	86,937	-	-	86,937	-	22,308	-	109,245	1,950	8,723	1,516	17,117	1,222	30,528	12,211	42,739	151,984
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	22,308	-	22,308	-	73,873	-	-	626	74,499	45,713	120,212	142,520
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	4,756	-	4,756	-	107,066	-	-	3,913	110,979	22,532	133,511	138,267
Humboldt	-	-	-	-	-	20,610	-	20,610	-	58,893	-	3,552	5,656	68,101	42,603	110,704	131,314
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	105,812	-	599	-	106,411	-	106,411	106,411
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	12,887	-	12,887	-	43,067	-	16,087	-	59,154	23,301	82,455	95,342
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-	-	15,598	-	15,598	11,514	21,534	-	8,423	-	41,471	31,579	73,050	88,648
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	22,308	-	22,308	225	2,028	421	31,656	1,346	35,676	11,379	47,055	69,363
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	18,711	-	18,711	8,529	16,252	1,613	-	1,879	28,273	16,663	44,936	63,647
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	22,308	-	22,308	-	21,176	-	2,724	-	23,900	11,403	35,303	57,611
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	22,308	-	22,308	272	24,303	-	4,022	-	28,597	807	29,404	51,712
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	22,308	-	22,308	-	8,409	-	184	-	8,593	12,983	21,576	43,884
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29,361	-	-	-	29,361	8,599	37,960	37,960
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	19,700	-	19,700	-	7,592	-	-	-	7,592	8,002	15,594	35,294
Mono	27,848	-	1,816	29,664	-	-	-	29,664	-	-	-	368	1,280	1,648	3,227	4,875	34,539
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	14,925	-	14,925	-	13,619	-	350	564	14,533	4,702	19,235	34,160
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	9,942	-	9,942	-	11,519	-	-	-	11,519	10,999	22,518	32,460
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	6,478	-	6,478	5,014	36	175	-	-	5,225	12,288	17,513	23,991
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	6,762	-	6,762	-	4,683	-	4,600	-	9,283	2,758	12,041	18,803
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	5,000	-	1,159	-	153	-	1,312	1,012	2,324	7,324
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	423	-	3,360	-	-	3,783	-	3,783	3,783
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,904	-	-	-	2,904	292	3,196	3,196
TOTAL	67,770,131	323,488	939,824	69,033,443	-	2,225,459	504,409	71,763,311	1,229,383	9,455,149	797,239	2,488,385	1,841,683	15,811,839	2,376,804	18,188,643	89,951,954