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## Executive Summary

The Judicial Council's Language Access Services recommends approving the annual report on trial court interpreter expenditures for submission to the Legislature and the Department of Finance. This report is required by the Budget Act of 2017 (Stats. 2017, ch. 14).

## Recommendation

The Language Access Services recommends that the Judicial Council, effective January 17, 2020:

1. Approve the report to the Legislature summarizing the fiscal year 2017-18 trial court interpreter expenditures as per the requirements of the Budget Act of 2017; and
2. Direct staff to submit the report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance.

The Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2017-18 is included as Attachment A to this report.

## Relevant Previous Council Action

At the Judicial Council business meeting on May 24, 2018, the council approved the Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2016-17 for submission to the Legislature, summarizing the fiscal year 2016-17 trial court interpreter expenditures under the requirements of the Budget Act of 2016 (Stats. 2016, ch. 23), and directed submission of the report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance. The Judicial Council has approved all previous reports submitted in prior years. Copies of previous reports may be accessed at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

## Analysis/Rationale

The Budget Act of 2017, item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund 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)." In fulfillment of that provision, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreters.

## Policy implications

No policy implications are associated with the approval of this report.

## Comments

This report did not circulate for comment.

## Alternatives considered

Preparation and submission of this report is mandated by the annual Budget Act, and thus no alternatives were considered.

## Fiscal and Operational Impacts

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

## Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2017-18
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Report title: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2017-18

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2017 (Stats. 2017, ch. 14)

Date of report: December 3, 2019

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 2017.

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

The total appropriation for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18, including \$87,000 for maintenance of the Court Interpreter Data Collection System, was $\$ 103,632,000$, of which $\$ 103,545,000$ was available for reimbursement of eligible court interpreter expenditures.

The appropriation increased by $\$ 174,000$ over the prior-year appropration of $\$ 103,458,000$ for trial court employee health benefit adjusments related to court interpreters. Total court interpreter expenditures reported for FY 2017-18 eligible for reimbursment from the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 0150037 were $\$ 114,181,943$-an increase of $\$ 8,047,208$, or 7.05 percent, over expenditures in FY 2016-17. Those expenditures exceeded the appropriation by $\$ 10,636,943$.

The expansion of interpreter services for civil matters and increased costs in criminal cases have led to shortfalls that require ongoing resources. It is anticipated that as courts continue to expand interpreter 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 California court interpreters.

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 that 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). 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." ${ }^{1}$

This report outlines the expenditures by court for reimbursable court interpreter services provided by the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2017-18. This 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 2017 (Stats. 2017, ch. 14), 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.

[^0]
## Trial Court Trust Fund Program 150037 Funding for FY 2017-18

- The FY 2017-18 appropriation of $\$ 103,632,000$ included $\$ 174,000$ for trial court employee health benefit adjustments related to court interpreters. The appropriation exceeded the previous year's appropriation of $\$ 103,458,000$ by $\$ 174,000$.
- Funding included $\$ 103,545,000$ for reimbursement of court interpreter costs and $\$ 87,000$ for the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS).
- The total of statewide court interpreter expenditures incurred during FY 2017-18 eligible to be reimbursed from TCTF Program 150037 was $\$ 114,181,943$. (See Attachment 1 for a breakdown of expenditures by court.)
- Because the surplus in the TCTF Program 150037 was depleted, and to address an anticipated shortfall in interpreter funding for FY 2017-18, the Judicial Council requested an increase of $\$ 4.9$ million in expenditure authority.
- Table 1 shows that criminal cases accounted for $\$ 108,580,939$ of the reported expenditures eligible for reimbursement ( 95.09 percent). Civil cases (including domestic violence cases) accounted for $\$ 5,601,004$ of the reported expenditures eligible for reimbursement (4.91 percent).
- Court interpreter reimbursed expenditures exceeded the FY 2017-18 appropriation by \$10,636,943 and increased by $\$ 8,047,208$ over expenditures in FY 2016-17 (7.05 percent) (see table 1 and table 4).

Table 1. Expenditures by case type, FY 2017-18

| Case Type | Amount | Percentage of Total <br> Reimbursement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Criminal (mandated) | \$108,580,939 | 95.09\% |
| 2. Domestic Violence (DV)-reported by courts | \$1,426,150 | 1.25 |
| - Domestic Violence and Family Law with DV | \$951,798 |  |
| - Civil Harassment | \$471,406 |  |
| - Case type not specified | \$2,946 |  |
| 3. Civil-reported by courts | \$4,174,854 | 3.66 |
| - Unlawful Detainer | \$805,659 |  |
| - Parental Termination | \$39,600 |  |
| - Conservatorship/Guardianship | \$191,799 |  |
| - Custody/Visitation | \$105,397 |  |
| - Other Family Law | \$1,995,467 |  |
| - Other Civil | \$475,911 |  |
| - Case type not specified | \$561,021 |  |
| Court reimbursements (sum of 1, 2 \& 3) | \$114,181,943 | 100\% |
| Appropriation available to the courts FY 2017-18 | \$103,545,000 | (Does not include \$87,000 for CIDCS) |
| Amount over appropriation | \$10,636,943 |  |

## 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; ${ }^{3}$ 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 minimum 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 minimum 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. ${ }^{4}$

[^1]Rates paid to contract interpreters often exceed the statewide minimum 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 2017 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. ${ }^{5}$

California employee court interpreters negotiate salaries, benefits, and working conditions regionally. The federal system relies almost exclusively on contract interpreters. By 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 76.4 percent of total interpreter reimbursements in FY 2017-18 (table 2).

Contract interpreter expenditures for FY 2017-18 represented 23.6 percent of total reimbursements (table 2). As a percentage of total expenditures, contractor costs have risen steadily over the past five years (ibid.). 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 $\$ 3,425,642$ (14.6 percent) versus a $\$ 4,621,310$ increase ( 5.6 percent) for court employees. (See Attachment 1.)

[^2]Table 2. Expenditures for certified and registered employee and contract interpreters ${ }^{6}$

| Fiscal Year | $2013-14$ | $2014-15$ | $2015-16$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $2017-18$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Employee- <br> Related Expenditures <br> Percentage of Total | $\$ 75,939,519$ | $\$ 78,573,771$ | $\$ 80,942,575$ | $\$ 82,610,361$ | $\$ 87,231,671$ |
| Total Contractor <br> Expenditures <br> Percentage of Total | $\mathbf{8 4 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 4 0}$ |
| Total Expenditures <br> Percentage Change <br> Over Prior Year | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 , 0 8 9 , 2 1 5}$ | $\$ 15,934,550$ | $\$ 19,489,630$ | $\$ 23,524,630$ | $\$ 26,950,272$ |

FY 2012-13 reimbursements were $\$ 87,808,520$.

## Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

During FY 2017-18, statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled $\$ 4,122,157$, or 3.61 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 percentage of the total reimbursements for court interpreter services.

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

| Fiscal Year | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noncertified | $\$ 1,233,769$ | $\$ 1,493,856$ | $\$ 1,844,648$ | $\$ 2,312,752$ | $\$ 2,715,378$ |
| Expenditures | $1.37 \%$ | $1.58 \%$ | $1.81 \%$ | $2.18 \%$ | $2.38 \%$ |
| Nonregistered | $\$ 745,004$ | $\$ 922,538$ | $\$ 1007,345$ | $\$ 1,267,986$ | $\$ 1,406,780$ |
| Expenditures | $0.83 \%$ | $0.98 \%$ | $1.00 \%$ | $1.19 \%$ | $1.23 \%$ |
| Combined | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 7 8 , 7 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 4 1 6 , 3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 8 5 1 , 9 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 8 0 , 7 8 3}$ | $\$ 4, \mathbf{1 2 2 , 1 5 7}$ |
| Expenditures | $\mathbf{2 . 1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 6 1 \%}$ |

Table 4 lists the top 10 court reimbursements for allowable court interpreter expenditures incurred in FY 2016-17 as compared to those in FY 2017-18.

[^3]Table 4. Distribution of reimbursed expenditures to top 10 courts

| Superior Court | FY 2016-17 <br> Reimbursed Expenditures <br> (\$) | FY 2016-17 Percentage of <br> Statewide Total | FY 2017-18 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$) | FY 2017--18 <br> Percentage of <br> Statewide Total |  | Percentage Change from FY 2016-17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Los Angeles | \$35,572,597 | 33.52\% | \$35,688,712 | 31.26\% | \$116,115 | 0.33\% |
| Orange | 9,949,977 | 9.37 | 10,886,950 | 9.53 | 936,973 | 9.42 |
| San Diego | 5,707,460 | 5.38 | 5,924,143 | 5.19 | 216,683 | 3.80 |
| Santa Clara | 5,642,590 | 5.32 | 7,056,941 | 6.18 | 1,414,351 | 25.07 |
| San <br> Bernardino | 5,380,676 | 5.07 | 5,653,715 | 4.95 | 273,039 | 5.07 |
| Riverside | 4,983,660 | 4.70 | 5,314,665 | 4.65 | 331,005 | 6.64 |
| Alameda | 4,478,964 | 4.22 | 4,994,709 | 4.37 | 515,745 | 11.51 |
| Sacramento | 3,368,510 | 3.17 | 4,083,870 | 3.58 | 715,360 | 21.24 |
| San Francisco | 3,237,672 | 3.05 | 3,372,792 | 2.95 | 135,120 | 4.17 |
| Kern | 3,029,399 | 2.85 | 3,224,330 | 2.82 | 194,931 | 6.43 |
| Subtotal | \$81,351,504 | 76.65\% | \$86,200,827 | 75.49\% | \$4,849,323 | 5.96\% |
| Remaining Courts | 24,783,231 | 23.35 | 27,981,116 | 24.51 | 3,197,885 | 12.90 |
| Statewide Total | \$106,134,735 | 100.00\% | \$114,181,943 | 100.00\% | \$8,047,208 | 7.05\% |

## VI. Conclusion

In FY 2017-18, the state appropriation fell short in providing the courts with enough funding for full reimbursement of their reported allowable court interpreter expenditures. The expansion of interpreter services for civil matters, and increased costs in criminal cases, have led to shortfalls that require ongoing resources. As courts continue to expand interpreter 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 expect to continue to see increases in expenditures for the use of California court interpreters.

## VII. Attachments

1. FY 2017-18 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures-All Case Types
2. FY 2017-18 Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures-Civil Cases

2017-18 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures All Case Types

| Courts | All Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff <br> Interpreter <br>  <br> Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross <br> Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | Interpreter <br> Coordinator <br> Reimbursed <br> Amount | Supervisor Salaries, Benefits \& OE\&E (\$12,500/FTE) | Total <br> Employee- <br> Related Costs |
|  | A | B | C | D | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 3,658,100 | 19,250 | - | 3,677,350 | 357,983 | - | 4,035,333 |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | 9,428 | - | 9,428 |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | 1,537,489 | 2,775 | - | 1,540,263 | 94,494 | - | 1,634,757 |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | 114,395 | 7,820 | - | 122,215 | 25,337 | - | 147,551 |
| Fresno | 1,115,644 | 11,463 | - | 1,127,106 | 162,483 | - | 1,289,589 |
| Glenn | 8,276 | - | - | 8,276 | - | - | 8,276 |
| Humboldt | 112,278 | - | - | 112,278 | - | - | 112,278 |
| Imperial | 378,439 | 318 | - | 378,757 | - | - | 378,757 |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | 3,166 | - | 3,166 |
| Kern | 2,607,077 | 10,793 | - | 2,617,869 | - | - | 2,617,869 |
| Kings | 228,369 | - | - | 228,369 | - | - | 228,369 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | 20,810 | - | 20,810 |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | 24,065 | - | 24,065 |
| Los Angeles | 33,413,737 | 6,131 | 175,332 | 33,595,200 | 70,542 | 341,878 | 34,007,620 |
| Madera | 371,073 | - | - | 371,073 | - | - | 371,073 |
| Marin | 358,495 | 705 | - | 359,200 | 40,343 | - | 399,543 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | 219,306 | 20 | - | 219,326 | - | - | 219,326 |
| Merced | 364,663 | 1,282 | - | 365,945 | - | - | 365,945 |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mono | 3,194 | - | - | 3,194 | 30,781 | - | 33,975 |
| Monterey | 692,343 | 1,807 | - | 694,150 | 42,660 | - | 736,810 |
| Napa | 232,041 | - | - | 232,041 | 56,228 | - | 288,269 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | 19,845 | - | 19,845 |
| Orange | 8,624,073 | 7,185 | 57,619 | 8,688,877 | - | 255,962 | 8,944,839 |
| Placer | 196,333 | 6,813 | 1,834 | 204,980 | 63,025 | - | 268,004 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | 4,305,926 | 7,140 | - | 4,313,066 | 209,306 | - | 4,522,372 |
| Sacramento | 3,016,902 | 13,094 | 260,211 | 3,290,208 | 149,851 | - | 3,440,059 | All Case Types


| Courts | All Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff <br> Interpreter <br>  <br> Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross <br> Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount | Supervisor Salaries, Benefits \& OE\&E $(\$ 12,500 / F T E)$ | Total <br> Employee- <br> Related Costs |
|  | A | B | C | D | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \end{gathered}$ |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino | 4,957,091 | 7,695 | 51,728 | 5,016,514 | 171,827 | - | 5,188,341 |
| San Diego | 4,611,018 | 3,518 | 19,736 | 4,634,272 | 97,116 | 81,549 | 4,812,937 |
| San Francisco | 2,226,856 | - | 11,583 | 2,238,439 | - | - | 2,238,439 |
| San Joaquin | 873,873 | 398 | 49,154 | 923,426 | 104,858 | - | 1,028,284 |
| San Luis Obispo | 492,663 | - | - | 492,663 | - | - | 492,663 |
| San Mateo | 1,152,910 | 456 | - | 1,153,366 | 127,668 | - | 1,281,034 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,263,193 | 2,244 | - | 1,265,437 | - | - | 1,265,437 |
| Santa Clara | 2,735,185 | 1,174 | 110,235 | 2,846,593 | - | - | 2,846,593 |
| Santa Cruz | 716,113 | 58 | - | 716,171 | 45,016 | - | 761,187 |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | 21,955 | - | 21,955 |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano | 228,960 | - | - | 228,960 | 46,169 | - | 275,129 |
| Sonoma | 821,270 | 24 | - | 821,294 | - | - | 821,294 |
| Stanislaus | 245,041 | 729 | - | 245,770 | 40,382 | - | 286,152 |
| Sutter | 114,729 | - | - | 114,729 | 14,516 | - | 129,245 |
| Tehama | 117,435 | 38 | - | 117,473 | 27,173 | - | 144,646 |
| Trinity | - | 683 | - | 683 | 24,413 | - | 25,096 |
| Tulare | 335,847 | - | - | 335,847 | 52,609 | - | 388,455 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | 19,059 | - | 19,059 |
| Ventura | 797,443 | - | - | 797,443 | 121,466 | - | 918,909 |
| Yolo | 69,021 | - | - | 69,021 | 69,021 | - | 138,042 |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | 20,842 | - | 20,842 |
| Total: | 83,316,799 | 113,613 | 737,433 | 84,167,845 | 2,384,437 | 679,389 | 87,231,671 |

2017-18 Total Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures All Case Types

| Courts | All Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Registered Contractor Per 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 | All Cases <br> Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
|  | 1 | J | K | L | M | N | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline P \\ \text { (I thru } 0 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} R \\ (P+Q) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ (\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{R}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 64,950 | 254,369 | 198,493 | 140,218 | 124,992 | - | - | 783,023 | 176,353 | 959,376 | 4,994,709 |
| Alpine | - | 575 | - | - | - | - | - | 575 | 851 | 1,426 | 1,426 |
| Amador | - | 13,752 | - | - | - | - | - | 13,752 | 11,021 | 24,773 | 24,773 |
| Butte | 6,325 | 115,848 | 720 | 4,180 | 2,943 | - | 477 | 130,493 | 96,771 | 227,263 | 227,263 |
| Calaveras | 2,451 | 2,770 | 1,253 | 2,327 | - | 831 | - | 9,631 | 7,295 | 16,926 | 26,354 |
| Colusa | - | 68,630 | - | 750 | - | 900 | - | 70,280 | 27,609 | 97,888 | 97,888 |
| Contra Costa | 62,533 | 729,486 | 19,558 | 112,628 | - | 4,560 | - | 928,766 | 74,301 | 1,003,067 | 2,637,825 |
| Del Norte | - | 37,437 | - | - | - | - | - | 37,437 | 11,861 | 49,298 | 49,298 |
| El Dorado | - | 70,710 | - | - | - | 106 | - | 70,816 | 28,242 | 99,058 | 246,609 |
| Fresno | 17,902 | 285,245 | 7,465 | 96,034 | 51,926 | - | - | 458,571 | 269,551 | 728,122 | 2,017,712 |
| Glenn | - | 39,379 | - | 16,403 | 1,050 | - | - | 56,832 | 29,937 | 86,769 | 95,045 |
| Humboldt | - | 24,126 | - | - | 450 | 2,534 | - | 27,111 | 35,656 | 62,766 | 175,045 |
| Imperial | - | 84,425 | - | - | - | 612 | - | 85,037 | 44,619 | 129,656 | 508,413 |
| Inyo | - | 26,848 | - | - | - | 637 | - | 27,485 | 14,446 | 41,931 | 45,097 |
| Kern | 60,312 | 211,780 | 5,873 | 100,453 | 115,717 | - | - | 494,134 | 112,326 | 606,460 | 3,224,330 |
| Kings | 4,928 | 159,193 | 13,279 | 1,508 | 2,394 | - | - | 181,302 | 58,172 | 239,474 | 467,843 |
| Lake | - | 59,513 | - | - | 1,976 | - | - | 61,488 | 9,591 | 71,079 | 91,889 |
| Lassen | - | 7,390 | - | 1,371 | 282 | - | 4,025 | 13,068 | 6,378 | 19,446 | 43,511 |
| Los Angeles | 342,745 | 316,467 | 301,177 | 344,556 | 18,511 | - | 35,295 | 1,358,750 | 322,342 | 1,681,092 | 35,688,712 |
| Madera | - | 84,956 | - | 46,431 | - | - | - | 131,387 | 54,765 | 186,152 | 557,225 |
| Marin | - | 124,770 | - | 6,365 | - | - | - | 131,135 | 27,657 | 158,792 | 558,335 |
| Mariposa | - | 10,925 | 636 | 276 | 3,032 | - | - | 14,869 | 17,473 | 32,342 | 32,342 |
| Mendocino | 13,513 | 35,645 | 976 | 600 | 6,482 | - | - | 57,216 | 82,737 | 139,953 | 359,279 |
| Merced | 8,525 | 294,001 | 7,512 | 24,235 | 31,005 | - | 56 | 365,334 | 235,600 | 600,934 | 966,879 |
| Modoc | - | 900 | 3,605 | - | - | - | - | 4,505 | 800 | 5,305 | 5,305 |
| Mono | - | 2,090 | - | - | 1,200 | - | - | 3,290 | 6,389 | 9,679 | 43,654 |
| Monterey | 37,241 | 104,909 | 97,599 | 94,574 | 27,450 | - | - | 361,773 | 47,647 | 409,421 | 1,146,230 |
| Napa | - | 298,370 | - | - | - | - | - | 298,370 | 74,944 | 373,314 | 661,583 |
| Nevada | - | 36,983 | - | 1,656 | 3,168 | 742 | - | 42,549 | 10,976 | 53,525 | 73,370 |
| Orange | 151,829 | 987,256 | 67,488 | 221,547 | 439,838 | - | - | 1,867,958 | 74,152 | 1,942,110 | 10,886,950 |
| Placer | 17,060 | 83,878 | 5,708 | 23,110 | 21,138 | 48 | - | 150,943 | 67,356 | 218,299 | 486,303 |
| Plumas | - | 2,124 | - | - | 282 | - | - | 2,406 | 4,054 | 6,460 | 6,460 |
| Riverside | 22,909 | 287,599 | 41,208 | 58,269 | 80,745 | 914 | - | 491,644 | 300,649 | 792,293 | 5,314,665 |
| Sacramento | 88,329 | 213,448 | 57,297 | 119,375 | 21,269 | - | - | 499,717 | 144,094 | 643,811 | 4,083,870 |


| Courts | All Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Registered Contractor Per 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> ContractorRelated Costs | All Cases <br> Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
|  | 1 | J | K | L | M | N | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline P \\ \text { (I thru } 0 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} R \\ (P+Q) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ (\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{R}) \end{gathered}$ |
| San Benito | - | 85,834 | - | 20,172 | - | - | - | 106,006 | - | 106,006 | 106,006 |
| San Bernardino | 33,149 | 148,463 | 40,408 | 40,622 | 155,645 | 915 | 357 | 419,558 | 45,815 | 465,374 | 5,653,715 |
| San Diego | 95,948 | 583,971 | 77,612 | 175,327 | 350 | 1,094 | - | 934,303 | 176,902 | 1,111,205 | 5,924,143 |
| San Francisco | 83,183 | 620,434 | 20,877 | 212,862 | 109,703 | - | - | 1,047,059 | 87,295 | 1,134,354 | 3,372,792 |
| San Joaquin | 49,350 | 454,176 | 27,267 | 89,068 | - | - | - | 619,861 | 97,998 | 717,859 | 1,746,143 |
| San Luis Obispo | 3,364 | 123,521 | 3,441 | 1,057 | 11,001 | - | - | 142,384 | 53,350 | 195,734 | 688,397 |
| San Mateo | 42,336 | 680,347 | 17,854 | 77,892 | 24,253 | 1,496 | - | 844,178 | 193,326 | 1,037,503 | 2,318,537 |
| Santa Barbara | 16,991 | 353,874 | 135,835 | 958 | 10,554 | 36 | - | 518,247 | 130,831 | 649,079 | 1,914,515 |
| Santa Clara | 38,220 | 2,194,376 | 86,618 | 163,404 | 74,108 | - | - | 2,556,726 | 1,653,622 | 4,210,348 | 7,056,941 |
| Santa Cruz | 11,785 | 15,337 | 1,002 | 8,476 | 16,000 | - | - | 52,600 | 6,280 | 58,881 | 820,068 |
| Shasta | 18,831 | 80,230 | 3,083 | 22,349 | 12,994 | 91 | - | 137,578 | 158,631 | 296,209 | 318,164 |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4,889 | 4,889 | 108 | 4,997 | 4,997 |
| Siskiyou | 157 | 35,905 | - | 1,050 | - | 370 | - | 37,482 | 20,702 | 58,183 | 58,183 |
| Solano | 16,014 | 188,777 | 8,205 | 70,502 | 23,135 | - | - | 306,633 | 23,178 | 329,811 | 604,941 |
| Sonoma | 16,590 | 240,397 | 7,344 | 21,553 | 31,709 | 115 | - | 317,708 | 33,565 | 351,273 | 1,172,567 |
| Stanislaus | 21,170 | 388,102 | 14,256 | 145,676 | 29,406 | - | - | 598,609 | 456,948 | 1,055,557 | 1,341,709 |
| Sutter | 2,941 | 45,401 | 566 | 25,762 | 2,695 | 257 | - | 77,622 | 67,179 | 144,801 | 274,046 |
| Tehama | 2,193 | 7,892 | - | - | 2,001 | - | - | 12,086 | 12,868 | 24,954 | 169,600 |
| Trinity | 5,393 | 7,657 | - | - | - | - | - | 13,050 | 14,366 | 27,416 | 52,512 |
| Tulare | 37,024 | 878,653 | 82,671 | 133,977 | 33,131 | - | - | 1,165,456 | 226,184 | 1,391,640 | 1,780,095 |
| Tuolumne | 114 | 8,640 | 175 | 10,113 | 591 | - | - | 19,633 | 12,221 | 31,853 | 50,913 |
| Ventura | 30,075 | 853,386 | 48,780 | 67,954 | - | - | - | 1,000,196 | 82,732 | 1,082,928 | 2,001,836 |
| Yolo | 24,671 | 476,736 | 939 | 9,491 | 17,472 | - | - | 529,309 | 168,843 | 698,153 | 836,195 |
| Yuba | 6,214 | 25,754 | - | 247 | - | 1,094 | - | 33,308 | 14,587 | 47,895 | 68,737 |
| Total: | 1,457,264 | 13,573,657 | 1,406,780 | 2,715,378 | 1,510,597 | 17,353 | 45,098 | 20,726,126 | 6,224,146 | 26,950,272 | 114,181,943 |

Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures

## Civil Cases

| Courts | Staff Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | D |
| Alameda | - | - |  |
| Alpine | - | - |  |
| Amador | - | - |  |
| Butte | - | - |  |
| Calaveras | - | - |  |
| Colusa |  | - |  |
| Contra Costa | - | - |  |
| Del Norte | - | - |  |
| El Dorado | - | - |  |
| Fresno | - | - |  |
| Glenn | - | - |  |
| Humboldt | - | - |  |
| Imperial | 39,279 | - | 39,279 |
| Inyo | - | - |  |
| Kern | - | - |  |
| Kings | - | - |  |
| Lake | - | - |  |
| Lassen | - | - |  |
| Los Angeles | 2,064,911 | - | 2,064,911 |
| Madera | - | - |  |
| Marin | - | - |  |
| Mariposa | - | - |  |
| Mendocino | - | - |  |
| Merced | - | - |  |
| Modoc | - | - |  |
| Mono | - | - |  |
| Monterey | - | - |  |
| Napa | 5,245 | - | 5,245 |
| Nevada | - | - |  |
| Orange | 143,826 | - | 143,826 |
| Placer | - | - |  |
| Plumas | - | - |  |
| Riverside | - | - |  |
| Sacramento | 183,066 | - | 183,066 |
| San Benito | - | - |  |
| San Bernardino | 6,483 | - | 6,483 |
| San Diego | - | - |  |
| San Francisco | - | - |  |
| San Joaquin | 37,955 | - | 37,955 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - |  |
| San Mateo | - | - |  |
| Santa Barbara | - | - |  |
| Santa Clara | 139,872 | - | 139,872 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - |  |
| Shasta |  |  |  |
| Sierra | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou |  | - |  |
| Solano | - | - |  |
| Sonoma | 2,226 | - | 2,226 |

Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures Civil Cases

| Courts | Staff <br> Interpreter <br>  <br> Benefits | Staff <br> Interpreter <br> Travel | Total Staff <br> Interpreter <br> Salaries, <br>  <br> Travel |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stanislaus | 2,429 | - | 2,429 |
| Sutter | - | - | - |
| Tehama | - | - | - |
| Trinity | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | - | - |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - |
| Ventura | - | - | - |
| Yolo | - | - | - |
| Yuba | - | - | - |
| Total: | $\mathbf{2 , 6 2 5 , 2 9 3}$ | - | $\mathbf{2 , 6 2 5 , \mathbf { 2 9 3 }}$ |


| Courts | Interpreter <br> Coordinator <br> Reimbursed <br> Amount | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | NonRegistered Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { ASL } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Total Contractor Per Diems | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs | Civil Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | J | K | L | M | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { (I thru } 0 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} R \\ (P+Q) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} s \\ (H+R) \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | - |  | 1,003 | 2,188 |  | 3,046 | 1,806 | 8,044 | 1,693 | 9,737 | 9,737 |
| Alpine | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Amador | - | - | - | 1,824 | - | - | - | 1,824 | 913 | 2,737 | 2,737 |
| Butte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Colusa | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Contra Costa | - | - | 10,271 | 105,781 | 2,988 | 22,917 | - | 141,957 | 13,048 | 155,005 | 155,005 |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Fresno | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Humboldt |  |  |  | 1,470 | - | - | - | 1,470 | 2,965 | 4,434 | 4,434 |
| Imperial | - | 39,279 | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 39,279 |
| Inyo | - | - | - | 5,680 | - | - | - | 5,680 | 3,082 | 8,761 | 8,761 |
| Kern | - | - | - | 105,208 | - | - | - | 105,208 | - | 105,208 | 105,208 |
| Kings | - | - | 4,928 | 10,882 | 2,498 |  | 210 | 18,518 | - | 18,518 | 18,518 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Los Angeles | - | 2,064,911 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,064,911 |
| Madera | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | 157 | - | - | - | 157 | 240 | 397 | 397 |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Merced | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Monterey | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Napa | - | 5,245 | - | 6,750 | - | - | - | 6,750 | 1,688 | 8,438 | 13,683 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Orange | - | 143,826 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 143,826 |
| Placer | - | - | 1,511 | 6,629 | 450 | 2,076 | 5,240 | 15,906 | 8,533 | 24,439 | 24,439 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Sacramento | - | 183,066 | 21,705 | 40,055 | 21,776 | 21,240 | 6,658 | 111,434 | 32,981 | 144,415 | 327,481 |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| San Bernardino | - | 6,483 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6,483 |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - - | - | - - | - |  | - | - |  |
| San Francisco | - | - | 14,662 | 90,983 | 3,335 | 77,687 | 9,567 | 196,234 | 24,043 | 220,277 | 220,277 |
| San Joaquin | - | 37,955 | 1,595 | 42,032 | 2,270 | 5,682 | - | 51,579 | 7,949 | 59,528 | 97,483 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - |  |  | - - |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| San Mateo | - | - | 580 | 84,444 | 470 | 4,519 | 2,800 | 92,812 | 19,997 | 112,809 | 112,809 |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | 5,639 | 76,811 | 10,049 | 141 | 3,307 | 95,947 | 18,594 | 114,541 | 114,541 |
| Santa Clara | - | 139,872 | 1,817 | 5,621 | 3,637 | 6,797 | 732 | 18,604 | 3,132 | 21,736 | 161,608 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - - | - - | - - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Shasta |  | - | 591 | 18,997 | 1,600 |  | 8,007 | 29,195 | 32,811 | 62,006 | 62,006 |
| Sierra | - | - | - |  | - | - - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | 2,433 | - | 350 | - | 2,783 | 1,779 | 4,562 | 4,562 |
| Solano | - | - | 1,891 | 24,775 | 1,389 | 9,725 | 3,195 | 40,975 | 3,280 | 44,255 | 44,255 |
| Sonoma | - | 2,226 | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - | 2,226 |

## Trial Court Interpreter Reimbursed Expenditures

| Courts | Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | Certified Contractor Per Diems | NonRegistered Contractor Per Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { ASL } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Total } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals \& Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs | Civil Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stanislaus | 4,997 | 7,426 | 4,146 | 96,009 | 4,745 | 14,502 | 6,650 | 126,052 | 95,908 | 221,960 | 229,386 |
| Sutter | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Tehama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Tulare | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Tuolumne | - | - | 114 | 440 | 175 |  | 591 | 1,320 |  | 1,320 | 1,320 |
| Ventura | - | - | 3,854 | 158,912 | 8,370 | 10,728 | - | 181,863 | 14,639 | 196,502 | 196,502 |
| Yolo |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yuba | - | - | 478 | 1,533 | - | - | - | 2,011 | 967 | 2,978 | 2,978 |
| Total: | 4,997 | 2,630,289 | 74,785 | 889,612 | 63,753 | 179,410 | 48,763 | 1,256,323 | 288,242 | 1,544,565 | 4,174,854 |


[^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]:    ${ }^{3}$ Limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 3, of the Budget Act of 2017 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 2017 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.
    ${ }^{4}$ 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).)

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts
    /UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ 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 indigent parties in civil cases as authorized by the Judicial Council in January 2014 and later updated in light of the enactment of Assembly Bill 1657. Itemization by interpreter category was unavailable for purposes of this analysis.

