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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 2019 (Stats. 2019, ch. 23).

## Recommendation

Language Access Services recommends that the Judicial Council, effective May 21, 2021:

1. Approve the report to the Legislature summarizing the fiscal year 2019-20 trial court interpreter expenditures as required by the Budget Act of 2019; 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 2019-20 is included as Attachment A to this report.

## Relevant Previous Council Action

Judicial Council circulating order CO-20-01, dated April 8, 2020, requested approval of the Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2018-19 and other items that were on the consent agenda of the Judicial Council business meeting on March 24, 2020, which was cancelled in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. By April 15, 2020, the council approved the fiscal year 2018-19 report for submission to the Legislature, which summarized the fiscal year 2018-19 trial court interpreter expenditures under the requirements of the Budget Act of 2018 (Stats. 2018, ch. 29), 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 2019, item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 4 states that " $[t]$ he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4)." 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 2019-20
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Report title: Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2019 (Stats. 2019, ch. 23)

Date of report: May 21, 2021

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance in accordance with provision 4 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2019 .

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

The total appropriation for fiscal year (FY) 2019-20, including \$87,000 for maintenance of the Court Interpreter Data Collection System, was $\$ 120,686,000$, of which $\$ 120,599,000$ was available for reimbursement of eligible court interpreter expenditures.

The appropriation increased by $\$ 874,000$ for trial court employee health benefit adjustments and $\$ 1,288,000$ for court interpreters for new judges, converted the one-time $\$ 4$ million in funding from FY 2018-19 to ongoing funding, and added $\$ 9,564,000$ in ongoing funding through a budget change proposal. Total court interpreter expenditures reported for FY 2019-20 eligible for reimbursement from Trial Court Trust Fund Program 0150037 were $\$ 121,969,330$-a decrease of $\$ 902,991$, or -0.73 percent, over expenditures in FY 2018-19. Expenditures for FY 20192020 exceeded the appropriation by $\$ 1,370,330$.

In FY 2019-20, the state appropriation fell short in providing the courts with enough funding for full reimbursement of their reported allowable court interpreter expenditures, although not to the extent of prior years. Over $\$ 13$ million was added to the annual appropriation for the fund on an ongoing basis through budget change proposal efforts, which along with the appropriate use of technology will help with future efforts to stabilize the fund.

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 English proficient] court users in all courtroom proceedings and, by 2020, in all court-ordered, court-operated events."

This report outlines the expenditures by court for reimbursable court interpreter services provided by the courts for fiscal year (FY) 2019-20. 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 2019 (Stats. 2019, ch. 23), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides an appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for the services of court interpreters. Provision 4 states that " $[t]$ he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4)." Consistent with these requirements, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreter services.

[^0]
## Trial Court Trust Fund Program 150037 Funding for FY 2019-20

- The FY 2019-20 appropriation of $\$ 120.686$ million included an additional $\$ 874,000$ for trial court employee health benefit adjustments related to court interpreters and $\$ 1.288$ million for court interpreters for new judges, converted the one-time $\$ 4$ million from FY 2018-19 to ongoing funding, and added $\$ 9.564$ million in ongoing funding through a budget change proposal to further advance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts.
- Funding included $\$ 120.599$ million 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 2019-20 eligible to be reimbursed from TCTF Program 150037 was $\$ 121.969$ million. (See Attachment A for an expenditure overview for FY 2019-20 and Attachment B for a breakdown of expenditures by court.)
- Because the surplus in TCTF Program 150037 was depleted, and to address an anticipated shortfall in interpreter funding for FY 2019-20, the Judicial Council requested an increase of $\$ 13.542$ million in expenditure authority.
- Table 1 shows that mandated cases accounted for $\$ 116.241$ million of the reported expenditures eligible for reimbursement ( 95 percent). ${ }^{3}$ Civil cases (including domestic violence cases) accounted for $\$ 5.728$ million of the reported expenditures eligible for reimbursement ( 5 percent).
- Court interpreter reimbursed expenditures exceeded the FY 2019-20 appropriation by $\$ 1.370$ million and decreased by $\$ 902,991$ over expenditures in FY 2018-19 (-0.73 percent) (see table 1 and table 4).
- During FY 2019-20, the COVID-19 pandemic affected court services, including reducing court operations. ${ }^{4}$

Table 1. Expenditures by case type, FY 2019-20

| Case Type | Amount | Percentage of Total <br> Reimbursement |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 1. Mandated | $\$ 116,241,477$ | $95 \%$ |
| 2. Domestic Violence-reported by courts | $\$ 1,433,168$ | $1 \%$ |
| 3. Civil-reported by courts | $\$ 4,294,685$ | $4 \%$ |
| Court reimbursements (sum of $\mathbf{1 , 2} \& \mathbf{3}$ ) | $\$ 121,969,330$ | $100 \%$ |
| Appropriation available to the courts FY 2019-20 | $\$ 120,599,000$ | (Does not include <br> $\$ 87,000$ for CIDCS) |
| Amount over appropriation | $\$ 1,370,330$ |  |

[^1]
## 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; ${ }^{5}$
- Court interpreter coordinators who are certified or registered court interpreters, including salaries and benefits; ${ }^{6}$ 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.

Individual California courts negotiate rates with independent contractors on a case-by-case basis, and rates paid to contract interpreters have often exceeded the statewide standards. For languages other than Spanish, including rare languages or even certified languages with an insufficient number of interpreters for the state, the costs of court interpreter services for contract court interpreters may vary dramatically across the state. These wide variations in contractor costs, often well above the statewide standards, have partly contributed to the rise in court interpreter expenditures over the past five years, as described in section IV below.
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## Certified and Registered Contract Court Interpreters

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

## Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

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

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

## Comparison With Federal Rates

Provision 4 of item 0250-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2019 states, "[T]he Judicial Council shall set statewide or regional rates and policies for payment of court interpreters, not to exceed the rate paid to certified interpreters in the federal court system." The current federal rate for certified and registered contract court interpreters is $\$ 418$ for a full day, $\$ 226$ for a half day, and $\$ 59$ per hour for overtime. The federal rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters is $\$ 202$ for a full day and $\$ 111$ for a half day. ${ }^{10}$

Court interpreters who are California court employees 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.
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## 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 78.4 percent of total interpreter reimbursements in FY 2019-20. Contract interpreter expenditures in FY 2019-20 represented 21.6 percent of total reimbursements, which is a decrease from FY 2018-19, when contractor expenses were 24.83 percent of the total expenditures (table 2). Compared to FY 2018-19, expenditures for contract interpreters in FY 2019-20 decreased by $\$ 4.170$ million ( $-3.28 \%$ ) and expenditures for court employees in FY 2019-20 increased by $\$ 3.267$ million (+3.23\%). (Ibid.)

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

| Fiscal Year | 2015-16 |  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Employee- <br> Related Expenditures <br> Percentage of Total | $\$ 80,942,575$ | $\$ 82,610,361$ | $\$ 87,231,671$ | $\$ 92,362,074$ | $\$ 95,629,396$ |  |
| Total Contractor <br> Expenditures | $\mathbf{8 0 . 5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 4 \%}$ |  |
| Percentage of Total | $\mathbf{\$ 1 9 , 4 8 9 , 6 3 0}$ | $\$ 23,524,630$ | $\$ 26,950,272$ | $\$ 30,510,247$ | $\$ 26,339,933$ |  |
| Total Expenditures <br> Percentage Change <br> Over Prior Year | $\$ 100,432,20$ | $\$ 106,134,73$ | $\$ 114,181,94$ | $\$ 122,872,321$ | $\$ 121,969,330$ |  |

FY 2014-15 total reimbursements were $\$ 94,508,321$.

## Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

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

During FY 2019-20, statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled $\$ 4.162$ million, or 3.41 percent of total statewide expenditures. This is a decrease from FY 2018-19, when these expenditures were 4.06 percent of the total.

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

| Fiscal Year | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noncertified Expenditures | \$1,844,648 | \$2,312,752 | \$2,715,378 | \$3,195,466 | \$2,577,711 |
|  | 1.81\% | 2.18\% | 2.38\% | 2.60\% | 2.11\% |
| Nonregistered Expenditures | \$1,007,345 | \$1,267,986 | \$1,406,780 | \$1,788,983 | \$1,584,072 |
|  | 1.00\% | 1.19\% | 1.23\% | 1.46\% | 1.30\% |
| Combined Expenditures | \$2,851,993 | \$3,580,783 | \$4,122,157 | \$4,984,449 | \$4,161,783 |
|  | 2.84\% | 3.37\% | 3.61\% | 4.06\% | 3.41\% |

Table 4 lists and compares the top 10 court reimbursements for allowable court interpreter expenditures incurred in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20.

Table 4. Distribution of reimbursed expenditures to top 10 courts

| Superior Court | FY 2018-19 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$) | FY 2018-19 Percentage of Statewide Total | FY 2019-20 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$) | FY 2019-20 <br> Percentage of Statewide Total | \$ <br> Change from FY 2018-19 | Percentage Change from FY 2018-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Los Angeles | \$38,540,226 | 31.37\% | \$39,032,884 | 32.0\% | \$492,658 | 1.28\% |
| Orange | 10,734,638 | 8.74 | 10,058,682 | 8.25\% | -675,956 | -6.30\% |
| Santa Clara | 7,289,792 | 5.93 | 5,846,426 | 4.79\% | -1,443,366 | -19.80\% |
| San <br> Bernardino | 6,074,705 | 4.94 | 6,157,161 | 5.05\% | 82,456 | 1.36\% |
| San Diego | 6,024,074 | 4.90 | 6,178,018 | 5.07\% | 153,944 | 2.56\% |
| Alameda | 5,491,760 | 4.47 | 5,360,994 | 4.40\% | -130,766 | -2.38\% |
| Riverside | 5,301,396 | 4.31 | 6,130,551 | 5.03\% | 829,155 | 15.64\% |
| Sacramento | 4,345,704 | 3.54 | 4,336,528 | 3.56\% | -9,176 | -0.21\% |
| San Francisco | 3,840,708 | 3.13 | 3,771,960 | 3.09\% | -68,748 | -1.79\% |
| Kern | 3,646,134 | 2.97 | 3,957,861 | 3.24\% | 311,727 | 8.55\% |
| Subtotal | \$91,289,137 | 74.30\% | \$90,831,065 | 74.47\% | -\$458,072 | -0.50\% |
| Remaining Courts | 31,583,184 | 25.70 | 31,138,265 | 25.53\% | -444,877 | -1.41\% |
| Statewide Total | \$122,872,321 | 100.00\% | \$121,969,330 | 100.00\% | -\$902,950 | -0.73\% |

## V. Conclusion

In FY 2019-20, the state appropriation fell short in providing the courts with enough funding for full reimbursement of their reported allowable court interpreter expenditures, although not to the extent of prior years. Over $\$ 13$ million was added to the annual appropriation for the fund on an ongoing basis through budget change proposal efforts, which along with the appropriate use of
technology will help with future efforts to stabilize the fund. The expansion of interpreter services for civil matters and increased costs in mandated 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, the program will continue to experience increases in expenditures for the use of California court interpreters.

## VI. Attachments

1. Attachment A: FY 2019-20 Court Interpreter Program 0150037: Expenditure Overview
2. Attachment B: FY 2019-20 Final Reimbursed Expenditures: Court Interpreter Program 0150037

## 2019-2020 Court Interpreter Program 0150037

## Expenditure Overview

| 1. Total Mandated Criminal | $\$$ | $116,241,477$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2. Total Domestic Violence reported by courts: | $\$$ | $1,433,168$ |
| 3. Total Civil reported by courts: | $\$$ | $4,294,685$ |
| Court Total Reimbursements (sum of 1, 2, 3) | $\$$ | $121,969,330$ |
| Court Interpreter Data Collection System | $\$$ | 87,000 |
| Total Expenditures | $\$$ | $122,056,330$ |

2019-20 Final Reimbursed Expenditures: Court Interpreter Program 0150037

|  | All Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All CasesTotal ReimbursedExpenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | cip <br> Arbitration Awards | Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount | Supervisor Salaries, Benefits \& OE\&E ( $\$ 12,500 /$ FTE $)$ | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Registered } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Certified Contractor Per Diems | Non- <br> Registered <br> Contractor Per <br> Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { ASL } \\ \hline \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs |  |
|  | A | B | c | D | E | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 | J | к | 1 | M | N | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P } \\ \text { (I thru } 0 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{R} \\ (\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{Q}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} s \\ (H+R) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 4,301,208 | 8,057 |  | 4,309,265 |  | - |  | 4,309,265 | 127,058 | 312,401 | 117,271 | 167,239 | 146,737 |  |  | 870,705 | 181,024 | 1,051,729 | 5,360,994 |
| Alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amador |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32,494 | 8,000 |  | 300 |  |  | 40,794 | 15,412 | 56,206 | 56,206 |
| Butte |  |  |  |  |  | 29,887 |  | 29,887 | 226 | 112,062 |  | 313 | 3,042 | 125 |  | 115,769 | 51,382 | 167,150 | 197,038 |
| Calaveras | 21,269 |  |  | 21,269 |  |  |  | 21,269 | 1,890 | 27,474 |  | 7,077 | 1,411 | 993 |  | 38,845 | 14,519 | 53,364 | 74,633 |
| Colusa | 31,332 |  |  | 31,332 |  |  |  | 31,332 |  | 68,219 |  | 250 |  | 900 |  | 69,369 | 34,058 | 103,427 | 134,759 |
| Contra Costa | 2,122,005 | 2,608 |  | 2,124,613 |  |  |  | 2,124,613 | 145,294 | 641,169 | 52,984 | 133,114 |  | 1,273 |  | 973,834 | 84,542 | 1,058,376 | 3,182,989 |
| Del Norte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,459 |  |  |  |  |  | 50,459 | 2,890 | 53,349 | 53,349 |
| El Dorado |  |  |  |  |  | 27,041 |  | 27,041 |  | 124,361 |  |  |  | 481 |  | 124,842 | 55,481 | 180,322 | 207,363 |
| Fresno | 1,349,887 | 10,884 |  | 1,360,770 |  |  |  | 1,360,770 | 20,378 | 284,531 | 12,543 | 41,162 | 42,455 | 693 |  | 401,762 | 369,107 | 770,869 | 2,131,639 |
| Glenn |  |  | - |  |  | 12,307 |  | 12,307 |  | 61,433 |  |  |  |  |  | 61,433 | 40,526 | 101,959 | 114,266 |
| Humboldt | 23,086 |  |  | 23,086 |  | - |  | 23,086 |  | 102,545 |  | 526 |  | 631 |  | 103,703 | 57,380 | 161,083 | 184,169 |
| Imperial | 447,101 | 148 |  | 447,249 |  |  |  | 447,249 |  | 76,935 |  |  |  | 265 |  | 77,200 | 56,383 | 133,583 | 580,832 |
| Inyo | 21,842 |  |  | 21,842 |  |  |  | 21,842 |  | 36,255 |  |  |  | 606 |  | 36,861 | 21,089 | 57,951 | 79,793 |
| Kern | 2,613,374 | 22,003 |  | 2,635,376 |  |  |  | 2,635,376 | 46,734 | 599,152 | 156,786 | 197,740 | 123,430 |  |  | 1,123,842 | 198,642 | 1,322,484 | 3,957,861 |
| Kings | 210,647 | 912 | - | 211,559 |  |  |  | 211,559 |  | 223,163 | 8,499 | 175 | 1,676 |  |  | 233,513 | 99,267 | 332,781 | 544,340 |
| Lake | 16,868 |  | - | 16,868 |  | - |  | 16,868 | - | 96,292 |  |  | 14,395 |  |  | 110,687 | 6,878 | 117,566 | 134,433 |
| Lassen |  |  |  |  |  | 25,822 |  | 25,822 |  | 13,747 |  | 1,852 |  |  | 204 | 15,803 | 13,311 | 29,113 | 54,935 |
| Los Angeles | 37,108,518 | 405 | 146,170 | 37,255,093 |  | 115,592 | 346,425 | 37,717,110 | 126,246 | 91,527 | 289,945 | 354,944 | 50,583 |  | 135,120 | 1,048,365 | 267,409 | 1,315,774 | 39,032,884 |
| Madera | 495,472 |  |  | 495,472 |  |  |  | 495,472 |  | 38,038 |  | 22,205 |  |  |  | 60,243 | 22,489 | 82,732 | 578,204 |
| Marin | 451,742 | 84 | - | 451,826 |  | 48,289 |  | 500,115 | - | 122,624 |  | 24,400 | - |  |  | 147,025 | 20,768 | 167,792 | 667,907 |
| Mariposa |  |  | - |  |  | - | - |  |  | 12,045 |  |  |  |  | - | 12,045 | 9,856 | 21,901 | 21,901 |
| Mendocino | 120,497 | 19 |  | 120,516 |  |  |  | 120,516 | 508 | 91,697 |  | 1,652 | 32,558 |  |  | 126,415 | 171,390 | 297,805 | 418,321 |
| Merced | 393,925 | 71 |  | 393,996 |  |  |  | 393,996 | 11,272 | 389,759 | 3,401 | 19,625 | 28,589 |  | 60 | 452,705 | 242,939 | 695,645 | 1,089,640 |
| Modoc |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 420 | 2,485 |  |  |  |  | 2,916 | 594 | 3,510 | 3,510 |
| Mono | 38,358 | 16 | - | 38,374 |  | - | - | 38,374 |  | 7,170 |  |  |  | 452 |  | 7,622 | 9,537 | 17,160 | 55,533 |
| Monterey | 1,099,414 | 529 | - | 1,099,942 |  |  |  | 1,099,942 | 9,277 | 58,924 | 51,425 | 135,398 | 38,359 |  |  | 293,382 | 16,671 | 310,053 | 1,409,995 |
| Napa | 282,671 |  |  | 282,671 |  | 58,810 |  | 341,481 |  | 277,282 |  | 300 |  | 4,384 |  | 281,966 | 76,040 | 358,006 | 699,487 |
| Nevada | 19,641 |  |  | 19,641 |  |  |  | 19,641 | 508 | 23,620 |  | 13,448 | 1,364 | 352 |  | 39,293 | 8,653 | 47,945 | 67,586 |
| Orange | 8,675,020 | 14,821 | 39,406 | 8,729,247 |  |  | 293,935 | 9,023,182 | 52,959 | 493,830 | 84,880 | 129,068 | 170,160 |  |  | 930,897 | 104,603 | 1,035,500 | 10,058,682 |
| Placer | 186,676 | 1,843 | - | 188,519 |  | 33,847 |  | 222,366 | 9,774 | 155,109 | 4,303 | 14,463 | 16,438 |  |  | 200,086 | 54,601 | 254,687 | 477,053 |
| Plumas | 114 |  |  | 114 |  |  |  | 114 |  | 4,039 |  |  | 282 | 24 |  | 4,345 | 6,987 | 11,332 | 11,446 |
| Riverside | 4,812,465 | 8,365 |  | 4,820,830 |  | 332,630 |  | 5,153,459 | 24,007 | 334,618 | 79,086 | 79,432 | 125,192 | 693 |  | 643,027 | 334,065 | 977,092 | 6,130,551 |
| Sacramento | 3,352,201 | 48,320 |  | 3,400,521 |  |  | - | 3,400,521 | 103,066 | 430,126 | 31,541 | 79,382 | 89,556 |  |  | 733,671 | 202,336 | 936,007 | 4,336,528 |
| San Benito |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80,980 |  | 12,767 |  | 1,146 |  | 94,893 | 4,778 | 99,671 | 99,671 |
| San Bernardino | 5,497,397 | 14,232 | 25,155 | 5,536,784 |  | 210,359 |  | 5,747,143 | 25,577 | 157,236 | 27,766 | 62,056 | 92,406 | 1,338 |  | 366,379 | 43,640 | 410,019 | 6,157,161 |
| San Diego | 5,061,316 | 1,821 | 2,017 | 5,065,154 |  | 118,596 | 72,709 | 5,256,459 | 102,404 | 456,361 | 57,147 | 154,764 |  | 1,259 |  | 771,935 | 149,623 | 921,559 | 6,178,018 |
| San Francisco | 2,905,594 | 11,806 |  | 2,917,400 |  |  |  | 2,917,400 | 62,135 | 376,119 |  | 243,949 | 87,275 |  |  | 769,479 | 85,081 | 854,560 | 3,771,960 |
| San Joaquin | 687,749 | 2,424 | 50,224 | 740,397 |  | 144,317 |  | 884,714 | 33,411 | 532,392 | 40,659 | 99,441 |  |  |  | 705,903 | 99,171 | 805,074 | 1,689,788 |
| San Luis Obispo | 502,325 | 2,923 | - | 505,248 |  |  |  | 505,248 | 65,345 | 152,808 | 5,164 | 6,693 | 67,200 |  |  | 297,211 | 151,811 | 449,022 | 954,270 |
| San Mateo | 994,505 | 174 | - | 994,679 |  | 145,572 | - | 1,140,251 | 63,754 | 924,398 | 47,066 | 122,758 | 5,650 |  | $(57,099)$ | 1,106,527 | 419,542 | 1,526,068 | 2,666,320 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,396,362 | 255 |  | 1,396,616 |  |  |  | 1,396,616 | 12,148 | 340,808 | 183,955 |  | 6,906 | 61 |  | 543,877 | 103,434 | 647,311 | 2,043,928 |
| Santa Clara | 3,175,296 | 748 | 103,783 | 3,279,827 |  | 147,040 |  | 3,426,867 | 57,814 | 1,281,523 | 85,761 | 108,302 | 36,795 |  |  | 1,570,195 | 849,364 | 2,419,559 | 5,846,426 |
| Santa Cruz | 744,199 | 927 |  | 745,126 |  | 97,519 |  | 842,644 | 14,559 | 46,555 | 3,002 | 42,684 | 30,431 |  |  | 137,231 | 13,606 | 150,836 | 993,481 |
| Shasta | 93,073 | - | - | 93,073 | - | - | - | 93,073 | 23,827 | 59,983 | 1,400 | 17,578 | 22,461 | 15 | - | 125,263 | 135,593 | 260,856 | 353,929 |
| Sierra |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Siskiyou |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28,095 |  | 725 |  | 335 |  | 29,155 | 16,223 | 45,377 | 45,377 |
| Solano | 274,353 |  |  | 274,353 |  | 53,754 |  | 328,107 | 6,843 | 205,236 | 21,096 | 44,427 | 23,689 |  |  | 301,292 | 35,078 | 336,370 | 664,477 |
| Sonoma | 914,280 |  |  | 914,280 |  |  |  | 914,280 | 43,057 | 544,212 | 34,431 | 33,306 | 55,440 | 20 |  | 710,465 | 147,489 | 857,954 | 1,772,234 |
| Stanislaus | 363,006 | 948 | - | 363,954 |  |  |  | 363,954 | 48,780 | 504,448 | 11,720 | 65,060 | 31,312 | 2,600 |  | 663,920 | 455,412 | 1,119,332 | 1,483,286 |
| Sutter | 156,121 |  | - | 156,121 |  | 1,655 |  | 157,776 | 2,895 | 47,265 | 284 | 29,433 | 6,735 | 518 |  | 87,131 | 52,983 | 140,114 | 297,890 |
| Tehama | 127,016 |  |  | 127,016 |  | 28,448 |  | 155,464 | 1,354 | 9,827 |  |  | 282 |  |  | 11,463 | 11,818 | 23,281 | 178,745 |
| Trinity | 28,491 |  | - | 28,491 |  |  |  | 28,491 | 1,804 | 16,757 |  |  |  |  | - | 18,561 | 23,910 | 42,471 | 70,962 |
| Tulare | 407,138 |  |  | 407,138 |  |  |  | 407,138 | 27,569 | 810,825 | 75,613 | 49,079 | 23,253 |  |  | 986,339 | 194,030 | 1,180,369 | 1,587,507 |
| Tuolumne | 21,752 |  |  | 21,752 |  |  |  | 21,752 |  | 22,513 |  | 4,135 | 264 |  |  | 26,913 | 2,533 | 29,446 | 51,198 |
| Ventura | 932,558 | 851 |  | 933,409 |  | 127,095 |  | 1,060,505 | 16,261 | 749,970 | 63,662 | 40,579 |  |  |  | 870,473 | 56,171 | 926,644 | 1,987,149 |
| Yolo | 156,937 |  |  | 156,937 |  |  |  | 156,937 | 29,968 | 484,066 | 21,860 | 15,046 | 9,928 |  |  | 560,868 | 184,828 | 745,695 | 902,632 |
| Yuba |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,845 | 39,553 | 340 | 1,163 | 847 | 2,552 |  | 50,300 | 13,794 | 64,094 | 64,094 |
| Total: | 92,634,800 | 156,193 | 366,755 | 93,157,748 |  | 1,758,579 | 713,069 | 95,629,396 | 1,324,559 | 13,265,451 | 1,584,072 | 2,577,711 | 1,387,403 | 21,714 | 78,284 | 20,239,194 | 6,100,740 | 26,339,934 | 121,969,330 |


|  | Mandated Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mandated Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | Staff Interpreter Travel | Staff Cross Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | CIP Arbitration Awards | Interpreter <br> Coordinator <br> Reimbursed <br> Amount | Supervisor <br> Salaries, <br>  <br> OE\&E <br> (\$12,500/FTE) | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | Registered Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Certified } \\ \hline \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Non- Registered Contractor Per Diems | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Non-Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}\right.$ | ASL Contractor Per Diems | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs | Mandated Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
|  | A | B | c | D | E | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (D+E+F+G) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | J | к | L | M | N | o | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { (I thru } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} R \\ (P+Q) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} s \\ (H+R) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | 4,301,208 | 8,057 |  | 4,309,265 |  |  |  | 4,309,265 | 117,182 | 282,926 | 105,122 | 149,248 | 139,674 |  |  | 794,152 | 161,750 | 955,902 | 5,265,167 |
| Alpine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amador |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30,589 | 4,250 |  |  |  |  | 34,839 | 13,912 | 48,752 | 48,752 |
| Butte |  |  |  |  |  | 29,887 |  | 29,887 | 226 | 86,853 |  | 313 | 3,042 | 125 |  | 90,560 | 39,732 | 130,292 | 160,179 |
| Calaveras | 21,269 |  |  | 21,269 |  |  |  | 21,269 | 1,890 | 27,474 |  | 7,077 | 1,411 | 993 |  | 38,845 | 14,519 | 53,364 | 74,633 |
| Colusa | 31,332 |  |  | 31,332 |  |  |  | 31,332 |  | 68,219 |  | 250 |  | 900 |  | 69,369 | 34,058 | 103,427 | 134,759 |
| Contra Costa | 2,122,005 | 2,608 |  | 2,124,613 |  |  |  | 2,124,613 | 124,374 | 493,359 | 42,057 | 103,709 |  | 1,273 |  | 764,773 | 63,631 | 828,404 | 2,953,017 |
| Del Norte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,459 |  |  |  |  |  | 50,459 | 2,890 | 53,349 | 53,349 |
| El Dorado |  |  |  |  |  | 27,041 |  | 27,041 |  | 95,744 |  |  |  |  |  | 95,744 | 39,631 | 135,374 | 162,415 |
| Fresno | 1,349,887 | 10,884 |  | 1,360,770 |  |  |  | 1,360,770 | 20,378 | 284,531 | 12,543 | 41,162 | 42,455 | 693 |  | 401,762 | 369,107 | 770,869 | 2,131,639 |
| Glenn |  |  |  |  |  | 12,307 |  | 12,307 |  | 45,294 |  |  |  |  |  | 45,294 | 27,548 | 72,843 | 85,149 |
| Humboldt | 23,086 |  |  | 23,086 |  |  |  | 23,086 |  | 93,024 |  | 526 |  | 631 |  | 94,181 | 52,066 | 146,247 | 169,334 |
| Imperial | 414,009 | 148 |  | 414,158 |  |  |  | 414,158 |  | 76,935 |  |  |  | 265 |  | 77,200 | 56,383 | 133,583 | 547,741 |
| Inyo | 21,842 |  |  | 21,842 |  |  |  | 21,842 |  | 25,341 |  |  |  | 606 |  | 25,947 | 14,187 | 40,134 | 61,977 |
| Kern | 2,613,374 | 22,003 |  | 2,635,376 |  |  |  | 2,635,376 | 46,734 | 599,152 | 3,090 | 197,740 | 123,430 |  |  | 970,146 | 198,642 | 1,168,788 | 3,804,165 |
| Kings | 210,647 | 912 |  | 211,559 |  |  |  | 211,559 |  | 194,657 | 5,627 | 175 | 787 | - |  | 201,246 | 87,271 | 288,517 | 500,076 |
| Lake | 16,868 |  |  | 16,868 |  |  |  | 16,868 |  | 96,292 |  |  | 14,395 | - |  | 110,687 | 6,878 | 117,566 | 134,433 |
| Lassen |  |  |  |  |  | 25,822 |  | 25,822 |  | 13,747 |  | 1,852 |  |  | 204 | 15,803 | 13,311 | 29,113 | 54,935 |
| Los Angeles | 35,200,053 | 405 | 146,170 | 35,346,628 |  | 115,592 | 346,425 | 35,808,645 | 122,552 | 83,657 | 276,790 | 338,070 | 47,681 |  | 135,120 | 1,003,870 | 267,409 | 1,271,279 | 37,079,924 |
| Madera | 495,472 |  |  | 495,472 |  |  |  | 495,472 |  | 38,038 |  | 22,205 |  | - |  | 60,243 | 22,489 | 82,732 | 578,204 |
| Marin | 451,742 | 84 |  | 451,826 |  | 48,289 |  | 500,115 |  | 105,864 |  | 19,535 |  | - |  | 125,399 | 17,760 | 143,159 | 643,274 |
| Mariposa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,045 |  |  |  | - |  | 12,045 | 9,856 | 21,901 | 21,901 |
| Mendocino | 120,497 | 6 |  | 120,503 |  |  |  | 120,503 | 508 | 61,988 |  | 452 | 28,947 |  |  | 91,895 | 128,102 | 219,997 | 340,500 |
| Merced | 393,925 | 71 |  | 393,996 |  |  |  | 393,996 | 10,119 | 376,459 | 3,401 | 18,779 | 26,689 |  | 60 | 435,506 | 234,754 | 670,260 | 1,064,256 |
| Modoc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 420 | 2,485 |  |  |  |  | 2,916 | 594 | 3,510 | 3,510 |
| Mono | 36,292 |  |  | 36,292 |  |  |  | 36,292 |  | 6,666 |  |  |  | 452 |  | 7,118 | 9,217 | 16,335 | 52,627 |
| Monterey | 1,099,414 | 529 |  | 1,099,942 |  |  |  | 1,099,942 | 9,277 | 58,924 | 51,425 | 135,398 | 38,359 |  |  | 293,382 | 16,671 | 310,053 | 1,409,995 |
| Napa | 208,298 |  |  | 208,298 |  | 58,810 |  | 267,108 |  | 188,497 |  | 300 |  | 4,384 |  | 193,181 | 76,040 | 269,221 | 536,329 |
| Nevada | 19,641 |  |  | 19,641 |  |  |  | 19,641 | 508 | 19,180 |  | 11,514 | 1,364 | 352 |  | 32,918 | 6,867 | 39,784 | 59,425 |
| Orange | 8,488,217 | 14,821 | 39,406 | 8,542,444 |  |  | 293,935 | 8,836,379 | 52,959 | 493,517 | 84,560 | 129,068 | 169,560 | - |  | 929,664 | 104,243 | 1,033,907 | 9,870,286 |
| Placer | 186,676 | 1,843 |  | 188,519 |  | 33,847 |  | 222,366 | 9,517 | 129,780 | 3,568 | 11,477 | 11,476 | - |  | 165,818 | 46,783 | 212,601 | 434,967 |
| Plumas | 114 |  |  | 114 |  |  |  | 114 |  | 4,039 |  |  | 282 | 24 |  | 4,345 | 6,987 | 11,332 | 11,446 |
| Riverside | 4,473,727 | 8,365 | - | 4,482,091 |  | 332,630 |  | 4,814,721 | 20,972 | 320,642 | 73,791 | 70,787 | 123,897 | 693 |  | 610,781 | 318,875 | 929,656 | 5,744,377 |
| Sacramento | 3,166,693 | 48,320 |  | 3,215,013 |  |  |  | 3,215,013 | 77,438 | 296,819 | 25,687 | 40,211 | 82,921 |  |  | 523,076 | 131,640 | 654,716 | 3,869,729 |
| San Benito |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80,980 |  | 12,767 |  | 1,146 |  | 94,893 | 4,778 | 99,671 | 99,671 |
| San Bernardino | 5,446,722 | 14,232 | 25,155 | 5,486,109 |  | 210,359 |  | 5,696,468 | 24,294 | 149,632 | 25,321 | 48,447 | 92,406 | 1,338 |  | 341,438 | 40,116 | 381,553 | 6,078,021 |
| San Diego | 5,050,351 | 1,821 | 2,017 | 5,054,189 |  | 118,596 | 72,709 | 5,245,494 | 96,581 | 454,239 | 55,267 | 152,216 |  | 1,259 |  | 759,563 | 149,623 | 909,186 | 6,154,680 |
| San Francisco | 2,905,594 | 11,806 |  | 2,917,400 |  |  |  | 2,917,400 | 53,645 | 333,238 |  | 156,921 | 82,775 |  |  | 626,579 | 55,791 | 682,370 | 3,599,770 |
| San Joaquin | 663,139 | 2,424 | 50,224 | 715,787 |  | 144,317 |  | 860,104 | 28,641 | 447,450 | 39,137 | 81,802 |  | - |  | 597,031 | 83,217 | 680,248 | 1,540,352 |
| San Luis Obispo | 502,325 | 2,923 |  | 505,248 |  |  |  | 505,248 | 65,345 | 152,808 | 5,164 | 6,693 | 67,200 | - |  | 297,211 | 151,811 | 449,022 | 954,270 |
| San Mateo | 994,505 | 174 |  | 994,679 |  | 145,572 |  | 1,140,251 | 57,378 | 809,408 | 46,753 | 111,468 | 5,100 |  | $(57,099)$ | 973,007 | 369,537 | 1,342,544 | 2,482,796 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,396,362 | 255 |  | 1,396,616 |  |  |  | 1,396,616 | 10,831 | 260,438 | 170,218 |  | 4,206 | 61 |  | 445,754 | 86,162 | 531,916 | 1,928,533 |
| Santa Clara | 3,054,580 | 717 | 103,783 | 3,159,080 |  | 147,040 |  | 3,306,120 | 57,814 | 1,280,269 | 84,351 | 107,393 | 36,795 | - |  | 1,566,622 | 848,910 | 2,415,532 | 5,721,652 |
| Santa Cruz | 744,199 | 927 |  | 745,126 |  | 97,519 |  | 842,644 | 14,559 | 46,555 | 3,002 | 42,684 | 30,431 |  |  | 137,231 | 13,606 | 150,836 | 993,481 |
| Shasta | 93,073 |  |  | 93,073 |  |  |  | 93,073 | 23,532 | 57,145 | 1,400 | 17,428 | 22,165 | 15 |  | 121,685 | 132,127 | 253,812 | 346,885 |
| Sierra |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Siskivou |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25,514 |  | 550 |  | 335 |  | 26,398 | 14,983 | 41,382 | 41,382 |
| Solano | 274,353 |  |  | 274,353 |  | 53,754 |  | 328,107 | 5,927 | 166,453 | 18,406 | 31,509 | 17,257 | - |  | 239,550 | 27,620 | 267,170 | 595,278 |
| Sonoma | 889,379 |  |  | 889,379 |  |  |  | 889,379 | 43,057 | 544,212 | 34,431 | 33,306 | 55,440 | 20 |  | 710,465 | 147,489 | 857,954 | 1,747,333 |
| Stanislaus | 355,806 | 948 |  | 356,754 |  |  |  | 356,754 | 37,832 | 380,977 | 9,200 | 41,868 | 20,715 | 2,600 |  | 493,192 | 337,964 | 831,156 | 1,187,910 |
| Sutter | 156,121 |  |  | 156,121 |  | 1,655 |  | 157,776 | 2,895 | 44,660 |  | 28,418 | 6,203 | 518 |  | 82,694 | 49,814 | 132,508 | 290,284 |
| Tehama | 127,016 |  |  | 127,016 |  | 28,448 |  | 155,464 | 1,354 | 9,827 |  |  | 282 | - |  | 11,463 | 11,818 | 23,281 | 178,745 |
| Trinity | 28,491 |  |  | 28,491 |  |  |  | 28,491 | 1,804 | 16,757 |  |  |  |  |  | 18,561 | 23,910 | 42,471 | 70,962 |
| Tulare | 407,138 |  |  | 407,138 |  |  |  | 407,138 | 26,717 | 728,484 | 40,580 | 38,530 | 23,253 | - |  | 857,564 | 173,638 | 1,031,202 | 1,438,340 |
| Tuolumne | 21,752 |  |  | 21,752 |  |  |  | 21,752 |  | 22,399 |  | 1,055 | 264 |  |  | 23,719 | 1,940 | 25,659 | 47,410 |
| Ventura | 868,318 | 851 |  | 869,169 |  | 127,095 |  | 996,264 | 9,210 | 594,753 | 53,454 | 31,164 |  | - |  | 688,580 | 43,608 | 732,189 | 1,728,453 |
| Yolo | 156,937 |  |  | 156,937 |  |  |  | 156,937 | 28,838 | 480,168 | 21,860 | 15,046 | 9,928 |  |  | 555,840 | 184,828 | 740,667 | 897,604 |
| Yuba |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,999 | 35,342 | 340 | 1,163 | 282 | 1,288 |  | 43,414 | 11,783 | 55,197 | 55,197 |
| Total: | 89,602,447 | 156,133 | 366,755 | 90,125,335 |  | 1,758,579 | 713,069 | 92,596,984 | 1,209,899 | 11,882,841 | 1,303,279 | 2,260,273 | 1,331,073 | 19,970 | 78,284 | 18,085,618 | 5,558,875 | 23,644,494 | 116,241,477 |


|  | Domestic Violence Plus Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Domestic Violence Plus Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Domestic <br> Violence Plus <br> Cases <br> Total <br> Reitbursed <br> Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff Interpreter <br>  <br> Benefits | $\begin{gathered} \text { Staff } \\ \text { Interpreter } \\ \text { Travel } \end{gathered}$ | Staff Cross Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | CIP <br> Arbitration Awards | Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { Supervisor } \\ \text { Salaries, } \\ \text { Benefits \& } \\ \text { OE\&E } \\ \text { (\$12,500/FTE) } \end{gathered}$ | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Registered } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Non- Registered Contractor Per Diems | Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { ASL } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{gathered}$ | Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals \& Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs |  |
|  | A | в | c | D | E | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 | J | к | L | M | N | o | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { (I thru }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{R} \\ (\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{Q}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} s \\ (H+R) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | 1,139 | 13,381 | 2,801 | 7,029 | 3,600 |  |  | 27,950 | 7,018 | 34,968 | 34,968 |
| Alpine |  |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amador | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Butte | - |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Calaveras | . |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colusa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contra Costa | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 4,521 | 14,676 | 1,056 | 2,809 |  | - |  | 23,062 | 2,988 | 26,050 | 26,050 |
| Del Norte | - |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| El Dorado |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | - | 7,452 |  |  |  | - |  | 7,452 | 3,922 | 11,374 | 11,374 |
| Fresno | - |  | - |  |  | - | - |  | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Glenn | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 4,561 |  | - |  | - |  | 4,561 | 3,587 | 8,148 | 8,148 |
| Humboldt |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - | 538 |  |  |  |  |  | 538 | 223 | 761 | 761 |
| Imperial | 3,835 |  | - | 3,835 | - | - |  | 3,835 | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,835 |
| Inyo |  |  | - |  |  | - | - |  | - | 1,111 |  | - |  |  |  | 1,111 | 1,223 | 2,335 | 2,335 |
| Kern | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  | 76,042 |  |  | - |  | 76,042 |  | 76,042 | 76,042 |
| Kings | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 5,804 | 832 |  | 470 | - | - | 7,106 | 3,142 | 10,248 | 10,248 |
| Lake | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Los Angeles | 441,216 | - | - | 441,216 | - | - | - | 441,216 | 505 | 836 | 1,233 | 1,706 | 735 | - |  | 5,015 |  | 5,015 | 446,231 |
| Madera | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marin | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 6,496 | - | 700 | - | - | - | 7,196 | 654 | 7,850 | 7,850 |
| Mariposa | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Mendocino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,578 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,578 | 3,313 | 4,891 | 4,891 |
| Merced | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,152 | 13,300 | - | 847 | 1,900 | - | - | 17,199 | 8,185 | 25,384 | 25,384 |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mono | 468 |  | - | 468 |  | - | - | 468 | - | 84 |  | - |  | - |  | 84 | 38 | 122 | 590 |
| Monterey |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Napa | 10,025 |  | - | 10,025 | - | - | - | 10,025 | - | 6,972 | - |  |  | - |  | 6,972 |  | 6,972 | 16,997 |
| Nevada |  |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - | 588 |  | 383 |  |  |  | 970 | 352 | 1,322 | 1,322 |
| Orange | 91,415 | - | - | 91,415 | - | - | - | 91,415 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 91,415 |
| Placer |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 257 | 10,408 | 270 | 2,590 | 864 | - | - | 14,389 | 3,575 | 17,964 | 17,964 |
| Plumas |  |  | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Riverside | 99,370 |  |  | 99,370 | - | - | - | 99,370 | 450 | 2,052 |  | 2,765 | 896 | - | - | 6,162 | 1,468 | 7,630 | 107,000 |
| Sacramento | 23,685 |  | - | 23,685 | - | - | - | 23,685 | 2,498 | 24,446 | 616 | 20,871 | 2,027 | - | - | 50,458 | 14,634 | 65,092 | 88,776 |
| San Benito |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino | 49,048 | - | - | 49,048 | - | - | - | 49,048 | 1,282 | 7,604 | 2,445 | 13,609 |  | - | - | 24,941 | 3,524 | 28,465 | 77,513 |
| San Diego | 10,965 | - | - | 10,965 | - | - | - | 10,965 | 5,823 | 2,122 | 1,880 | 2,548 |  | - |  | 12,373 |  | 12,373 | 23,338 |
| San Francisco |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 2,475 | 18,056 |  | 23,896 | 2,775 | - |  | 47,202 | 9,382 | 56,584 | 56,584 |
| San Joaquin | 6,412 |  | - | 6,412 | - | - | - | 6,412 | 823 | 21,882 | 607 | 6,370 |  | - | - | 29,681 | 3,839 | 33,520 | 39,932 |
| San Luis Obispo |  |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| San Mateo |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Santa Barbara |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | - | 5,564 | 1,125 |  | 1,600 |  |  | 8,289 | 1,401 | 9,689 | 9,689 |
| Santa Clara | 62,114 | 15 | - | 62,129 | - | - | - | 62,129 | - | 1,254 | 235 | 313 |  | - | - | 1,802 | 454 | 2,256 | 64,385 |
| Santa Cruz |  |  | - |  | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shasta | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 418 |  | - |  | - |  | 418 | 234 | 652 | 652 |
| Sierra | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Siskiyou | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 415 |  |  |  | - | - | 415 | 801 | 1,216 | 1,216 |
| Solano |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 8,536 | 911 | 2,457 | 1,525 | - |  | 13,429 | 1,774 | 15,203 | 15,203 |
| Sonoma | 20,443 |  | - | 20,443 | - | - | - | 20,443 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20,443 |
| Stanislaus | 2,181 | - | - | 2,181 | - | - | - | 2,181 | 2,112 | 19,483 | 1,121 | 2,362 | 1,300 | - |  | 26,378 | 19,297 | 45,675 | 47,856 |
| Sutter |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | 2,605 | 284 | 1,016 | 532 | - | - | 4,437 | 3,169 | 7,606 | 7,606 |
| Tehama | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Trinity | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Tulare |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 | 38,623 | 5,407 | 4,881 |  |  |  | 49,411 | 8,906 | 58,317 | 58,317 |
| Tuolumne |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | 3,080 |  | - |  | 3,080 | 593 | 3,673 | 3,673 |
| Ventura | 4,788 | - | - | 4,788 | - | - | - | 4,788 | - | 11,237 | - | 284 | - | - |  | 11,521 | 185 | 11,705 | 16,493 |
| Yolo |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 1,130 | 3,898 |  |  |  |  |  | 5,028 |  | 5,028 | 5,028 |
| Yuba |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  | 847 | 1,045 |  |  |  | 371 |  | 2,263 | 797 | 3,060 | 3,060 |
| Total: | 825,964 | 15 | - | 825,979 | - | - | - | 825,979 | 25,514 | 257,023 | 96,864 | 100,514 | 18,225 | 371 | - | 498,511 | 108,679 | 607,189 | 1,433,168 |


|  | Civil Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Civil Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Civil Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Courts | Staff Interpreter Salaries \& Benefits | $\begin{gathered} \text { Staff } \\ \text { Interpreter } \\ \text { Travel } \end{gathered}$ | Staff Cross Assignments | Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits \& Travel | Arbit <br> Arbitration Awards | Interpreter <br> Coordinator <br> Reimbursed <br> Amount | Supervisor Salaries, Benefits \& OE\&E $(\$ 12,500 /$ FTE $)$ | Total EmployeeRelated Costs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Registered } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Certified Contractor Per Diems | Non- Registered Contratoor Per Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Non-Certified } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \end{array}$ Diems | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { ASL } \\ \text { Contractor Per } \\ \text { Diems } \end{array}$ | Telephonic Interpreting | Court Interpreter Services | Total Contractor Per Diems | Contractor <br> Travel, <br> Mileage, <br>  <br> Lodging | Total ContractorRelated Costs |  |
|  | A | B | c | D | E | F | G | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H} \\ (\mathrm{D}+E+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{G}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 | J | к | L | M | N | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { (I thru } 0 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Q | $\begin{gathered} R \\ (P+Q) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} s \\ (H+R) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Alameda | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | 8,736 | 16,094 | 9,348 | 10,962 | 3,463 |  |  | 48,603 | 12,256 | 60,860 | 60,860 |
| Alpine | - |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amador |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 1,905 | 3,750 |  | 300 |  |  | 5,955 | 1,500 | 7,455 | 7,455 |
| Butte | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | 25,209 |  |  | - | - |  | 25,209 | 11,650 | 36,858 | 36,858 |
| Calaveras | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colusa | - |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contra Costa | - |  |  |  |  | - |  | - | 16,398 | 133,134 | 9,871 | 26,596 | - | - |  | 185,999 | 17,923 | 203,922 | 203,922 |
| Del Norte | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| El Dorado | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 21,166 | - | - | - | 481 |  | 21,646 | 11,928 | 33,574 | 33,574 |
| Fresno | - |  |  |  |  | - |  | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Glenn | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 11,578 | - | - | - | - |  | 11,578 | 9,391 | 20,968 | 20,968 |
| Humboldt | - |  |  |  | - | - |  |  | - | 8,983 | - |  | - | - |  | 8,983 | 5,091 | 14,075 | 14,075 |
| Imperial | 29,257 |  |  | 29,257 |  |  |  | 29,257 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29,257 |
| Inyo | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 9,803 |  | - | - | - |  | 9,803 | 5,679 | 15,482 | 15,482 |
| Kern | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | 77,654 | - | - | - |  | 77,654 |  | 77,654 | 77,654 |
| Kings | - |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | 22,702 | 2,040 | - | 420 | - |  | 25,162 | 8,854 | 34,015 | 34,015 |
| Lake | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lassen |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Los Angeles | 1,467,249 |  |  | 1,467,249 | - | - |  | 1,467,249 | 3,189 | 7,034 | 11,922 | 15,168 | 2,167 | - |  | 39,480 |  | 39,480 | 1,506,728 |
| Madera | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10,264 | - | 4,166 | - | - | - | 14,430 | 2,353 | 16,783 | 16,783 |
| Mariposa | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mendocino |  | 13 |  | 13 |  | - |  | 13 | - | 28,131 |  | 1,200 | 3,611 | - |  | 32,942 | 39,975 | 72,917 | 72,930 |
| Merced | - |  |  |  | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Modoc |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mono | 1,598 | 16 |  | 1,614 |  | - |  | 1,614 | - | 420 |  |  |  | - |  | 420 | 282 | 702 | 2,317 |
| Monterey | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Napa | 64,348 |  |  | 64,348 | - | - |  | 64,348 | - | 81,813 | - |  | - | - |  | 81,813 |  | 81,813 | 146,161 |
| Nevada |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  | - | 3,853 |  | 1,552 |  | - |  | 5,405 | 1,434 | 6,839 | 6,839 |
| Orange | 95,388 |  |  | 95,388 | - | - |  | 95,388 | - | 313 | 320 |  | 600 | - |  | 1,233 | 360 | 1,593 | 96,981 |
| Placer |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | 14,921 | 465 | 397 | 4,097 | - |  | 19,880 | 4,242 | 24,122 | 24,122 |
| Plumas |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Riverside | 239,369 |  |  | 239,369 |  | - |  | 239,369 | 2,585 | 11,924 | 5,295 | 5,880 | 400 | - |  | 26,084 | 13,722 | 39,806 | 279,174 |
| Sacramento | 161,823 | - |  | 161,823 | - | - | - | 161,823 | 23,130 | 108,862 | 5,237 | 18,300 | 4,608 | - |  | 160,137 | 56,063 | 216,199 | 378,023 |
| San Benito |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino | 1,627 |  |  | 1,627 |  | - |  | 1,627 | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 1,627 |
| San Diego |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Francisco |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  | 6,016 | 24,825 |  | 63,132 | 1,725 | - |  | 95,698 | 19,908 | 115,606 | 115,606 |
| San Joaquin | 18,198 |  |  | 18,198 |  | - |  | 18,198 | 3,947 | 63,061 | 915 | 11,269 |  | - |  | 79,192 | 12,115 | 91,306 | 109,504 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Mateo | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 6,376 | 114,989 | 313 | 11,291 | 550 | - |  | 133,519 | 50,005 | 183,524 | 183,524 |
| Santa Barbara |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  | 1,316 | 74,806 | 12,612 |  | 1,100 | - |  | 89,834 | 15,871 | 105,706 | 105,706 |
| Santa Clara | 58,602 | 16 |  | 58,618 | - | - | - | 58,618 | - |  | 1,175 | 596 |  | - |  | 1,771 |  | 1,771 | 60,389 |
| Santa Cruz |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shasta | - |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | 295 | 2,419 | - | 150 | 295 | - |  | 3,160 | 3,232 | 6,392 | 6,392 |
| Sierra | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,166 |  | 175 |  | - |  | 2,341 | 439 | 2,780 | 2,780 |
| Solano |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 917 | 30,248 | 1,779 | 10,461 | 4,907 | - |  | 48,313 | 5,684 | 53,996 | 53,996 |
| Sonoma | 4,458 |  |  | 4,458 | - | - |  | 4,458 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | 4,458 |
| Stanislaus | 5,019 |  |  | 5,019 | - | - | - | 5,019 | 8,836 | 103,988 | 1,399 | 20,830 | 9,297 | - |  | 144,350 | 98,151 | 242,501 | 247,520 |
| Sutter |  | - |  |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Tehama | - |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tulare | - |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | 352 | 43,718 | 29,626 | 5,668 |  | - |  | 79,364 | 11,486 | 90,850 | 90,850 |
| Tuolumne |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |  | 114 |  |  | - | - |  | 114 |  | 114 | 114 |
| Ventura | 59,453 |  | - | 59,453 | - | - | - | 59,453 | 7,052 | 143,980 | 10,209 | 9,131 | - | - |  | 170,372 | 12,378 | 182,750 | 242,202 |
| Yolo |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yuba |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  | 3,166 |  |  | 564 | 893 |  | 4,623 | 1,214 | 5,837 | 5,837 |
| Total: | 2,206,389 | 45 |  | 2,206,434 |  |  | - | 2,206,434 | 89,145 | 1,125,587 | 183,929 | 216,925 | 38,106 | 1,374 | - | 1,655,065 | 433,186 | 2,088,251 | 4,294,685 |


[^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]:    ${ }^{3}$ The provision of interpreter services is mandated for criminal, traffic, juvenile delinquency or dependency, mental competency hearings with appointed counsel, and other mandated civil cases.
    ${ }^{4}$ A state of emergency has been in place in the state since March 4, 2020. The 2019-20 fiscal year ended on June 30 , 2020, approximately three months into the COVID-19 pandemic.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Only interpreters who pass the Bilingual Interpreter Exam (BIE)—or passed the legal specialist (SC:L) exam previously administered by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) for American Sign Language-and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements are referred to as certified interpreters. Languages certified for court interpreters include American Sign Language and 15 spoken languages-Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Farsi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese (note: Western Armenian and Japanese currently remain certified languages, but there is no BIE available in those languages). Interpreters of other spoken languages for which there is no state-certifying exam are required to pass the Written Exam and Oral Proficiency Exam (OPE) in both English and their non-English language if available and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements in order to become a registered interpreter. The OPE is available in Spanish and 69 other languages.
    ${ }^{6}$ Limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 4, of the Budget Act of 2019 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 2019 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 .

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Judicial Council of Cal., Adv. Com. Rep., Court Interpreters: Payment Policies for Contract Court Interpreters (Feb. 17, 2021), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx? $M=F \& I D=9189125 \& G U I D=$ CDB12CF5-C6C6-442D-80195FA16603B3E7.
    ${ }^{8}$ Ibid.
    ${ }^{9}$ The court is required to appoint a certified interpreter to interpret in a language designated by the Judicial Council. (Gov. Code, § 68561.) The court is required to appoint a registered interpreter to interpret in a language not designated by the Judicial Council. The court may appoint a noncertified interpreter if the court (1) on the record finds good cause to appoint a noncertified interpreter and finds the interpreter to be qualified, and (2) follows the procedures adopted by the Judicial Council. (Gov. Code, $\S \S 68561$ (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, § $71802(\mathrm{~b})(1)$ and (d).)
    ${ }^{10}$ Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts /UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx.

