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Report title: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2021-22

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2021 (Sen. Bill 170; Stats. 2021, ch. 240)

Date of report: June 30, 2023
The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance in accordance with provision 27 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2021.

The 2021-22 appropriation of \$162.145 million included one-time \$30 million for the Court Interpreter Employee Incentive Grant (CIEIG), ongoing benefits funding in the amount of $\$ 1.080$ million, and a decrease of $-\$ 316,000$ for video remote interpreting (VRI) equipment, which was included in the 2020 Budget Act as one-time funding for courts.

A total of $\$ 130.977$ million was allocated for court interpreter expenditures, and $\$ 2.5$ million was distributed in June 2022 to nine courts that applied for CIEIG funds to help establish new court employee interpreter positions.

Total court interpreter expenditures for 2021-22 were $\$ 116.580$ million, which is a slight decrease from the previous year. Compared to FY 202021, total court interpreter expenditures for FY 2021-22 decreased by $\$ 190,784$ ( -0.16 percent). This resulted in program savings of approximately $\$ 15$ million, which reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted program funding. Unused grant funding for the CIEIG will be collected for return to the general fund.

During 2021-22, the state of emergency continued due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Total filings were generally the same from 2020-21 to 202122 , and the total appropriation was sufficient for eligible court interpreter expenditures. Due to negotiated wage increases, expenses for the fund are anticipated to increase in future years.

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.
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## 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-Englishproficient] court users in all courtroom proceedings and, by 2020, in all court-ordered, courtoperated events."

This report outlines the expenditures by court for eligible court interpreter services provided by the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2021-22. 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 2021 (Sen. Bill 170; Stats. 2021, ch. 240), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for the services of court interpreters. Provision 27 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.

[^0]
## Trial Court Trust Fund Program 150037 Funding for FY 2021-22

- The 2021-22 appropriation of $\$ 162.145$ million included one-time $\$ 30$ million for the Court Interpreter Employee Incentive Grant (CIEIG), ${ }^{3}$ ongoing benefits funding in the amount of $\$ 1.080$ million, and a decrease of $-\$ 316,000$ for video remote interpreting (VRI) equipment, which was included in the 2020 Budget Act as one-time funding.
- Court Interpreter Data Collection System funding of $\$ 87,000$ is included in the ongoing appropriation and managed by the Judicial Council of California Information Technology office working in conjunction with Language Access Services. ${ }^{4}$
- 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. ${ }^{5}$
- The 2021-22 allocation to the courts (\$130.977 million) was distributed in 12 monthly installments of $\$ 10.914$ million from July 2021 through June 2022.
- During the entirety of the time covered in this report (July 2021 through June 2022), a state of emergency continued due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Total filings were generally the same from 2020-21 to 2021-22. ${ }^{6}$
- Total statewide court interpreter expenditures, as reported by courts in the Phoenix financial system, were $\$ 116.580$ million. (See Attachment A for an expenditure overview for 2021-22 and Attachment B for a breakdown of expenditures by court.)
- Total expenditures for 2021-22 were less than the $\$ 132.145$ million available to courts for court interpreter costs by $\$ 15.6$ million (see table 1). Unspent funds were first allocated to reimburse those courts with interpreter expenditures in excess of their budget

[^1]allocation. Approximately $\$ 15$ million from the 2021-22 appropriation reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted program funding. ${ }^{7}$

- Compared to expenditures in 2020-21, total court interpreter expenditures for 2021-22 decreased by $\$ 190,784$ ( -0.16 percent). (See tables 1 and 6 .)
- Table 1 shows that mandated cases accounted for $\$ 113.081$ million of the reported expenditures ( 97 percent). ${ }^{8}$ Civil cases (including domestic violence cases) accounted for $\$ 3.499$ million of the reported expenditures ( 3 percent).
- Contract interpreter expenditures in 2021-22 represented 21.7 percent of total expenditures, reflecting an increase from 2020-21, when contractor expenses were 18.5 percent of the total expenditures (table 4).
- Compared to 2020-21, expenditures for contract interpreters in 2021-22 increased by $\$ 3.724$ million ( 17.27 percent), and expenditures for court employees in 2021-22 decreased by $\$ 3.915$ million ( -4.11 percent).

Table 1. Expenditures by Case Type, FY 2021-22

| Case Type | Amount | Percentage of Total Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Mandated—reported by courts | \$113,081,360 | 97\% |
| 2. Domestic Violence—reported by courts | \$903,239 | 1\% |
| 3. Civil-reported by courts | \$2,595,849 | 2\% |
| Court expenditures (sum of 1, 2, and 3) | \$116,580,449 ${ }^{\text {9 }}$ | 100\% |
| FY 2021-22 appropriation available to the courts (excluding CIEIG funding) | \$132,145,000 | (Does not include \$87,000 for CIDCS ${ }^{10}$ ) |
| Amount under appropriation | \$15,564,551 |  |

## 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. ${ }^{11}$

[^2]- Court interpreter coordinators who are certified or registered court interpreters, including salaries and benefits. ${ }^{12}$
- 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.
- Contract court interpreters, including per diems (see section III) and travel.


## 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.

Effective July 1, 2021, the council approved increasing and standardizing the daily compensation rate for contract court interpreters. ${ }^{13}$ The current rates are shown below in table 2.

Table 2. Current Rates for Contract Court Interpreters

| Session | Certified and Registered <br> Contract Court Interpreters | Noncertified and Nonregistered <br> Contract Interpreters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Full Day | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 220$ |
| Half Day | $\$ 175$ | $\$ 110$ |
| Hourly | $\$ 44$ | $\$ 28$ |

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. ${ }^{14}$

[^3]
## Comparison with Federal Rates

The above contractor rates comply with provision 4 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2021 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."

Effective January 1, 2023, the rates for federal court interpreters were increased. ${ }^{15}$ The current rates for federal interpreters are shown below in table 3.

Table 3. Current Rates for Federal Court Interpreters

| Session | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Federally Certified } \\ \text { Interpreters }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Provisionally } \\ \text { Qualified } \\ \text { Interpreters }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Language Skilled <br>

Interpreters <br>
(Noncertified)\end{array}\right]\)

## IV. Expenditures for Employee and Contract Interpreters

## Certified and Registered Employee and Contract Interpreters

Table 4 details eligible expenditures for employee-related and contract court interpreter costs.
Total employee-related expenditures represented 78.3 percent of total interpreter expenditures in 2021-22. Contract interpreter expenditures in 2021-22 represented 21.7 percent of total expenditures, which is an increase from 2020-21, when contractor expenses were 18.5 percent of the total expenditures. Compared to 2020-21, expenditures for contract interpreters in 2021-22 increased by $\$ 3.724$ million ( 17.27 percent), and expenditures for court employees in 2021-22 decreased by $\$ 3.915$ million ( -4.11 percent). (See table 4 .)

[^4]Table 4. Expenditures for Certified and Registered Employee and Contract Interpreters

| Fiscal Year | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Employee- <br> Related Expenditures <br> Percentage of Total | $\$ 87,231,671$ | $\$ 92,362,074$ | $\$ 95,629,396$ | $\$ 95,211,238$ | $\$ 91,296,511$ |
| Total Contractor <br> Expenditures <br> Percentage of Total | $\mathbf{7 6 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 3 1 \%}$ |
| Total Expenditures <br> Percentage Change <br> Over Prior Year | $\mathbf{\$ 2 6 , 9 5 0 , 2 7 2}$ | $\$ 30,510,247$ | $\$ 26,339,933$ | $\$ 21,559,996$ | $\$ 25,283,937$ |

FY 2016-17 total reimbursements were \$106,134,731.

## Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

Table 5 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 2021-22, statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled $\$ 3.366$ million, or 2.89 percent of total statewide expenditures. This is an increase from 2020-21, when these expenditures were 2.47 percent of the total.

Table 5. Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters and Corresponding Percentage of Total Expenditures

| Fiscal Year | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noncertified Expenditures | \$2,715,378 | \$3,195,466 | \$2,577,711 | \$1,816,758 | \$2,144,466 |
|  | 2.38\% | 2.60\% | 2.11\% | 1.56\% | 1.84\% |
| Nonregistered Expenditures | \$1,406,780 | \$1,788,983 | \$1,584,072 | \$1,069,242 | \$1,221,543 |
|  | 1.23\% | 1.46\% | 1.30\% | 0.92\% | 1.05\% |
| Combined Expenditures | \$4,122,157 | \$4,984,449 | \$4,161,783 | \$2,886,000 | \$3,366,009 |
|  | 3.61\% | 4.06\% | 3.41\% | 2.47\% | 2.89\% |

Table 6 compares the top 10 court expenditures incurred in 2020-21 and 2021-22.
Table 6. Distribution of Eligible Expenditures to Top 10 Courts

| Superior Court | FY 2020-21 <br> Eligible Expenditures (\$) | FY 2020-21 Statewide Total \% | FY 2021-22 <br> Eligible Expenditures <br> (\$) | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2021-22 } \\ \text { Statewide } \\ \text { Total \% } \end{gathered}$ | \$ <br> Change <br> from FY 2020-21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Change } \\ \text { from FY } \\ 2020-21 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Los Angeles | \$37,119,284 | 31.79\% | \$34,877,681 | 29.92\% | -\$2,241,603 | -6.04\% |
| Orange | \$10,013,876 | 8.58\% | \$9,024,188 | 7.74\% | -\$989,688 | -9.88\% |
| Riverside | \$6,409,042 | 5.49\% | \$6,319,192 | 5.42\% | -\$89,850 | -1.40\% |
| San <br> Bernardino | \$5,995,137 | 5.13\% | \$6,406,379 | 5.50\% | \$411,242 | 6.86\% |
| San Diego | \$5,364,481 | 4.59\% | \$6,109,480 | 5.24\% | \$744,999 | 13.89\% |
| Santa Clara | \$5,244,318 | 4.49\% | \$5,466,517 | 4.69\% | \$222,199 | 4.24\% |
| Alameda | \$5,024,020 | 4.30\% | \$4,835,529 | 4.15\% | -\$188,491 | -3.75\% |
| Sacramento | \$4,347,325 | 3.72\% | \$4,690,504 | 4.02\% | \$343,179 | 7.89\% |
| San Francisco | \$3,679,421 | 3.15\% | \$3,767,628 | 3.23\% | \$88,207 | 2.40\% |
| Kern | \$3,646,659 | 3.12\% | \$3,608,775 | 3.10\% | -\$37,884 | -1.04\% |
| Subtotal | \$86,843,563 | 74.37\% | \$85,105,873 | 73.00\% | -\$1,737,690 | -2.00\% |
| Remaining Courts | \$29,927,670 | 25.63\% | \$31,474,576 | 27.00\% | \$1,546,906 | 5.17\% |
| Statewide <br> Total | \$116,771,233 | 100.00\% | \$116,580,449 | 100.00\% | -\$190,784 | -0.16\% |

## V. Conclusion

During 2021-22, the state of emergency continued due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Total filings were generally the same from 2020-21 to 2021-22, and the total appropriation for interpreter services was sufficient for eligible court interpreter expenditures. Total court interpreter expenditures for 2021-22 were $\$ 116.580$ million, which is a slight decrease from the previous year ( -0.16 percent). This resulted in program savings of approximately $\$ 15$ million, which reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund as restricted program funding. As the courts continue to expand interpreter services to include all civil proceedings and increase salaries and benefits for court interpreters, the program is expected to continue the prior trend of increasing expenditures for court interpreters for the benefit of California court users.

## VI. Attachments

1. Attachment A: 2021-22 Court Interpreter Program 0150037: Expenditure Overview
2. Attachment B: 2021-22 Final Expenditures: Court Interpreter Program 0150037

## 2021-2022 Court Interpreter Program 0150037 <br> Expenditure Overview

| 1. Total Mandated Criminal | $\$$ | $113,081,360$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2. Total Domestic Violence reported by courts: | $\$$ | 903,239 |
| 3. Total Civil reported by courts: | $\$$ | $2,595,849$ |
| Court Total Expenditures (sum of 1, 2, 3) | $\$$ | $116,580,449$ |
| Court Interpreter Data Collection System | $\$$ | 87,000 |
| Total Expenditures | $\$$ | $116,667,449$ |

2021-22 Final Expenditures: Court Interpreter Program 0150037

|  | All Cases -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  | All Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff <br> Interpreter <br>  <br> Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross <br> Assignments | Total <br> Employee- <br> Related Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | $\qquad$ | NonRegistered Contractor Per Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | ASL Contractor Per Diems 938507 | Telephonic Interpreting 938514 | Court Interpreter Services | Total Contractor Per Diems | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total <br> Contractor- <br> Related Costs | All Cases <br> Total Expenditures |
|  | A | B | C | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ (\mathrm{~A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} \\ \text { (E thru }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} N \\ (L+M) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (D+N) \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 4,226,603 | 9,874 | - | 4,236,477 | 64,079 | 307,274 | 43,297 | 75,900 | 64,612 | - | - | 555,161 | 43,890 | 599,052 | 4,835,529 |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35 | - | 35 | - | 35 | 35 |
| Amador | - | - |  | - | - | 41,322 | - | - | - | - |  | 41,322 | 17,035 | 58,356 | 58,356 |
| Butte | 67,800 | 0 | - | 67,800 | 11,368 | 135,612 | - | 638 | 12,359 | 275 |  | 160,253 | 71,727 | 231,979 | 299,779 |
| Calaveras | 25,012 | - |  | 25,012 | 3,850 | 8,521 | 320 | 4,773 | - | 1,022 |  | 18,486 | 6,450 | 24,937 | 49,949 |
| Colusa | - | - |  | - | - | 78,778 | 452 | - |  | 999 |  | 80,229 | 34,199 | 114,428 | 114,428 |
| Contra Costa | 1,710,946 | 5,478 |  | 1,716,424 | 98,809 | 447,070 | 26,058 | 57,003 | - | 3,290 |  | 632,230 | 51,474 | 683,704 | 2,400,128 |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | 24,465 | - | - | - | - |  | 24,465 | 2,410 | 26,875 | 26,875 |
| El Dorado | 6,790 | - |  | 6,790 | - | 166,565 | - | - | - | 88 | - | 166,653 | 44,580 | 211,233 | 218,023 |
| Fresno | 1,331,023 | 10,270 | 65,451 | 1,406,744 | 44,000 | 509,129 | 15,894 | 37,952 | 21,975 | - | - | 628,950 | 439,046 | 1,067,996 | 2,474,740 |
| Glenn | 53,806 | 48 |  | 53,854 | - | 77,358 | - | - | 400 | 40 |  | 77,798 | 52,371 | 130,169 | 184,023 |
| Humboldt | 42,141 | - | - | 42,141 | - | 4,789 | - | - | - | 688 |  | 5,478 |  | 5,478 | 47,618 |
| Imperial | 360,502 | 170 | - | 360,673 | - | 150,574 | - | - | - | 379 |  | 150,953 | 80,448 | 231,401 | 592,073 |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | - | 23,644 | - | - | - | 1,535 | - | 25,180 | 10,921 | 36,100 | 36,100 |
| Kern | 2,120,324 | 23,479 | - | 2,143,803 | 22,181 | 989,329 | - | 222,220 | 103,944 | - | - | 1,337,674 | 127,298 | 1,464,972 | 3,608,775 |
| Kings | 217,534 | - | - | 217,534 | - | 293,526 | 1,600 | - | 4,550 | - | - | 299,676 | 108,515 | 408,192 | 625,726 |
| Lake | 15,229 | - | - | 15,229 | - | 72,068 | - | - | 4,402 | - |  | 76,470 | 19,692 | 96,162 | 111,391 |
| Lassen | 32,744 | - | - | 32,744 | - | 5,240 | - | 440 | - | - | 650 | 6,330 | 2,756 | 9,086 | 41,831 |
| Los Angeles | 33,645,201 | 1,075 | 189,445 | 33,835,720 | 97,104 | 194,467 | 193,362 | 268,675 | 36,613 | - | 16,300 | 806,521 | 235,440 | 1,041,961 | 34,877,681 |
| Madera | 450,925 | - | - | 450,925 | - | 141,461 | - | 45,799 | - | - | - | 187,260 | 96,638 | 283,897 | 734,822 |
| Marin | 567,613 | - | - | 567,613 | 2,700 | 83,020 | 110 | 10,325 | - | - | 22 | 96,177 | 4,986 | 101,163 | 668,776 |
| Mariposa | 9,430 | - | - | 9,430 | - | 15,547 | - | 1,429 | - | - | - | 16,976 | 22,775 | 39,750 | 49,181 |
| Mendocino | 147,054 | - | - | 147,054 | - | 116,674 | 3,195 | - | 6,000 | - | - | 125,869 | 141,872 | 267,741 | 414,795 |
| Merced | 308,767 | 38 | - | 308,805 | 7,869 | 386,218 | 8,790 | 8,433 | 8,727 | - | 7 | 420,044 | 256,997 | 677,041 | 985,845 |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,716 | - | - | - | - | 2,716 | - | 2,716 | 2,716 |
| Mono | 51,850 | - | - | 51,850 | 300 | 7,964 | - | 2,025 | - | - | - | 10,289 | 1,094 | 11,383 | 63,233 |
| Monterey | 1,220,400 | 4,992 | - | 1,225,392 | 13,608 | 44,777 | 63,342 | 113,153 | 13,800 | - | - | 248,680 | 9,003 | 257,683 | 1,483,075 |
| Napa | 429,627 | - | - | 429,627 | - | 215,299 | - | 452 | - | - | - | 215,751 | 74,529 | 290,280 | 719,907 |
| Nevada | 22,100 | - | - | 22,100 | 226 | 40,991 | - | 5,466 | 1,464 | 195 | - | 48,343 | 10,739 | 59,082 | 81,182 |
| Orange | 8,427,313 | 8,385 | 99,663 | 8,535,361 | 49,251 | 108,306 | 48,469 | 136,758 | 80,377 | - | - | 423,161 | 65,667 | 488,827 | 9,024,188 |
| Placer | 226,655 | 2,191 | - | 228,846 | 48,564 | 191,069 | 3,854 | 13,105 | 23,433 | - | - | 280,026 | 93,980 | 374,005 | 602,851 |
| Plumas |  | - | - |  | - | 1,762 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,762 | - | 1,762 | 1,762 |
| Riverside | 5,082,496 | 7,627 | - | 5,090,123 | 40,436 | 511,124 | 87,539 | 79,531 | 100,412 | 1,117 | - | 820,159 | 408,911 | 1,229,069 | 6,319,192 |
| Sacramento | 3,728,322 | 1,907 | 239,478 | 3,969,707 | 136,789 | 437,705 | 40,008 | 33,711 | 25,942 | - | - | 674,155 | 46,642 | 720,797 | 4,690,504 |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | 107,346 | - | 1,370 | - | 990 | - | 109,706 | 31,670 | 141,376 | 141,376 |
| San Bernardino | 6,001,470 | 15,314 | - | 6,016,784 | 20,300 | 60,013 | 52,224 | 52,534 | 109,853 | 8,557 | - | 303,480 | 86,115 | 389,595 | 6,406,379 |
| San Diego | 4,990,495 | 3,394 | 10,835 | 5,004,724 | 93,920 | 548,431 | 102,328 | 156,749 |  | 953 | 2,778 | 905,159 | 199,597 | 1,104,756 | 6,109,480 |
| San Francisco | 2,958,577 | - | 8,537 | 2,967,113 | 41,006 | 416,942 | - | 186,368 | 99,765 | - | - | 744,081 | 56,433 | 800,515 | 3,767,628 |
| San Joaquin | 830,732 | 290 | 25,401 | 856,423 | 52,868 | 682,197 | 44,087 | 190,807 | - | - | - | 969,960 | 130,068 | 1,100,028 | 1,956,451 |
| San Luis Obispo | 622,157 | - | - | 622,157 | 53,874 | 20,902 | 3,857 | - | 21,000 | - | - | 99,632 | 3,202 | 102,834 | 724,991 |
| San Mateo | 1,634,807 | 209 | - | 1,635,016 | 53,948 | 609,261 | 43,983 | 121,688 | 38,000 | - | - | 866,880 | 278,505 | 1,145,384 | 2,780,400 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,587,611 | 128 | - | 1,587,739 | 2,100 | 307,806 | 231,973 | 1,200 | 40,562 | - | - | 583,641 | 107,546 | 691,186 | 2,278,926 |
| Santa Clara | 2,936,399 | 3,813 | 56,223 | 2,996,434 | 64,390 | 1,170,036 | 14,081 | 60,642 | 12,350 | - | - | 1,321,498 | 1,148,585 | 2,470,083 | 5,466,517 |


| Santa Cruz | 794,395 | 22 | - | 794,417 | 23,325 | 22,399 | 2,741 | 18,863 | 2,600 | - | - | 69,928 | 29,989 | 99,916 | 894,334 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shasta | 184,869 | - | - | 184,869 | 10,228 | 89,321 | 800 | 4,315 | 25,466 | 14 | - | 130,145 | 127,452 | 257,597 | 442,466 |
| Sierra |  | - | - |  | - | 540 | - |  | - | 240 |  | 780 |  | 780 | 780 |
| Siskiyou | 5,924 | - | - | 5,924 | - | 41,729 |  | 990 |  | 870 |  | 43,590 | 22,644 | 66,234 | 72,157 |
| Solano | 428,656 | 77 |  | 428,733 | 15,106 | 232,500 | 18,658 | 52,273 | 19,420 | - |  | 337,956 | 34,367 | 372,323 | 801,056 |
| Sonoma | 794,276 | 210 | - | 794,486 | 40,572 | 384,504 | 18,449 | 30,335 | 19,244 | 1,236 | - | 494,339 | 52,324 | 546,663 | 1,341,148 |
| Stanislaus | 254,926 | - | - | 254,926 | 46,581 | 650,626 | 15,795 | 65,433 | 24,609 | - | - | 803,043 | 544,219 | 1,347,262 | 1,602,188 |
| Sutter | 344 | - | - | 344 | 510 | 133,427 | - | 28,625 | 3,440 | 663 | - | 166,665 | 39,891 | 206,556 | 206,901 |
| Tehama | 137,747 | - | - | 137,747 | 700 | 35,113 | - | - | 2,900 | 3,930 | - | 42,643 | 30,493 | 73,137 | 210,884 |
| Trinity | 30,330 | - | - | 30,330 | 6,143 | 10,966 | - | - | 418 | - |  | 17,527 | 15,667 | 33,194 | 63,524 |
| Tulare | 399,083 | - | - | 399,083 | 19,489 | 1,344,429 | 8,614 | 14,410 | 32,758 | - | - | 1,419,701 | 260,792 | 1,680,493 | 2,079,576 |
| Tuolumne | 30,526 | - |  | 30,526 | 400 | 32,595 |  | - | - | - |  | 32,995 | 10,610 | 43,605 | 74,130 |
| Ventura | 1,149,992 | - | - | 1,149,992 | 27,186 | 960,568 | 124,948 | 39,418 | - | - | - | 1,152,120 | 76,150 | 1,228,270 | 2,378,263 |
| Yolo | 183,148 | - |  | 183,148 | - | 200 | - | - |  | - | - | 200 | 72,370 | 72,570 | 255,718 |
| Yuba | 17,818 | - |  | 17,818 | 4,900 | 37,984 | - | 660 | 3,147 | 612 | 210 | 47,514 | 14,755 | 62,268 | 80,086 |
| Total: | 90,502,488 | 98,991 | 695,032 | 91,296,511 | 1,218,681 | 13,731,483 | 1,221,543 | 2,144,466 | 964,542 | 27,729 | 19,967 | 19,328,412 | 5,955,526 | 25,283,937 | 116,580,449 |


|  | Mandated Cases -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  | Mandated Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mandated Cases Total Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | $\begin{gathered} \text { Staff } \\ \text { Interpreter } \\ \text { Travel } \end{gathered}$ | Staff Cross Assignments | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | Certified Contractor Per Diems | Non- Registered Contractor Per Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{gathered} \text { ASL } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}$ | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Total } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs |  |
|  | A | B | c | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ (A+B+C) \end{gathered}$ | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | к | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{L} \\ \text { (E thru } K) \end{gathered}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} N \\ (L+M) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{N}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 4,226,603 | 9,874 |  | 4,236,477 | 62,686 | 304,624 | 43,297 | 71,935 | 64,262 |  |  | 546,804 | 43,838 | 590,642 | 4,827,119 |
| Alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |  | 35 |  | 35 | 35 |
| Amador |  |  |  |  |  | 41,322 |  |  |  |  |  | 41,322 | 17,035 | 58,356 | 58,356 |
| Butte | 67,800 | 0 |  | 67,800 | 10,843 | 113,379 |  | 638 | 8,087 | 275 |  | 133,223 | 56,312 | 189,535 | 257,335 |
| Calaveras | 25,012 |  |  | 25,012 | 3,850 | 8,521 | 320 | 4,773 |  | 1,022 |  | 18,486 | 6,450 | 24,937 | 49,949 |
| Colusa |  |  |  |  |  | 78,778 | 452 |  |  | 999 |  | 80,229 | 34,199 | 114,428 | 114,428 |
| Contra Costa | 1,710,946 | 5,478 | - | 1,716,424 | 65,067 | 331,189 | 25,458 | 35,085 | - | 3,290 |  | 460,089 | 36,594 | 496,683 | 2,213,107 |
| Del Norte |  |  |  |  |  | 24,465 |  |  |  |  |  | 24,465 | 2,410 | 26,875 | 26,875 |
| El Dorado | 6,790 |  |  | 6,790 |  | 134,171 |  |  |  | 88 |  | 134,260 | 37,324 | 171,584 | 178,374 |
| Fresno | 1,152,682 | 10,270 | 65,451 | 1,228,403 | 40,418 | 479,501 | 15,264 | 24,447 | 19,875 |  |  | 579,504 | 424,505 | 1,004,009 | 2,232,412 |
| Glenn | 53,806 | 48 |  | 53,854 |  | 77,358 |  |  | 400 | 40 |  | 77,798 | 52,371 | 130,169 | 184,023 |
| Humboldt | 42,141 |  |  | 42,141 |  |  |  |  |  | 688 |  | 688 |  | 688 | 42,829 |
| Imperial | 323,868 | 170 |  | 324,038 |  | 150,574 |  |  |  | 379 |  | 150,953 | 80,448 | 231,401 | 555,439 |
| Inyo |  |  |  |  |  | 22,636 |  |  |  | 1,535 |  | 24,172 | 9,799 | 33,970 | 33,970 |
| Kern | 2,120,324 | 23,479 |  | 2,143,803 | 22,181 | 989,329 |  | 222,220 | 103,944 |  | - | 1,337,674 | 127,298 | 1,464,972 | 3,608,775 |
| Kings | 217,534 |  |  | 217,534 |  | 256,035 | 1,150 |  | 3,763 |  |  | 260,947 | 96,416 | 357,363 | 574,897 |
| Lake | 15,229 | - | - | 15,229 | - | 72,068 |  |  | 4,402 |  |  | 76,470 | 19,692 | 96,162 | 111,391 |
| Lassen | 32,744 |  |  | 32,744 |  | 5,240 |  | 440 |  |  | 650 | 6,330 | 2,756 | 9,086 | 41,831 |
| Los Angeles | 33,645,201 | 1,075 | 189,445 | 33,835,720 | 97,104 | 194,467 | 193,362 | 268,675 | 36,613 |  | 16,300 | 806,521 | 235,440 | 1,041,961 | 34,877,681 |
| Madera | 450,925 | - | - | 450,925 |  | 141,461 |  | 45,799 | - | - | - | 187,260 | 96,638 | 283,897 | 734,822 |
| Marin | 567,613 |  | - | 567,613 | 2,700 | 83,020 | 110 | 10,325 | - |  | 22 | 96,177 | 4,986 | 101,163 | 668,776 |
| Mariposa | 9,430 |  |  | 9,430 |  | 15,547 |  | 1,429 |  |  |  | 16,976 | 22,775 | 39,750 | 49,181 |
| Mendocino | 147,054 |  |  | 147,054 |  | 98,188 | 3,020 |  | 4,250 |  |  | 105,458 | 120,458 | 225,916 | 372,970 |
| Merced | 308,767 | 38 |  | 308,805 | 7,869 | 374,822 | 8,790 | 8,213 | 8,727 |  | 7 | 408,428 | 250,152 | 658,580 | 967,385 |
| Modoc |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,716 |  | - | - | - | 2,716 |  | 2,716 | 2,716 |
| Mono | 51,850 |  |  | 51,850 | 300 | 7,964 |  | 2,025 |  | - | - | 10,289 | 1,094 | 11,383 | 63,233 |
| Monterey | 1,220,400 | 4,992 |  | 1,225,392 | 13,608 | 44,777 | 63,342 | 113,153 | 13,800 |  |  | 248,680 | 9,003 | 257,683 | 1,483,075 |
| Napa | 426,843 |  | - | 426,843 |  | 215,299 | - | 452 |  |  | - | 215,751 | 74,529 | 290,280 | 717,123 |
| Nevada | 22,100 |  |  | 22,100 | 226 | 32,622 |  | 5,466 | 900 | 195 | - | 39,409 | 8,494 | 47,903 | 70,003 |
| Orange | 8,366,640 | 8,385 | 99,663 | 8,474,689 | 49,251 | 108,306 | 48,469 | 136,758 | 80,377 |  |  | 423,161 | 65,667 | 488,827 | 8,963,516 |
| Placer | 226,655 | 2,191 | - | 228,846 | 45,870 | 152,400 | 3,012 | 9,279 | 13,212 | - | - | 223,773 | 79,480 | 303,253 | 532,099 |
| Plumas |  |  | - |  |  | 1,762 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,762 |  | 1,762 | 1,762 |
| Riverside | 4,627,736 | 7,627 |  | 4,635,363 | 34,156 | 488,216 | 82,326 | 61,083 | 100,412 | 1,117 |  | 767,310 | 383,861 | 1,151,171 | 5,786,534 |
| Sacramento | 3,472,326 | 1,907 | 239,478 | 3,713,710 | 106,307 | 289,320 | 35,431 | 16,499 | 22,642 |  |  | 470,200 | 29,917 | 500,116 | 4,213,827 |
| San Benito |  |  |  |  |  | 107,346 |  | 1,370 |  | 990 |  | 109,706 | 31,670 | 141,376 | 141,376 |
| San Bernardino | 5,960,629 | 15,314 |  | 5,975,944 | 19,825 | 56,968 | 51,181 | 46,734 | 109,853 | 8,557 |  | 293,119 | 82,385 | 375,504 | 6,351,447 |
| San Diego | 4,975,052 | 3,394 | 10,835 | 4,989,281 | 87,081 | 543,460 | 98,893 | 152,641 |  | 953 | 2,778 | 885,806 | 199,597 | 1,085,403 | 6,074,684 |
| San Francisco | 2,958,577 |  | 8,537 | 2,967,113 | 35,695 | 355,399 |  | 125,268 | 97,165 |  |  | 613,528 | 36,723 | 650,250 | 3,617,364 |
| San Joaquin | 828,165 | 290 | 25,401 | 853,855 | 52,868 | 674,543 | 43,877 | 189,576 |  | - |  | 960,865 | 128,945 | 1,089,810 | 1,943,665 |
| San Luis Obispo | 622,157 |  |  | 622,157 | 53,874 | 20,902 | 3,857 |  | 21,000 |  |  | 99,632 | 3,202 | 102,834 | 724,991 |
| San Mateo | 1,634,807 | 209 | - | 1,635,016 | 52,346 | 561,999 | 42,992 | 113,063 | 37,500 |  | - | 807,901 | 261,385 | 1,069,286 | 2,704,302 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,587,611 | 128 |  | 1,587,739 | 700 | 246,216 | 221,587 | 1,200 | 30,958 | - | - | 500,661 | 95,882 | 596,544 | 2,184,283 |
| Santa Clara | 2,682,101 | 2,511 | 56,223 | 2,740,835 | 64,040 | 1,167,941 | 14,081 | 60,642 | 12,350 |  |  | 1,319,054 | 1,148,226 | 2,467,279 | 5,208,114 |
| Santa Cruz | 794,395 | 22 |  | 794,417 | 23,325 | 22,399 | 2,741 | 18,863 | 2,600 |  |  | 69,928 | 29,989 | 99,916 | 894,334 |
| Shasta | 184,869 |  |  | 184,869 | 10,228 | 89,321 | 800 | 4,315 | 25,466 | 14 | - | 130,145 | 127,452 | 257,597 | 442,466 |
| Sierra |  |  |  |  |  | 540 |  |  |  | 240 | - | 780 |  | 780 | 780 |
| Siskiyou | 5,924 |  | - | 5,924 |  | 33,946 |  | 293 | - | 870 | - | 35,110 | 17,097 | 52,207 | 58,130 |


| Solano | 428,656 | 77 | - | 428,733 | 12,958 | 200,238 | 17,566 | 31,265 | 16,756 |  |  | 278,784 | 27,931 | 306,715 | 735,448 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sonoma | 794,276 | 210 | - | 794,486 | 40,572 | 384,504 | 18,449 | 30,335 | 19,244 | 1,236 | - | 494,339 | 52,324 | 546,663 | 1,341,148 |
| Stanislaus | 253,318 | - | - | 253,318 | 33,426 | 493,100 | 13,133 | 51,222 | 19,094 | - | - | 609,975 | 405,778 | 1,015,754 | 1,269,071 |
| Sutter | 344 | - | - | 344 | 510 | 131,357 | - | 28,570 | 3,440 | 663 | - | 164,540 | 39,563 | 204,103 | 204,447 |
| Tehama | 137,747 | - | - | 137,747 | 700 | 35,113 | - | - | 2,900 | 3,930 | - | 42,643 | 30,493 | 73,137 | 210,884 |
| Trinity | 30,330 | - | - | 30,330 | 6,143 | 10,966 | - | - | 418 | - | - | 17,527 | 15,667 | 33,194 | 63,524 |
| Tulare | 399,083 | - | - | 399,083 | 15,457 | 1,145,007 | 6,597 | 11,968 | 32,758 | - | - | 1,211,787 | 227,793 | 1,439,579 | 1,838,663 |
| Tuolumne | 30,526 | - | - | 30,526 | 400 | 29,950 | - | - | - | - | - | 30,350 | 9,547 | 39,897 | 70,423 |
| Ventura | 992,213 | - | - | 992,213 | 12,432 | 834,095 | 121,713 | 27,042 | - | - | - | 995,283 | 65,085 | 1,060,367 | 2,052,581 |
| Yolo | 183,148 | - | - | 183,148 | - | 200 | - | - | - | - | - | 200 | 72,370 | 72,570 | 255,718 |
| Yuba | 17,818 | - | - | 17,818 | 4,200 | 37,204 | - | 660 | 2,865 | 401 | 210 | 45,540 | 14,313 | 59,852 | 77,670 |
| Total: | 89,040,764 | 97,689 | 695,032 | 89,833,485 | 1,089,217 | 12,520,078 | 1,183,988 | 1,933,720 | 920,034 | 27,518 | 19,967 | 17,694,520 | 5,553,355 | 23,247,875 | 113,081,360 |


| 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 <br> Assignments | Total Employee Related Costs | Registered <br> Contractor Per <br> Diems | Certified Contractor Per Diems | NonRegistered Contractor Per Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | ASL Contractor Per Diems | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | Total Contractor Per Diems | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total <br> Contractor- <br> Related Costs |  |
|  | A | B | C | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ (\mathrm{~A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}) \end{gathered}$ | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} \\ \text { (E thru K) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} N \\ (L+M) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (D+N) \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte | - | - | - | - | - | 418 | - | - | - | - | - | 418 | 146 | 564 | 564 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | - | 336 | 6,234 | - | 414 | - | - | - | 6,984 | 677 | 7,661 | 7,661 |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | - | - | 12,083 | - | - | - | - | - | 12,083 | 2,186 | 14,269 | 14,269 |
| Fresno | 113,365 | - | - | 113,365 | - | 3,067 | - | 1,320 | 350 | - | - | 4,737 | 2,680 | 7,417 | 120,782 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Imperial | 6,263 | - | - | 6,263 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6,263 |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 127 | 127 | 127 |
| Kern | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kings | - | - | - | - | - | 7,400 | - | - | - | - | - | 7,400 | 2,381 | 9,781 | 9,781 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | 2,201 | - | - | - | - | - | 2,201 | 2,311 | 4,512 | 4,512 |
| Merced | - | - | - | - | - | 11,396 | - | 220 | - | - | - | 11,616 | 6,845 | 18,460 | 18,460 |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Napa | 2,784 | - | - | 2,784 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,784 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | 920 | - | - | - | - | - | 920 | 357 | 1,277 | 1,277 |
| Orange | 31,247 | - | - | 31,247 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 31,247 |
| Placer | - | - | - | - | - | 12,098 | - | 2,790 | 2,011 | - | - | 16,899 | 5,310 | 22,209 | 22,209 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | 131,244 | - | - | 131,244 | 2,730 | 4,992 | 975 | 3,928 | - | - | - | 12,626 | 5,786 | 18,412 | 149,656 |
| Sacramento | 49,476 | - | - | 49,476 | 7,982 | 19,220 | 582 | 3,325 | 670 | - | - | 31,780 | 2,516 | 34,296 | 83,772 |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| San Bernardino | 40,840 | - | - | 40,840 | 475 | 3,044 | 1,042 | 5,800 | - | - | - | 10,361 | 3,730 | 14,092 | 54,932 |
| San Diego | 15,443 | - | - | 15,443 | 6,839 | 4,972 | 3,435 | 4,108 | - | - | - | 19,353 | - | 19,353 | 34,796 |
| San Francisco | - | - | - | - | 1,235 | 17,894 | - | 12,986 | 850 | - | - | 32,965 | 4,268 | 37,232 | 37,232 |
| San Joaquin | 155 | - | - | 155 | - | 1,551 | - | 430 | - | - | - | 1,981 | 276 | 2,258 | 2,413 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - |  | - | 175 | - | - | - | - | 175 | 123 | 298 | 298 |
| Santa Barbara | - |  | - | - | 600 | 5,905 | 2,233 | - | 5,467 | - | - | 14,206 | 1,982 | 16,187 | 16,187 |
| Santa Clara | 85,974 | 679 | - | 86,653 | 350 | 1,186 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,536 | 359 | 1,895 | 88,548 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | 1,449 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,449 | 2,423 | 3,871 | 3,871 |


| Solano | - | - | - | - | 600 | 7,969 | - | 3,166 | 282 | - | - | 12,017 | 915 | 12,932 | 12,932 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sonoma | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stanislaus | 503 | - | - | 503 | 1,010 | 10,768 | 110 | 1,293 | 1,056 | - | - | 14,237 | 10,306 | 24,543 | 25,046 |
| Sutter | - | - | - | - | - | 2,070 | - | 55 | - | - | - | 2,125 | 328 | 2,453 | 2,453 |
| Tehama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | - | - | - | 1,850 | 93,227 | 528 | 330 | - | - | - | 95,935 | 15,757 | 111,693 | 111,693 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | - | 2,205 | - | - | - | - | - | 2,205 | 438 | 2,643 | 2,643 |
| Ventura | 22,660 | - | - | 22,660 | - | 12,150 | 350 | - | - | - | - | 12,500 | 837 | 13,337 | 35,997 |
| Yolo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | - | 780 | - | - | - | 55 | - | 835 | - | 835 | 835 |
| Total: | 499,953 | 679 | - | 500,633 | 24,007 | 245,198 | 9,431 | 40,166 | 10,686 | 55 | - | 329,542 | 73,064 | 402,606 | 903,239 |


|  | Civil Cases -- Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  | Civil Cases -- Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff <br> Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross <br> Assignments | Total Employee Related Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | Certified Contractor Per Diems | NonRegistered Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}$ | ASL Contractor Per Diems | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | Total Contractor Per Diems | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs | Civil Cases Total Expenditures |
|  | A | B | C | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ (\mathrm{~A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}) \end{gathered}$ | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} \\ \text { (E thru K) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} N \\ (L+M) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (D+N) \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | - | - | - | - | 1,393 | 2,650 | - | 3,965 | 350 | - | - | 8,358 | 52 | 8,410 | 8,410 |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Butte | - | - | - | - | 525 | 21,815 | - | - | 4,272 | - | - | 26,612 | 15,268 | 41,881 | 41,881 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | - | 33,406 | 109,647 | 600 | 21,504 | - | - | - | 165,157 | 14,203 | 179,360 | 179,360 |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | - | - | 20,311 | - | - | - | - | - | 20,311 | 5,069 | 25,380 | 25,380 |
| Fresno | 64,976 | - | - | 64,976 | 3,582 | 26,562 | 630 | 12,185 | 1,750 | - | - | 44,709 | 11,861 | 56,570 | 121,546 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | 4,789 | - | - | - | - | - | 4,789 | - | 4,789 | 4,789 |
| Imperial | 30,371 | - | - | 30,371 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 30,371 |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | - | 1,008 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,008 | 995 | 2,003 | 2,003 |
| Kern | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kings | - | - | - | - | - | 30,092 | 450 | - | 788 | - | - | 31,329 | 9,719 | 41,048 | 41,048 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | 16,285 | 175 | - | 1,750 | - | - | 18,210 | 19,103 | 37,313 | 37,313 |
| Merced | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Napa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | 7,449 | - | - | 564 | - | - | 8,014 | 1,888 | 9,902 | 9,902 |
| Orange | 29,425 | - | - | 29,425 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29,425 |
| Placer | - | - | - | - | 2,694 | 26,571 | 842 | 1,037 | 8,209 | - | - | 39,354 | 9,189 | 48,543 | 48,543 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Riverside | 323,515 | - | - | 323,515 | 3,550 | 17,915 | 4,238 | 14,520 | - | - | - | 40,223 | 19,263 | 59,486 | 383,001 |
| Sacramento | 206,521 | - | - | 206,521 | 22,500 | 129,164 | 3,995 | 13,886 | 2,630 | - | - | 172,175 | 14,210 | 186,385 | 392,905 |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| San Francisco | - | - | - | - | 4,076 | 43,649 | - | 48,114 | 1,750 | - | - | 97,589 | 15,443 | 113,032 | 113,032 |
| San Joaquin | 2,413 | - | - | 2,413 | - | 6,102 | 210 | 801 | - | - | - | 7,114 | 847 | 7,960 | 10,373 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | 1,602 | 47,262 | 815 | 8,625 | 500 | - | - | 58,804 | 16,996 | 75,800 | 75,800 |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | - | - | 800 | 55,685 | 8,152 | - | 4,137 | - | - | 68,774 | 9,682 | 78,456 | 78,456 |
| Santa Clara | 168,325 | 622 | - | 168,947 | - | 908 | - | - | - | - | - | 908 | - | 908 | 169,855 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - |  |  | 6,335 | - | 697 | - | - | - | 7,031 | 3,124 | 10,156 | 10,156 |


| Solano | - | - | - |  | 1,548 | 24,293 | 1,092 | 17,842 | 2,381 | - | - | 47,156 | 5,522 | 52,677 | 52,677 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sonoma | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stanislaus | 1,106 | - | - | 1,106 | 12,145 | 146,757 | 2,552 | 12,918 | 4,459 | - | - | 178,831 | 128,134 | 306,965 | 308,071 |
| Sutter | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tehama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | - | - | - | 2,182 | 106,195 | 1,489 | 2,113 | - | - | - | 111,978 | 17,243 | 129,221 | 129,221 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | - | 440 | - | - | - | - | - | 440 | 625 | 1,065 | 1,065 |
| Ventura | 135,119 | - | - | 135,119 | 14,754 | 114,323 | 2,885 | 12,376 | - | - | - | 144,337 | 10,229 | 154,566 | 289,685 |
| Yolo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | 700 | - | - | - | 282 | 157 | - | 1,139 | 442 | 1,581 | 1,581 |
| Total: | 961,772 | 622 | - | 962,394 | 105,458 | 966,207 | 28,125 | 170,580 | 33,823 | 157 | - | 1,304,349 | 329,107 | 1,633,456 | 2,595,849 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ 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.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ SB 170, which amended the Budget Act of 2021, provided one-time additional funding of $\$ 30$ million for the Court Interpreter Employee Incentive Grant (CIEIG) program. Eligible courts could apply for one-year of salary, benefits, and training to help establish new, full-time court interpreter employee positions both in the courtroom and in the courthouse. The council launched two grant cycles for courts to apply for CIEIG funding. See Judicial Council report (April 20, 2023). For Cycle 1, $\$ 2.5$ million was distributed in June 2022 to nine courts that applied for CIEIG funds to help establish new court employee interpreter positions. (Id. at p. 4). One barrier to grant applications has been the restrictions for grants under the language of SB 170, which established the CIEIG. To accept a grant, the court must commit to retaining the court interpreter employee position beyond the grant year. Thus, the court is responsible for paying subsequent years of salary through the court's annual Court Interpreters Program allocation or operational funds as needed. (Id. at p. 3.) Funding for the CIEIG program is available until June 30, 2024. (Id. at p. 1.) Unused grant funding will be collected for return to the general fund. (Id. at p. 5.)
    ${ }^{4}$ The Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS) is a program of the Judicial Council. CIDCS tracks actual court interpreter usage, including case type, number of interpreted events, languages, and costs, including capturing whether court interpreter events were handled by in-person, telephonic, or remote.
    ${ }^{5}$ In January 2023, the council approved an ongoing allocation methodology for Court Interpreters Program funding, effective July 1, 2023. Courts with a shortfall will continue to be reimbursed by courts with excess funding up to the appropriation amount, and the CIP fund balance will be used as needed to make courts whole. If the amount of the shortfall exceeds the appropriation, and no surplus fund balance is available, courts will be provided advance notification that they are projected to exceed their allocation, and they will be required to fund these excess costs from their trial court operating budgets. See Judicial Council report (Dec. 14, 2022).
    ${ }^{6}$ See 2023 Court Statistics Report, at p. 57 (Superior Courts, Figure 1: Total Filings and Dispositions).

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ The Court Interpreters Program Fund is a restricted fund, and expenses are limited for payments to certified and registered court interpreter employees, contractual court interpreters, and court interpreter coordinators as allowed and prescribed under the Budget Act. Savings remain in the restricted fund and carryover for future use.
    ${ }^{8}$ 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.
    ${ }^{9}$ Sum total difference due to rounding.
    ${ }^{10}$ See footnote 4, supra.
    ${ }^{11}$ 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,

[^3]:    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.
    ${ }^{12}$ Expenditures are limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 25 of the Budget Act of 2021 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. Government Code sections 28020-28085 define county classes based on size of population: counties in classes $1-15$ have populations of more than 290,000; classes $16-31$ have populations between 77,000 and 290,000; and classes 32-58 have populations of fewer than 77,000.
    ${ }^{13}$ 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-80195FA16603B3E7.
    ${ }^{14}$ 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

[^4]:    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).)
    ${ }^{15}$ Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/federal-courtinterpreters.

