



**Judicial Council of California**  
**Administrative Office of the Courts**

Finance Division  
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE  
*Chief Justice of California*  
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

WILLIAM C. VICKREY  
*Administrative Director of the Courts*

December 3, 2001

RONALD G. OVERHOLT  
*Chief Deputy Director*

CHRISTINE HANSEN  
*Director*  
*Finance Division*

Hon. Steve Peace  
California State Senate  
Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee  
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, California 95814

Hon. Tony Cardenas  
California State Assembly  
Chair, Assembly Budget Committee  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Court Interpreters Program Interpreter Usage Report  
Statutes 2001, Chapter 106

Dear Senator Peace and Assembly Member Cardenas:

Provision 3, item 0540-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2001 (Stats. 2001, ch. 106) provides that the Judicial Council shall report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Legislature's fiscal committees regarding:

1. An analysis of expenditures for each of the following categories of interpreters: interpreter coordinators, certified and registered interpreters, and interpreters who are not registered or certified, including provisionally qualified interpreters;

2. An analysis of the availability of certified and registered interpreters and whether there are sufficient numbers of certified and registered interpreters; and
3. Recommendations for increasing the numbers of certified and registered court interpreters to meet demand.

The enclosed report provides a detailed response to and data for each of these items. Following are summary responses.

**1. Analysis of expenditures**

*Interpreter coordinators.* Of the \$58 million appropriation in expenditures for the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2000–2001, \$4.5 million was spent on trial court staff who work as interpreter coordinators, staff interpreters and other staff in the court interpreter program. The trial courts reported 21.3 authorized, funded interpreter coordinator positions and 32.15 authorized funded staff interpreter positions for fiscal year 2000-2001.

*Certified interpreters and registered interpreters.* In order to provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by category of interpreter, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC collected detailed information from nine sample courts representing large, urban courts and small, rural courts as well as Northern, Central, and Southern California courts. These nine courts alone made over 60 percent of all expenditures on court interpreters in fiscal year 2000–2001 and 53 percent of total expenditures by the courts during this same period.

This analysis revealed that, of the \$28.7 million in expenditures on contract per-diem interpreters in the nine sample courts during fiscal year 2000–2001, 90 percent went to certified or registered interpreters.

*Interpreters who are not registered or certified, including provisionally qualified interpreters.* In the group of nine sample counties, which made 60 percent of expenditures on interpreters in fiscal year 2000–2001, 10 percent of expenditures were on noncertified or nonregistered interpreters. Specific use of noncertified and

nonregistered interpreters varied widely, however, depending on the language and location studied.

## **2. Analysis of availability and numbers**

Although 90 percent of expenditures in the nine sample courts were on certified and registered interpreters, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely in the state. Specific language needs also vary widely, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages. In addition, some courts are reporting that proceedings are sometimes delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Considering that California continues to attract large numbers of new immigrants, the courts will likely experience a steady increase in both the need for interpreter services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

## **3. Recommendations for increasing numbers to meet demand**

In order to address the chronic shortage of qualified interpreters, AOC staff has adopted a comprehensive, multipronged strategy that focuses on outreach, recruitment, training, and retention. The AOC has taken the following actions:

- Implemented a one-year pilot project using the services of certified and registered interpreters via specialized telephone equipment;
- Established preparation and assessment workshops to prepare Spanish and Korean oral applicants;
- Established a rate structure based on the interpreter's certification status to provide a financial incentive for working noncertified interpreters to gain the skills necessary for certification and to reward interpreters who are making some progress in obtaining their certification;
- Developed and released a statewide public service announcement to increase awareness of the interpreting profession;
- Collaborated with California State University at Long Beach to establish the nation's first Bachelor of Arts program in interpreting and translating;
- Collaborated with the University of California at Berkeley to develop a training program for Spanish interpreters and with the University of

Hon. Steve Peace  
Hon. Tony Cardenas  
November 30, 2001  
Page 4

California at Los Angeles to develop a program to train registered interpreters to pass the certification exams;

- Attended numerous job fairs at universities and high schools;
- Redesigned the Court Interpreters Program Web site to include a distinct area on how to become a court interpreter;
- Sponsored and coordinated statewide and regional meetings where interpreter coordinators can share information and to resolve common issues;
- Established a toll-free number for individuals interested in becoming court interpreters; and
- Began studying a proposal for courts to obtain interpreter services through the use of a computerized telephone notification system.

If you have any questions related to the enclosed report, please contact Shireen Advani, Senior Court Services Analyst at (415) 865-7606.

Sincerely,



Christine Hansen  
Director, Finance Division

CH/SRA

Enclosures

cc: Ray LeBov, Office of Governmental Affairs  
Susan Hough, Human Resources  
Judicial Administration Library

**Judicial Council of California**  
Administrative Office of the Courts

Report to the Legislature  
on the Use of Interpreters in the California Courts

December 1, 2001

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provision 3, item 0540-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2001 (Stats. 2001, ch. 106) provides that the Judicial Council shall report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Legislature's fiscal committees regarding:

1. An analysis of expenditures for each of the following categories of interpreters: interpreter coordinators, certified and registered interpreters, and interpreters who are not registered or certified, including provisionally qualified interpreters;
2. An analysis of the availability of certified and registered interpreters and whether there are sufficient numbers of certified and registered interpreters; and
3. Recommendations for increasing the numbers of certified and registered court interpreters to meet demand.

This report provides a detailed response to and data for each of these items. Following are summary responses.

### 1. Analysis of Expenditures

*Interpreter coordinators.* Of the \$58 million appropriation in expenditures for the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2000–2001, \$4.5 million was spent on trial court staff who work as interpreter coordinators, staff interpreters and other program staff. The trial courts reported 22.3 authorized, funded interpreter coordinator positions and 32.15 authorized funded staff interpreter positions for fiscal year 2000-2001.

*Certified interpreters and registered interpreters.* In order to provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by category of interpreter, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC collected detailed information from nine sample courts representing large, urban courts and small, rural courts as well as Northern, Central, and Southern California courts. These nine courts alone made over 60 percent of all expenditures on court interpreters in fiscal year 2000–2001 and 53 percent of total expenditures by the courts during this same period.

This analysis revealed that, of the \$28.7 million in expenditures on contract per-diem interpreter services in the nine sample courts during fiscal year 2000–2001, 90 percent went to certified or registered interpreters.

*Interpreters who are not registered or certified, including provisionally qualified interpreters.* In the group of nine sample counties, which made 60 percent of expenditures on interpreters in fiscal year 2000–2001, 10 percent of expenditures were on noncertified or nonregistered interpreters. Specific use of noncertified and

nonregistered interpreters varied widely, however, depending on the language and location studied.

## **2. Analysis of Availability and Numbers**

Although 90 percent of expenditures in the nine sample courts were on certified and registered interpreters, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely in the state. Specific language needs also vary widely, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages. In addition, some courts are reporting that proceedings are sometimes delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Considering that California continues to attract large numbers of new immigrants, the courts will likely experience a steady increase in both the need for interpreter services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

## **3. Recommendations for Increasing Numbers to Meet Demand**

In order to address the chronic shortage of qualified interpreters, the AOC staff has adopted a comprehensive, multipronged strategy that focuses on outreach, recruitment, training, and retention. The AOC has taken the following actions:

- Implemented a one-year pilot project using the services of certified and registered interpreters via specialized telephone equipment;
- Established preparation and assessment workshops to prepare Spanish and Korean oral applicants;
- Established a rate structure based on the interpreter's certification status to provide a financial incentive for working noncertified interpreters to gain the skills necessary for certification and to reward interpreters who are making some progress in obtaining their certification;
- Developed and released a statewide public service announcement to increase awareness of the interpreting profession;
- Collaborated with California State University at Long Beach to establish the nation's first Bachelor of Arts program in interpreting and translating;
- Collaborated with the University of California at Berkeley to develop a training program for Spanish interpreters and with the University of California at Los Angeles to develop a program to train registered interpreters to pass the certification exams;
- Attended numerous job fairs at universities and high schools;
- Redesigned the Court Interpreters Program Web site to include a distinct area on how to become a court interpreter;
- Sponsored and coordinated statewide and regional meetings where interpreter coordinators can share information and to resolve common issues;

- Established a toll-free number for individuals interested in becoming court interpreters; and
- Began studying a proposal for courts to obtain interpreter services through the use of a computerized telephone notification system.

#### 4. Table of Contents

I. Introduction	p. 5
A. Legal Mandates	p. 5
B. Court Interpreters Program	p. 5
II. Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	p. 7
A. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	p. 7
B. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters by County and Category	p. 8
C. Statewide Expenditures On and Use of Contract Interpreters	p. 10
III. Availability of Certified and Registered Interpreters	p. 16
IV. Recommendations to Increase the Numbers of Certified and Registered Interpreters	p. 17
V. Conclusion	p. 18



## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Legal Mandates

According to the California Constitution, “a person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings.”<sup>1</sup> In addition, the court must provide an interpreter for any witness who is unable to understand, or express him- or herself in, English well enough to be “understood directly by counsel, court and jury.”<sup>2</sup>

The Judicial Council is charged by statute to administer statewide standards for interpreter certification, certification renewal, professional standards, and continuing education as well as interpreter recruitment. Certified and registered interpreters are required by law to meet certain standards through testing, completion of ethics seminars, and mandated continuing education.<sup>3</sup> Government Code section 68561 and rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court require the trial court to appoint a certified court interpreter. Courts may use noncertified interpreters only after conducting a diligent search for available certified interpreters among state and federally certified court interpreters, administrative hearing-certified interpreters, and interpreter agencies. If the search is unsuccessful, the trial court must specifically qualify the noncertified interpreter and find good cause on the record to use him or her.

Interpreters are essential to ensuring access and fairness in the courts. By rendering an accurate interpretation of court proceedings, “without embellishing, omitting, or editing”<sup>4</sup> what is stated or written, interpreters enable non-English-speaking defendants and witnesses to participate fully in judicial proceedings.

### B. Court Interpreters Program

Pursuant to Government Code section 68561(a), the council has “designated” eight languages for which certification exams are administered—Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. In 2000, the council designated an additional five languages for certification—Armenian, Khmer, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Russian. Certification examinations for these newly designated languages are currently under development. Until the abovementioned exams are complete, the courts are using registered interpreters in these languages whenever possible.

To become certified, an interpreter must pass a state certification exam (with both written and oral components) and attend a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop. For any of the nondesignated languages or the five newly designated languages, an interpreter can

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Const., art. I, § 14.

<sup>2</sup> Evid. Code, § 752.

<sup>3</sup> Stats. 1992, ch. 770; Sen. Bill 1304.

<sup>4</sup> Cal. Rules of Court, rule 984.4.

register with the Judicial Council by passing an English proficiency exam (with both written and oral components) and attending a Judicial Council Code of Ethics and orientation workshop. To maintain certification or registration, an interpreter must provide the council with biannual proof of continuing education and complete a minimum of 40 law-related professional assignments.

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) maintains a *Master List of Certified Court Interpreters of Designated Languages and Registered Interpreters of Nondesignated Languages*. Table 1 breaks down, by language, the current total of 1,116 certified interpreters in the eight designated languages. An additional 245 interpreters are registered in one or more of the nondesignated languages, for a total of 1,361 certified and registered interpreters.

Arabic	9
Cantonese	23
Japanese	9
Korean	39
Portuguese	4
Spanish	992
Tagalog	5
Vietnamese	35
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,116</b>

Source: Court Interpreters Program, AOC, July 2001

To summarize, interpreters used in the California court system can be divided into five groups—certified, noncertified, registered, nonregistered and provisionally qualified. These categories correspond to the languages that interpreters speak and the levels of screening they have successfully completed. Definitions of the categories follow.

- *Certified interpreter.* An interpreter who has passed the certification exam in one of the eight *designated* languages, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biannual continuing education and professional requirements.
- *Registered interpreter.* An interpreter who has passed the registration exam for English fluency, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biannual continuing education and professional requirements. A registered interpreter may interpret in any of the nondesignated languages, as well as in any of the five newly designated languages until certification exams are created.
- *Noncertified interpreter.* An interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the designated languages but has not successfully met certification requirements.
- *Nonregistered interpreter.* An interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the nondesignated or newly designated languages but has not successfully met registration requirements.

- *Provisionally qualified interpreter.* <sup>5</sup>An interpreter who interprets in the courts in any language who has passed the written exam, taken the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop has been provisionally qualified under California Rule of Court 984.2 and as applied for and been accepted in the incremental rate program.

## II. EXPENDITURES ON AND USE OF INTERPRETERS

### A. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters

In fiscal year 2000–2001, the trial courts spent \$58.46 million on interpreting services, approximately 3 percent of their total expenditures of \$1.9 billion. As shown in Table 2, over 90 percent of expenditures on interpreting in the trial courts—\$52.46 million—was spent on per-diem interpreters who work as contractors for the courts on a daily basis. The second largest line in the interpreters budget—\$4.47 million—was spent on trial court staff who work as interpreters, on interpreter coordinators, and in other areas of court operations in support of interpreter programs. Transportation and travel and “other expenditures” make up the remaining \$1.53 million spent by the trial courts on interpreting in fiscal year 2000–2001.

Per diem contracts and agency contracts	\$ 52,458,619
Salaries and wages (inc. benefits)	4,470,945
Transportation and travel	959,290
Other expenditures <sup>6</sup>	575,900
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$58,465,893</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statement, FY 2000–2001

Although total expenditures for fiscal year 2000–2001 were \$58.46 million, the total appropriation for the Court Interpreters Program for that year was \$54.45 million. Expenditures in excess of appropriation in the amount of \$4 million were covered by the trial courts from their individual operating funds, each in proportion to its expenditures. The total appropriation for the Court Interpreters Program budget for fiscal year 2001–2002 was \$58.1 million. Based on current projections from the Quarterly Financial Statements for the first quarter of this fiscal year, the statewide Court Interpreters Program budget expenditures that qualify for funding under that item will total \$62.8 million. Thus,

<sup>5</sup> Any noncertified or nonregistered interpreter interpreting on the record in a criminal or juvenile proceeding must be provisionally qualified under California Rule of Court, Rule 984.2. However, in 1999 the Judicial Council created a program to provide a financial incentive for noncertified or nonregistered interpreters to obtain certification. Under this program, an interpreter who submitted proof of the following is eligible for an additional \$13/per half-day or \$25/per full day rate increase for two years. The criteria are as follows: the interpreter must pass the written exam and attend a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop. In addition, the interpreter must take the oral exam within 24 months of provisional qualification to retain the additional rate. Out of twenty-five participants in the program, twelve have obtained certification or registration since its inception. For the purposes of this study, provisionally qualified interpreter expenditures are included in the discussion of expenditures on noncertified, nonregistered interpreters.

<sup>6</sup> Other expenditures was derived by subtracting travel and per-diem expenditures from the total operating expenses and equipment on QFS 2000–2001. Other expenditures are expenses covered by the trial courts operating budgets and not by the Court Interpreter Program appropriation.

in fiscal year 2001–2002 the trial courts will need to allocate approximately \$4.7 million from their operating funds to cover interpreter costs.

## B. Statewide Expenditures On and Use of Interpreters by County and Category

### 1. Trial Court Staff

Each trial court provides an annual report to the AOC listing the number of authorized, funded positions, by position title and program budget area. This report is called *Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplements to the Annual Budget*. In June 2001, the trial courts reported 94 full-time equivalent (FTE) authorized and funded staff positions in the Court Interpreters Program for fiscal year 2001–2002.<sup>8</sup> More than 50 of these positions are listed as interpreters or interpreter coordinators.

Courts also reported that 19.1 FTE clerks and 5 FTE office assistants work in the program budget area of court interpreters. Table 3 shows interpreter staff broken down according to Schedule 7A. Like contract per-diem interpreters, staff interpreters interpret court proceedings, conferences, and interviews for parties to cases. In addition, staff interpreters are available to translate documents for the court and provide written translations from English.

Interpreter	32.15
Interpreter coordinator	22.3
Clerks (ncludes all ranks of court, courtroom, legal process and calendar clerks)	15
Office assistant (includes senior office assistant)	5
Temporary help	4.8
Other <sup>7</sup>	10.65
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>

Source: Schedule 7A, June 2001

Interpreter coordinator positions are funded in two ways. First, the 2001 Budget Act appropriation for the Court Interpreters Program allows for reimbursement to the trial courts for between 0.25 and 1 FTE, depending on county population. Second, the trial courts fund any additional interpreter coordinator positions from their individual operating budgets.

<sup>7</sup> Other in Table 3 includes the following: Court executive officers, and other upper-management positions where courts indicate that between 5 and 25 percent of an FTE is dedicated to the court interpreters program; court clerks and courtroom clerks (not the same as legal process clerks); calendar clerks; court supervisors; administrative analysts and secretaries.

<sup>8</sup> This total is the total number reported under program budget category 10-20-30, “Court Interpreters,” plus additional positions identified as “interpreter” and “interpreter coordinator” under other program budget codes. Interpreters and interpreter coordinators are reported regardless of the program budget category under which the position is listed, because these job titles place staff unambiguously in the area of interpreting. The program budget category is used to identify all other staff positions connected to the court interpreter programs. Adjustments to Schedule 7A data were made when direct communication with courts provided information not available on the 7A worksheets.

Not all courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 4 shows, only about two-thirds of the superior courts—41 of 58—reported authorized, funded staff in the court interpreters program for fiscal year 2000-2001.

Differing staffing levels and patterns in the courts in the area of court interpreters reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state. Most courts rely primarily on contract interpreters, while a few have interpreters and interpreter coordinators as court employees.

	FTE Staff Interpreters <sup>(2)</sup>	Interpreter Coordinators <sup>(1)</sup>	Other Staff <sup>(1)</sup>	Total Staff
Alameda	0	0	3	3
Butte	0	0.3	1.1	1.4
Calaveras	0	0	0.25	0.25
Colusa	0	0	0.5	0.5
Contra Costa	0	1	1.25	2.25
El Dorado	0	0	0.5	0.5
Fresno	5	1	3.8	9.8
Glenn	0	0	0.25	0.25
Humboldt	0	0	0.1	0.1
Imperial	3	0	0.25	3.25
Kern	2	1	0	3
Los Angeles	0	6	11	17
Marin	0	0	1	1
Mendocino	0	1	0	1
Merced	0	0.5	0	0.5
Monterey	1	0	1	2
Napa	0	1	0	1
Nevada	0	0	0.5	0.5
Orange	1	0	4.25	5.25
Riverside	1	0	0	1
Sacramento	2	1	1	4
San Bernardino	0	0	0.25	0.25
San Diego	3.9	1	2.5	7.4
San Francisco	0	1	0	1
San Joaquin	0	0	0.25	0.25
San Mateo	0	1	1	2
Santa Barbara	5	0.5	0	5.5
Santa Clara	0	1	3	4
Santa Cruz	0	1	0	1
Shasta	0	0.25	0	0.25
Siskiyou	0	0	0.5	0.5
Solano	1	1	0	2
Sonoma	0	1	0	1
Stanislaus	1	0	1	2
Sutter	0	0	0.25	0.25
Tehama	1	0	0	1
Trinity	0	0	0.05	0.05
Tuolumne	0	0	0.25	0.25
Ventura	5.25	0.75	0	6
Yolo	0	1	0	1
Yuba	0	0	0.75	0.75
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>32.15</b>	<b>22.30</b>	<b>39.55</b>	<b>94</b>

Source: Schedule 7A, June 2001

(1) Communication with Fresno indicated that "Branch Administrator" in Program 10-30-20 works as "Interpreter Coordinator." One FTE subtracted from "Non interpreter" staff, one FTE added to 222B.

(2) Communication with court indicates that seven staff interpreters in San Diego recently quit. Number for 222A in San Diego adjusted from 10.9 to 3.9.

## 2. Contract Interpreters

The Judicial Council established statewide standards for interpreter pay and authorized increases in the amounts paid for full-day and half-day interpretations effective January 1, 1999. Two additional increases were authorized and made effective on July 1, 1999, and July 1, 2000.<sup>9</sup> Table 5 shows the changes in payment over time. Certified and registered interpreters are currently paid 32.5 percent more for a full-day interpretation than they were when the Judicial Council first established statewide standards for interpreter pay in January 1999. At the same time, the Judicial Council lowered the rates paid to noncertified and nonregistered interpreters to provide a financial incentive for new and existing court interpreters to become certified or registered. Despite these increases in rates for certified and registered interpreters, compensation for interpreters in the state trial courts still lags behind that for federally certified interpreters who are paid \$305 for a full day. The Judicial Council sought, but did not receive, funding for further rate increases in fiscal year 2001–2002 and will continue to strive to ensure that California rates are set competitively with the federal rates.

	<b>Certified (Registered)</b>				<b>Noncertified (Nonregistered)</b>			
	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change
1/1/99	\$200	—	\$105	—	\$200	—	\$105	—
7/1/99	243	+21.5	135	28.57	175	-12.5	92	-12.38
7/1/00	265	+9.05	147	8.89	175	0	92	0

### C. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Contract Interpreters

All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in quarterly financial statements to the AOC. These data are reported in broad categories that include expenditures on personnel (court staff who administer the court interpreter programs as well as court staff employed as interpreters), expenditures on contract per-diem interpreters, and expenditures on travel for contract per-diem interpreters. Another source of statewide data on interpreters is the *Salary and Position Worksheet* compiled by the AOC and reported on Schedule 7A, in which all trial courts report the salaries and job titles of authorized, funded staff. A third source of statewide data on court interpreters is the annual estimate of expenditures on contract, per diem interpreters provided by the trial courts as part of the annual budget change request process. A fourth source of statewide data is the biannual report on each trial court's use of registered, noncertified, and nonregistered interpreters.

<sup>9</sup> Prior to 1999, rates for interpreting varied among different courts.

Although collection of statewide data is centralized at the AOC, still under development is a single system for capturing detailed information on the types of cases interpreted, the stages of the cases at which interpreters are used, and the languages interpreted. Due to the historical development of trial courts under a dual state-county system of funding, each trial court tracks detailed information about interpreters differently. Although estimates provided by the courts for the budget change process distinguish between expenditures for two different categories of interpreters—estimates of certified and registered expenditures are separated from noncertified and nonregistered expenditures—no distinction by language is made in these estimates.

In order to provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by language and certification status of interpreter, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC collected detailed information from nine sample courts representing large, urban courts and small, rural courts as well as Northern, Central, and Southern California courts. These nine courts alone made over 60 percent of the \$58.4 million total court interpreting expenditures in California, and 53 percent of the approximately \$1.9 billion total expenditures by the state's courts, in fiscal year 2000–2001, as shown in Table 6.

The principal sources of data for these case studies were invoices and payment forms for contract interpreters for the entire fiscal year 2000-2001. The superior courts of some counties were able to provide this information electronically while other courts provided copies of payment forms that were then entered into a database. The data from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County alone was entered from over 13,000 individual payment forms. Expenditures were coded to allow for the identification of payment by language and certification status of the interpreter.

	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Total Court Expenditures	Court Interpreter Expenditures as % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Superior Court of Los Angeles County	\$ 655,772,120	\$ 25,225,594	1.33%	43.35%
Superior Court of San Diego County	132,304,893	3,230,013	0.17%	5.55%
Superior Court of San Francisco County	66,136,800	1,606,445	0.08%	2.76%
Superior Court of Fresno County	34,449,130	1,478,355	0.08%	2.54%
Superior Court of Sacramento County	73,622,860	1,404,424	0.07%	2.41%
Superior Court of Monterey County	16,145,584	619,111	0.03%	1.06%
Superior Court of Merced County	8,132,723	489,219	0.03%	0.84%
Superior Court of Yolo County	8,542,749	362,542	0.02%	0.62%
Superior Court of Napa County	7,946,081	295,827	0.02%	0.51%
<b>9 Sample Courts</b>	<b>\$ 1,003,052,940</b>	<b>\$ 34,711,530</b>	<b>1.83%</b>	<b>59.38%</b>
<b>Rest of the State</b>	<b>\$ 887,685,767</b>	<b>\$ 23,754,363</b>	<b>1.26%</b>	<b>40.62%</b>
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>\$ 1,890,738,707</b>	<b>\$ 58,465,893</b>	<b>3.03%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2000–2001

The appendix to this report provides case studies of interpreter use in these nine courts, along with tables showing each court's use of contract per-diem interpreters, by language and certification status. The case studies provide a detailed picture of expenditures on interpreters, sorted by language and certification status of the contract per-diem interpreters. Following are some of the principal findings from the nine courts in the sample.

#### **D. Summary of Findings From Nine Sample Courts**

- *Courts' estimates of expenditures on certified and registered interpreters for the budget change request process are generally accurate:* For the budget change request process in fiscal year 2000–2001, the trial courts' estimates of expenditures on interpreters indicated that certified and registered interpreters receive approximately 89 percent of statewide expenditures for contract per diem interpreters. The nine-court sample studied here supports these estimates, showing that over 90 percent of all expenditures for contract per diem interpreters went to certified and registered interpreters.



- *Interpreter needs in the state courts are dominated by Spanish:* Of the \$28.7 million in interpreting expenditures in the nine sample courts during fiscal year 2000–2001, 81.6 percent went to Spanish language interpretation.
- *Interpreter needs are also dominated by the largest court in the state, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County:* In fiscal year 2000–2001, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County made 43.3 percent of all the statewide expenditures for interpreters. The influence of Los Angeles is evident in examining the frequency of Korean and Armenian interpreting in the courts. Neither Korean nor Armenian interpreting was a significant expense in the smaller courts in our sample. The need for Korean and Armenian interpreting in the Superior Court of Los Angeles, where it represents the second largest language expense, makes these two languages the second and third largest expenses, respectively, after Spanish in our sample (see Table 8).
- *Different courts have different interpreter needs:* As the example from the Superior Court of Los Angeles indicates, statewide trends may not reflect interpreter needs in individual courts. The expenditure data examined for this report indicate the following:
  - *South Asian and Southeast Asian languages are increasingly important:* In the Superior Courts of Merced and Fresno Counties, South Asian and Southeast Asian languages have become extremely important. In the Superior Court of Merced County, Hmong, Laotian, Mien, Thai, and Punjabi represent over 34 percent of total expenditures for contract per-diem interpretation in fiscal year 2000–2001. In the Superior Court of Fresno County, Hmong and Laotian alone represent over 9 percent of total expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters. In the Superior Court of San Diego County, the second and third highest amounts of expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters go to Laotian and Cambodian respectively.
  - *The availability of certified and registered interpreters varies across courts:* Although the vast majority of interpreting needs statewide are met with certified and registered interpreters where available, within individual courts the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies considerably. For instance, whereas 97 percent of all interpreting in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is performed by certified and registered interpreters, in the Superior Court of Merced County only 31 percent of all interpreting is performed by certified and registered interpreters.
  - *The influence of the size of the court upon the availability of certified and registered interpreters is not clear:* At first glance, it would appear that large courts have the advantage of being able to draw from a larger pool of certified and registered interpreters. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County, for

example, is able to meet 100 percent of its needs for interpreting in Cantonese, Arabic, and Japanese with certified interpreters. Upon closer examination, however, it appears that smaller courts have found certified and registered interpreters to meet their needs in certain languages. In the Superior Court of Fresno County, 100 percent of interpreting in Mien is performed by registered interpreters, while in the Superior Court of Merced, 100 percent of interpreting in Hmong and Cambodian is performed by registered interpreters. In Yolo County, 100 percent of Russian interpreting is performed by registered interpreters.

- *Different Interpretation Needs across Courts Can Also Be Seen in the Diversity of the Languages with the Highest Expenditures:* Although expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters were highest for all courts in Spanish, no two courts had the same languages as their second or third highest expenditures. The second and third highest expenditures by language were different in each of the nine sample courts: Korean and Armenian in Los Angeles; Laotian and Cambodian in San Diego; Russian and Hmong in Sacramento; Hmong, Laotian and Cambodian in Fresno; Cantonese and Vietnamese in San Francisco; Vietnamese and Korean in Monterey; Hmong and Thai in Merced; Russian, Punjabi and Hindi in Yolo, and; Cantonese, Mandarin and Tagalog in Napa.
- *Expenditure Data Do Not Capture Important Aspects of Interpreter Use in the Courts:* Interviews with interpreter coordinators in the courts indicate that there is important information that is not captured by examining expenditures on interpreters sorted by language and certification status of the interpreter. Perhaps most important, expenditure data do not capture the numbers of delayed proceedings caused by the unavailability of a certified or registered interpreter. The manager of interpreter services for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County estimates that more than 40 proceedings are continued every day in that county because of the unavailability of a certified or registered interpreter.<sup>10</sup>
- *The Interpretation Needs of the Trial Courts are Extremely Diverse:* For the nine courts in our sample, contract, per diem interpreters were used for over 64 languages during fiscal year 2000-2001: literally from A to Z (Albanian to Zapoteco).

---

<sup>10</sup> Reported by Gregory Drapac, Manager of Interpreter Services, Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

**Table 8: Expenditures on Contract Per-Diem Interpreting  
in Nine Sample Courts, Fiscal Year 2000–2001**

**by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter**

	Designated Languages		Nondesignated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as % of All Interpreter Expenditures in Sample Courts
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered			
Spanish	\$ 22,210,859	\$ 1,271,056			\$ 23,481,915	94.59%	81.60%
Korean	670,419	120,675			791,094	84.75%	2.75%
Vietnamese	459,367	93,358			552,725	83.11%	1.92%
Arabic	113,230	16,227			129,457	87.47%	0.45%
Japanese	72,546	16,427			88,973	81.54%	0.31%
Tagalog	99,937	128,576			228,513	43.73%	0.79%
Portuguese	15,397	13,407			28,804	53.45%	0.10%
Cantonese	298,990	10,761			309,751	96.53%	1.08%
Cantonese and Other Chinese (1)	180,207	3,331			183,538	98.19%	0.64%
Japanese-Korean	21,943	41,976			63,919	34.33%	0.22%
Armenian			547,078	16,574	563,652	97.06%	1.96%
Russian			350,256	69,088	419,344	83.52%	1.46%
Cambodian			180,648	135,803	316,451	57.09%	1.10%
Farsi			167,294	7,202	174,496	95.87%	0.61%
Mandarin (2)			258,538	17,570	276,108	93.64%	0.96%
Hmong-Lao-Mien-Thai (3)			205,444	344,184	549,628	37.38%	1.91%
Hindi-Punjabi-Urdu-Bengali (3)			55,306	115,346	170,652	32.41%	0.59%
Central Asian (4)			41,969	9,023	50,992	82.30%	0.18%
South Asian, Pacific Island (5)			4,502	54,474	58,976	7.63%	0.20%
Eastern, Southern European (6)			72,438	47,904	120,342	60.19%	0.42%
Meso-American (7)			-	20,303	20,303	0.00%	0.07%
African Languages (8)			19,853	38,032	57,885	34.30%	0.20%
Middle East (9)			43,378	6,798	50,176	86.45%	0.17%
Other Western European (10)			39,727	32,798	72,525	54.78%	0.25%
All Other Languages (11)			331	15,289	15,620	2.12%	0.05%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 24,142,895</b>	<b>\$ 1,715,794</b>	<b>\$ 1,986,762</b>	<b>\$ 930,389</b>	<b>\$ 28,775,840</b>	<b>90.80%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

(1) Used only where Cantonese is specified along with some "other Chinese," usually Mandarin.

(2) Includes all expenditures registered as "Mandarin," including "Mandarin/Taiwanese" and "Mandarin Chinese."

(3) Includes these languages in combination, in cases where interpreters grouped them together, as well as individual languages that were placed in this group only for presentation of data.

(4) Includes "Arabic Armenian," "Dari/Pashto," "Farsi/Afghani," Kurdish, Mongolian, and Pashto.

(5) Excludes Bengali, Hindi, Hmong, Lao, Mien, Punjabi, Tagalog, Thai, Urdu, and Vietnamese. Includes "Bisayan/Tagalog," Burmese, Fijian, Ilocano, "Indonesian," Samoan, Sinhalese, Tongan, and Visayan.

(6) Excludes Armenian and Russian. Includes Albanian, "Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian," Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, "Czech/Slovak," Greek, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and "Serbian/Croatian."

(7) Includes Mixteco, Trique, Tzotzil, Zapoteco, and "Meso-American."

(8) Includes Amharic, "Amharic Tigrina," "Ethiopian," Nuer, Somali, Swahili, "Sub-Saharan African," "Tigrinya," and "Tigrinian."

(9) Includes Assyrian, Hebrew, and Yiddish.

(10) Includes Danish, Dutch, French, German, Italian, "other European," Scandinavian, and Swedish.

(11) Includes noncontiguous language combinations such as "Spanish/Hindi" and "Fijian/Hindi," as well as Creole, Navajo, unspecified "Chinese," "Other," and "Thelegu."

### III. AVAILABILITY OF CERTIFIED AND REGISTERED INTERPRETERS

California is the largest immigrant state and the most linguistically diverse, with 224 languages and innumerable dialects spoken here.<sup>11</sup> Census data from a decade ago show that a substantial proportion of Californians did not have English as their first language. According to the 1990 U.S. Census,<sup>12</sup> 31.5 percent of Californians (8,619,334) did not speak English in their homes, and 8.8 percent of the state's population (2,412,034) reported that they did not speak English well or at all. In 1999, according to the Census Bureau's current population survey, more than 4 percent, or 1.34 million, of California's 33.4 million residents spoke no English at all.

California's legal immigration statistics show an increasing rate of growth in ethnic groups less likely to speak English as a first language. According to statistics released by the California Department of Finance,<sup>13</sup> yearly legal immigration to the state averages over 200,000. In the period 1990–1998, legal immigration to California was 1,807,953. Population increases during this period were particularly significant among in ethnic groups less likely to have English as their first language.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> United States Census, Language Use and English Ability, Persons Five Years of Age and Older, by State (1990).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> California State Department of Finance, *Legal Immigration in California by County, 1990–1998*.

<sup>14</sup> California State Department of Finance, *Race-Ethnic Population Estimates: Components of Change in California Counties, April 1990–July 1998*.

Table 9 shows the numbers of interpreter-days spent in the California Courts in fiscal year 1998–1999 for the designated languages,<sup>15</sup> taken from the council’s *2000 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study*. Interpreter-days spent interpreting in the nondesignated languages in fiscal year 1998–1999 are shown in Table 10.

Although there are more than 1,300 certified court and registered interpreters in California, the state’s trial courts are facing a critical shortage of qualified interpreters. For fiscal year 2002-2003 the AOC projects that workload for the court interpreter program will increase by 7%. As already discussed, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely among courts. The needs for specific languages also vary widely among courts, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages. In all of the courts sampled, the availability of interpreters in languages other than Spanish varies. In addition, some courts are reporting that proceedings are being delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Overall, it is clear that California will experience a steady increase in both the need for court interpreting services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE THE NUMBERS OF CERTIFIED AND REGISTERED COURT INTERPRETERS

In 1998 the council became responsible for setting payment rates and other compensation policies for court interpreters. A multipronged strategy is in place to overcome the critical shortage of certified and registered court interpreters. The components of this strategy include:

- Increased rates and an improved incentive-based rate structure to attract and retain certified and registered court interpreters;
- Active recruitment of individuals fluent in the languages most commonly spoken, through public service announcements and job fairs at high schools and universities;
- Collaboration with schools and universities (the nation’s first bachelor’s program in interpreting and translating has now been developed at California State University at Long Beach);

Spanish	145,661
Vietnamese	9,197
Korean	3,716
Cantonese	3,252
Tagalog	1,986
Arabic	1,365
Japanese	1,080
Portuguese	311
Total	166,567

Armenian	2,730
Khmer	2,112
Mandarin	2,100
Russian	1,956
Punjabi	1,492
Laotian	1,407
Hmong	1,262
Farsi	1,136
Mien	651
Hindi	383

<sup>15</sup> Judicial Council of California, *2000 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study*, p .3.2, Table 3.1.

- Preparation and assessment workshops to help interpreters pass the state certified interpreter exam; and
- Working with local trial courts by:
  - ensuring that courts explore all possible avenues in seeking certified interpreters,
  - providing registers of certified court and registered interpreters available throughout California,
  - providing other assistance to courts in locating certified court and registered interpreters, and
  - ensuring that funding allocated for certified interpreters is used only for that purpose.

Since January 1999, the Judicial Council has raised rates for certified contract interpreters three times; the rate is currently \$265 per day statewide. Prior to 1999, rates were set by local trial courts and varied from \$114 to \$210 per day. Even now, California's per diem rate remains lower than the federal rate of \$305 per day. In addition, interpreters can earn significantly higher compensation for conference interpreting in the private sector, where rates range from \$400 to \$800 per day. The council plans to continue to seek rate increases until California rates are competitive with the federal rate.

## V. CONCLUSION

As table 8 shows, the vast majority of all interpretations in the trial courts are performed by certified or registered interpreters. Almost 91 percent of expenditures on interpreters in all languages in a sample of nine courts went to certified and registered interpreters; in designated languages, the figure is still higher with 93.4 percent of expenditures for interpretation going to certified interpreters. Statewide data showing high percentages of expenditures going to certified and registered interpreters, however, can mask local shortages of interpreters in specific languages. Although local shortages represent a small percentage of total expenditures statewide on interpretation, they present serious challenges to the courts in providing access to non-English speakers. Moreover, the current use of interpreters focuses on constitutionally and legally mandated interpreter services in criminal matters. It is unclear how interpreter needs are being met in other important areas of court operations such as civil and family law. The council is committed to seeking expanded funding to ensure that non-English speakers have equal access to the courts and an equal ability to participate in court proceedings.

**Appendix A**  
**Tables of Expenditures on Interpreter Services in Nine Sample Courts**  
**Fiscal year 2000-01**

In order to provide a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Research & Planning unit collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the superior courts of nine counties: Fresno, Los Angeles, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, and Yolo.<sup>1</sup> The principal sources of data were invoices and payment forms for contract interpreters for the entire fiscal year 2000-2001. The superior courts of some counties were able to provide this information electronically while other courts provided copies of payment forms that were then entered into a database. The data from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County alone was entered from over 13,000 individual payment forms. Expenditures were coded to allow for the identification of payment by language and certification status of the interpreter.

Each of the following case studies begins with statewide data reported to the AOC to provide some points of comparison on each court: county population, filings data, and number of staff in the interpreter program. The case studies then report data collected specifically for this report through payment sheets and invoices: expenditures by language and certification status of interpreter.

It should be noted that the expenditures data collected for this report does not include Sign Language interpretations. Discrepancies between the data collected for this report and Quarterly Financial Statements are likely a result of the inclusion of Sign Language expenditures in the Quarterly Financial Statements and their exclusion from this study.

*(1) Superior Court of Los Angeles County.* Los Angeles County is the most populous county in the state with 9,884,300 inhabitants, or 29 percent of California's population according to state Department of Finance estimates for the year 2000. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is also the largest court in California. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County received 2,711,056 filings in fiscal year 1999-2000,<sup>2</sup> approximately 32 percent of all filings statewide.

The court uses interpreters in 640 court rooms at sixty-three different court locations throughout the county. According to Schedule 7A data, the court employs 17 FTE staff to handle its court interpreters program: 6

---

<sup>1</sup> Data for these counties was collected for Fiscal Year 2000-01 with the exception of Sacramento where data was available only for September 2000 to June 2001.

<sup>2</sup> FY 1999-2000 is the most recent complete year for which filing data is available.

FTE interpreter coordinators, 6 FTE legal process clerks, 1 FTE court manager, and 4 FTEs in other assorted positions.

In fiscal year 2000-2001, the court used 648 contract interpreters.<sup>3</sup> Table 1 shows the expenditures for per-diem interpreters in fiscal year 2000-2001 by language and certification status. Because this data was taken directly from payment sheets submitted by interpreters, some of the categories of languages are unclear. For example, it appears that two non-registered interpreters indicated that they interpret in “Bengali/Hindi/Urdu”; another three interpreters put “Sub-Saharan African” as the languages in which they interpret. It is likely that these interpreters work in multiple languages.

Consistent with estimates provided by the court for the budget development process, Table 1 shows that almost 97 percent of all spoken-language interpreting in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is performed by certified or registered interpreters. As expected, Spanish is by far the most widely interpreted language; 373 certified interpreters of this language and 42 noncertified interpreters work in the courts, and expenditures for Spanish interpreting totaled more than \$18 million in fiscal year 2000-2001. The percentage of Spanish language interpreting performed by *certified* interpreters—99 percent—is higher than the overall percentage of interpreting performed by certified interpreters.

The second largest expenditure by language in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is Korean, at \$705,870 in fiscal year 2000-2001. In that year, approximately 93 percent of all expenditures on Korean interpreting were for the services of certified interpreters.

Armenian is the third largest expenditure by language, accounting for \$563,437 in fiscal year 2000-2001. Ninety-nine percent of all expenditures for interpreting in Armenian and Arabic Armenian (combined) went to registered interpreters. Vietnamese accounted for the fourth largest expenditure by language, with \$353,561 spent on contract interpreters, 98 percent of it on certified interpreters.

Numerous nondesignated languages are interpreted primarily or only with nonregistered interpreters. However, these languages together represent a small minority of the total amount of interpreting in the court. For example, the following languages are interpreted primarily or exclusively

---

<sup>3</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs do not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.



with nonregistered interpreters: Albanian, Assyrian, Bengali/Hindi/Urdu, Burmese, Creole, sub-Saharan African, Scandinavian languages, French, Hindi, Indonesian, Mesoamerican languages, Kurdish, other European, Mongolian, Navaho, Samoan, Singhalese, Serbian/Croatian, and Tongan. Yet the total expenditure for these 19 languages combined amounted to \$94,804, or less than one-half of 1 percent of total expenditures on contract per-diem interpreters, in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County during fiscal year 2000–2001.

(2) *The Superior Court of San Diego County.* San Diego County is in the extreme southwestern corner of the state, bordered by Mexico to the south and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The Department of Finance estimates that the population of San Diego County in January 2000 was just under 3 million, at 2,911,500. The Superior Court of San Diego County received 669,968 filings in FY 1999–2000, just under eight percent of the total statewide filings.

The court reports 7.5 FTE staff working in its court interpreter program, 3 of which are staff interpreters. Another FTE is reported as an interpreter coordinator, two FTE are reported as office assistants, and .5 FTE is reported as temporary help.

The Superior Court of San Diego County recently implemented a new accounting system that tracks interpreter expenditures by broad case type.<sup>4</sup> This system makes it possible to not only provide details of expenditures by language and certification status of interpreter, but also to distinguish among expenditures by case type. Table 2 shows expenditures on contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County by case type.<sup>5</sup>

As Table 2 shows, a sizeable majority of the expenditures for contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County go to criminal proceedings. The criminal and traffic category together account for almost 80 percent of all expenditures. A relatively large percentage of expenditures on contract interpreters also goes to family law. The combined total for the three categories, family law, family support division, family court and domestic violence court is \$255,396, or approximately 9.9 percent of all expenditures on contract interpreters. This is more than either the juvenile or traffic category.

---

<sup>4</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs do not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

<sup>5</sup> It is important to keep in mind that the expenditures for interpretation by case type and by language do *not* include the work of the 10.9 FTE staff interpreters reported in the Schedule 7A.

Table 3 shows expenditures for spoken-language contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County by language and certification status. As in Los Angeles County and the rest of the state, Spanish is the dominant language. Approximately \$2.34 million—slightly more than 90 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters—goes to Spanish language interpreters, dwarfing the second highest most interpreted language, Laotian, for which \$47,836 (less than two percent of the total) was spent in fiscal year 2000-2001.

The percentage of total expenditures for contract interpreters going to certified and registered interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County is somewhat lower than that in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Approximately 81 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters in San Diego County went to certified and registered interpreters (compared with 97 percent in Los Angeles County). This figure is below the 89.2 percent estimate provided by San Diego County. However, that estimate, provided through the budget change request process includes sign language interpreters, who provide nearly 4 percent of all interpretations in San Diego.

When expenditures are broken down by language, 87 percent of those for Spanish went to certified interpreters and the remaining 13 percent went to noncertified interpreters (\$308,357). Among the designated languages, all expenditures for Tagalog, Arabic and Portuguese went to noncertified interpreters. Among the newly designated languages, all expenditures for Mandarin and Punjabi went to nonregistered interpreters. Still, the combined total expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters of these five languages was only \$43,899, less than 2 percent of total expenditures. The main factor in the percentage of expenditures for all languages that went to certified and registered interpreters in San Diego County appears to be the expenditures on noncertified Spanish language interpreters.

(3) *Superior Court of Sacramento County.* Sacramento County stretches from the delta lowlands in the west to the Sierra Nevada foothills on the east, and borders eight other counties. According to Department of Finance estimates, Sacramento is the eighth largest county by population with 1,209,500 inhabitants in 2000. The Superior Court of Sacramento

County received 164,386 filings in FY 1999-2000, approximately 2 percent of the total statewide filings.<sup>6</sup>

On Schedule 7A, the court reports 4 authorized, funded FTE staff positions in the interpreter program: 1 senior legal process clerk, 2 staff interpreters, and 1 interpreter coordinator.

The court used 87 interpreters during fiscal year 2000-2001.<sup>7</sup> Approximately half of the spoken-language interpreters used in Sacramento were certified or registered; of the Spanish interpreters, the overwhelming majority were certified. Spanish is the language interpreted most frequently followed by Russian, Hmong and Laotian. Sacramento County divided its interpreter usage by location, and approximately 98 percent of interpretations took place at the courthouse, with the other 2 percent being split between the state mental health center and the probation offices.

Table 4 shows expenditures on contract spoken-language interpreters, by language and certification status, in the Superior Court of Sacramento County. (The table does not include sign language, which accounted for 7 percent of interpreter usage.) According to the table, 58 percent of the expenditures captured in our data were paid to certified and registered interpreters.

The difference between the percentage of expenditures that go to certified and registered interpreters in Sacramento and the percentages that go to certified and registered interpreters in the other two counties examined so far can be explained in large part by the low percentages of certified interpreters in the most widely interpreted languages. Although 86 percent of expenditures for Spanish and 80 percent of expenditures for Russian interpreting went to certified or registered interpreters, six of the next 10 most widely interpreted languages show a majority of expenditures going to *noncertified* and *nonregistered* interpreters. Only 2 percent of expenditures for the third most widely interpreted language — Hmong — and only 44 percent of those for the fourth most widely interpreted language — Vietnamese — go to registered or certified interpreters. Although 57 percent of expenditures on the fifth most frequently interpreted language — Romanian — go to registered

---

<sup>6</sup> Filings data for Sacramento for FY 1999-2000 are an undercount due to problems with the court's case management system. The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

<sup>7</sup> The Superior Court of Sacramento County was unable to provide a full year of data. This section is based upon 10 months of expenditures from September 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001.

interpreters, none of the interpretations in the sixth most frequently interpreted language—Korean—go to certified interpreters.

(4) *Superior Court of Fresno County.* Fresno County lies in the middle of the Central Valley, stretching from the foothills of the Sierra Nevada on the east to the border of Monterey County on the west. Fresno has experienced tremendous growth in recent years and combines a growing urban center with an economy dominated by agriculture. The Department of Finance estimates the population of Fresno in 2000 at 805,000, making it the 10th largest county in the state. In FY 1999-2000, the Superior Court of Fresno County received 185,995 filings, a little more than 2 percent of all filings statewide.

On Schedule 7A, the court reports 9.8 FTE staff working in its court interpreters' program. Five of these positions are identified as staff interpreters, another 3.8 FTEs are reported as temporary positions, and 1 FTE was listed as a branch administrator but works as an interpreter coordinator.

In addition to hiring contract interpreters directly, the Superior Court of Fresno County uses an interpreting agency.<sup>8</sup> In the data provided to the AOC for this report, the Superior Court of Fresno County combines payments to individuals with payments to the interpreter agency making it difficult to determine the exact number of interpreters working in the court. Another quirk in the data from this court is that staff interpreters are counted along with the contract interpreters and paid the same rates. Counting the interpreting agency as one contract interpreter, and staff interpreters along with the per-diem interpreters, the Superior Court of Fresno County uses 93 interpreters. Slightly more than one-third, or 36 of the 93, interpret Spanish for the courts. Of these Spanish language interpreters, 24 are certified and 12 are not.

In regard to other languages, there is a total of 6 certified or registered interpreters for Cambodian, Hmong/Lao, Korean, Mien, and Vietnamese. All other interpreting needs are met using noncertified and nonregistered interpreters or through an interpreting service.

Table 5 shows data collected from payment sheets for contract interpreters for fiscal year 2000-2001 which indicate that 64 percent of these expenditures went to certified or registered interpreters. This percentage is actually 10 points *above* the estimates provided by the

---

<sup>8</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

Superior Court of Fresno County from its budget change request process, which indicate that only 54 percent of all contract per-diem expenditures go to certified or registered interpreters.<sup>9</sup> The real difference between Fresno and the other counties examined so far is in the absence of certified and registered interpreters of languages other than Spanish and Mien. For all languages besides Spanish and Mien in Fresno County, interpreter needs are met using noncertified or nonregistered interpreters. In Spanish, for which 24 of the 36 interpreters are certified, 79 percent of expenditures on interpretations go to certified interpreters. The average expenditure per certified Spanish language interpreter is \$31,965, compared with \$16,838 for noncertified Spanish interpreters suggesting that certified interpreters are given preference over noncertified interpreters.

(5) *Superior Court of San Francisco County.* San Francisco County has a population of 801,400, according to Department of Finance estimates, making it the 11<sup>th</sup> largest county in the state by population, right behind Fresno. Unlike Fresno, San Francisco is predominantly urban with high population density and an economy based upon finance and high technology. In FY 1999-2000, the Superior Court of San Francisco County received 203,347 filings, which amount to 2.4 percent of all filings statewide, a slightly higher percentage of the statewide total than the Superior Court of Fresno received.

The Schedule 7A report for the Superior Court of San Francisco County lists only one FTE (an interpreter coordinator) in the court interpreters program. Like the data from the San Diego courts, the financial data reported by San Francisco County allow for an examination of expenditures on contract interpreters by case type, although in San Francisco the case types are limited to three—criminal, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile dependency.

Table 6 shows a breakdown of cases by three broad case types.<sup>10</sup> The Superior Court of San Francisco County shows 85 percent of expenditures for contract interpreters going to criminal cases with approximately 10 percent going to juvenile delinquency and the remaining 5 percent going to juvenile dependency. Although the percentage of interpreter expenditures going to criminal cases in San Francisco County is higher than that in San Diego County, it is possible

---

<sup>9</sup> This figure provided by the Superior Court of Fresno County in the budget change request forms includes Sign Language interpretations.

<sup>10</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

that additional case types that were separated out by San Diego County, such as drug court cases, were lumped into the criminal category in San Francisco.

Table 7 shows the expenditures of the Superior Court of San Francisco County on contract interpreters, by language and certification status. Slightly more than 86 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters went to certified or registered interpreters— almost exactly the percentage estimated by the court from its budget change request process.

Among the most widely interpreted languages in the San Francisco County courts, the ratios of certified expenditures to noncertified expenditures vary quite dramatically. Over 93 percent of all expenditures for Spanish and Vietnamese interpreters and over 98 percent of all expenditures for Cantonese interpreters are paid for certified interpreters. At the same time, 81 percent of expenditures for Tagalog, and less than half (44.3 percent) of the expenditures for Korean went to certified interpreters and less than half of the expenditures for Russian (36.3 percent) went to registered interpreters.

The most impressive aspect of the data from San Francisco is the apparent diversity of the pool of certified and registered interpreters. With the exception of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, none of the other courts examined so far has as many certified and registered interpreters in so many languages.

(6) *The Superior Court of Monterey County.* Monterey County spans the central coastline between the Counties of San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz and reaches into the western edge of the Central Valley, bordering San Benito and Fresno Counties. The Department of Finance estimates the population of Monterey County at 399,300 in 2000, approximately 1.16 percent of the state's total population. The Superior Court of Monterey County received 95,632 filings in FY 1999-2000<sup>11</sup>, just over 1 percent of all filings statewide.

The court reported two FTE staff working in the area of court interpreters. One FTE is identified as a legal process clerk listed under the court interpreters' program. The other FTE is identified as a court interpreter splitting time between the court interpreters' program -- .25 FTE -- and the program budget area of "Other Support Operations" -- .75 FTE.

---

<sup>11</sup> FY 1999-2000 is the most recent year for which complete filings data are available.

The court uses contract interpreters in three different court locations. In FY 2000-01, the court used forty contract, per diem spoken language interpreters at a cost of \$524,545.<sup>12</sup>

Table 8 shows the expenditures of the Superior Court of Monterey County by language and certification status of the interpreters. Approximately 74 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters go to certified spoken language interpreters (no payments were reported to registered interpreters). This is slightly above the estimate provided for the Budget Change Request process in which the court estimated that 72 percent of expenditures for contract interpreters went to certified interpreters.

The percentage of contract expenditures that go to certified interpreters is driven primarily by Spanish language interpretation which accounts for 91 percent of all contract, per diem expenditures. Certified Spanish interpreters account for 79 percent of expenditures. Vietnamese is the second most frequently interpreted language, and a slight majority – 53 percent – of the \$23,636 expenditures on Vietnamese interpretation was spent on noncertified interpreters. All of the remaining expenditures for designated and non-designated languages go to non-certified and non-registered interpreters.

(7) *Superior Court of Merced County.* Merced County is located in the heart of the Central Valley with a large immigrant and migrant worker population. The county of Merced has an estimated population of 210,100 according to the Department of Finance and received 63,350 filings in FY 1999-2000, approximately three quarters of one percent of all filings statewide.

The Superior Court of Merced County reported one-half FTE authorized staff for FY 2001-2002 working as an interpreter coordinator.

Like the Superior Court of Fresno County, the Superior Court of Merced County uses interpreter agencies in addition to contract interpreters which makes the counting of interpreters problematic. In FY 2000-2001, the Superior Court used thirty-six interpreters or interpreter agencies to translate languages other than Sign Language. Of the interpreters, five certified and registered interpreters perform approximately 15 percent of all interpretations. Interpreter agencies are paid at the nonregistered,

---

<sup>12</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

noncertified rate which suggests that the agencies provide nonregistered noncertified interpreters.

Table 9 shows the mix of expenditures for contract interpreters by language and certification status of interpreters in FY 2000-2001. Out of total expenditures for contract interpreters of \$480,168, 31 percent went to certified or registered interpreters. Although low relative to other counties discussed here, it is twice the level of expenditures for certified or registered interpreters estimated by the court for the Budget Change Request process.

The key to the relatively low percentage of expenditures paid to certified interpreters in the Superior Court of Merced County is the apparent difficulty of finding certified interpreters for Spanish. While Spanish represents 61.3 percent of all interpretation expenditures in the court, only 16.7 percent of these expenditures go to certified interpreters. The Superior Court of Merced County has been able to find registered interpreters for the second most frequently interpreted language – 100 percent of all expenditures for Hmong go to registered interpreters. Expenditures for Hmong, however, represent only 17.2 percent of total expenditures. Mien is the third most frequently interpreted language, 74 percent of expenditures for interpretation in Mien go to registered interpreters. In Cantonese, 100 percent of expenditures for interpretation go to certified interpreters. In Cambodian, 100 percent of expenditures go to registered interpreters. However, all remaining expenditures for contract interpreters go to non-certified, non-registered interpreters.

*(8) The Superior Court of Yolo County*

Yolo County lies on the northwest border of Sacramento County and borders five other Counties in the northern Central Valley. The Department of Finance estimates the population of Yolo County at 162,900 in 2000. In FY 1999-2000, the Superior Court of Yolo County received 41,176 filings, slightly less than one-half of one percent of the total number of filings statewide.

The court reports that it has one FTE authorized and funded position in the court interpreter program for FY 2001-2002, an interpreter coordinator.

In FY 2000-2001, the Superior Court required interpretations in eighteen different languages. The total expenditures by the Superior Court of Yolo County on interpreters for FY 2000-2001 were \$208,788, approximately 82 percent of which is spent on contract interpreters. These figures do not



include Sign Language interpretations that accounted for less than 4 percent of all interpretations.

Table 10 shows the breakdown of expenditures for contract interpreters by language and certification status of the interpreter. Approximately 82.1 percent of all expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the Superior Court of Yolo County went to certified or registered interpreters in FY 2000-2001, almost exactly the 82.56 percent estimated by the court for the Budget Change Request process.

Spanish was the most widely interpreted language in the Superior Court of Yolo County. Over 68 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters in FY 2000-2001 went to Spanish language interpreters and 100 percent of these were certified interpreters. In the second most frequently interpreted language, Russian, all reported expenditures were also spent on registered interpreters. Registered interpreters were not available for Punjabi/Hindi or Laotian/Mien, the third and fourth most frequently interpreted languages. The languages are reported together because payment information does not distinguish, suggesting that interpreters work in more than one of these languages.

*(9) The Superior Court of Napa County.* The Superior Court of Napa County is the smallest court in this study. The County population is 127,000, or slightly less than one-third of one percent of California's population according to Department of Finance estimates for the year 2000. Situated in a largely rural county between Sonoma County to the west, and Yolo and Solano Counties to the east, the Superior Court of Napa County received 25,914 filings in FY 1999-2000, approximately one-third of one percent of all filings statewide.

According to Schedule 7-A data, Napa County has no staff interpreters and one FTE interpreter coordinator covering two court locations within the City of Napa. In FY 2000-2001, the Court used 38 contract interpreters – 3 of which were interpreter services. There were 22 certified interpreters utilized by the Court, 17 Spanish language certified interpreters, and one certified or registered interpreter each for Punjabi, Russian, Arabic, Tagalog and Cantonese/Mandarin. Additionally, there was one registered interpreter used in Hungarian. The usage of certified or registered interpreters accounted for 65 percent of all per diem, contract interpreter expenditures according to the data provided by the Superior Court of Napa County.

Table 11 shows the expenditures of the Superior Court of Napa county by language and status of the interpreter.<sup>13</sup> The largest expenditure, as in all the courts in the study, was for Spanish language interpretation. Spanish language interpretations accounted for over 96 percent of all interpretations, Certified interpreters performed approximately 65 percent of all Spanish language interpretations.

Additionally, 65 percent of all interpretations were performed by certified or registered interpreters. This exceeds the estimates of a 50 percent usage rate for certified or registered interpreters provided by the Court on the Budget Change Request form. The remaining 35 percent of interpretations were performed by non-certified and non-registered interpreters.

---

<sup>13</sup> The following discussion of contract, per-diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

**Table 1, Superior Court of Los Angeles County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 17,824,008	\$ 255,908			\$ 18,079,916	98.58%
Korean	659,194	46,676			705,870	93.39%
Vietnamese	345,378	8,183			353,561	97.69%
Cantonese/Mandarin	162,838	-			162,838	100.00%
Taglog	52,688	79,715			132,403	39.79%
Arabic	91,146	-			91,146	100.00%
Japanese	70,807	-			70,807	100.00%
Japanese Korean	21,943	41,976			63,919	34.33%
Portuguese	11,320	819			12,139	93.25%
Armenian			546,508	5,800	552,308	98.95%
Cambodian			155,395	62,664	218,059	71.26%
Russian			167,000	911	167,911	99.46%
Farsi			149,723	92	149,815	99.94%
Mandarin Taiwanese			141,225	6,278	147,503	95.74%
Chinese Mandarin			112,982	359	113,341	99.68%
Hmong-Lao-Thai			43,684	17,378	61,062	71.54%
Hindi Punjabi Urdu			36,284	14,697	50,981	71.17%
French			18,679	20,835	39,514	47.27%
Farsi/Afghani			28,929	175	29,104	99.40%
Yiddish			24,478	-	24,478	100.00%
Hebrew			18,900	4,963	23,863	79.20%
Amharic Tigrina			14,604	2,854	17,458	83.65%
Romanian			14,871	635	15,506	95.90%
Hungarian			7,555	6,516	14,071	53.69%
Tongan			-	12,130	12,130	0.00%
Arabic Armenian			11,129	-	11,129	100.00%
Indonesian			-	11,082	11,082	0.00%
Italian			9,641	-	9,641	100.00%
Samoan			-	9,592	9,592	0.00%
Polish			9,491	-	9,491	100.00%
German			6,975	92	7,067	98.70%
Meso-American			-	7,059	7,059	0.00%
Greek			4,729	92	4,821	98.09%
Czech/Slovak			3,775	276	4,051	93.19%
Serbian/Croatian			-	3,258	3,258	0.00%
Bulgarian			3,078	92	3,170	97.10%
Sinhalese			-	2,697	2,697	0.00%
Creole			-	2,688	2,688	0.00%
Bengali Hindi Urdu			-	2,641	2,641	0.00%
Hindi			-	2,522	2,522	0.00%
Mongolian			-	2,365	2,365	0.00%
Other European			-	1,905	1,905	0.00%
Burmese			-	1,896	1,896	0.00%
Assyrian			-	1,225	1,225	0.00%
Kurdish			-	1,160	1,160	0.00%
Sub Saharan African			-	1,012	1,012	0.00%
Albanian			-	736	736	0.00%
Navajo			-	709	709	0.00%
Scandanavian			145	368	513	28.27%
Danish			-	92	92	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,239,322</b>	<b>433,277</b>	<b>1,529,780</b>	<b>209,846</b>	<b>21,412,225</b>	<b>97.00%</b>

Criminal	\$ 1,849,688
Juvenile	250,386
Traffic	210,502
Domestic violence court	139,518
Family court	84,131
Family law family support div.	31,746
AOC grant (domestic violence)	6,803
Civil	3,787
Drug court	2,421
Small claims	2,229
Substance abuse evaluation	2,033
Other	691
Juror	530
Total	\$ 2,584,468.00

<sup>14</sup> Note: The Superior Court of San Diego County and the Superior Court of San Francisco County are the only two courts in our study that collected data on interpreter usage by case type.

**Table 3, Superior Court of San Diego County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered		
Spanish	2,032,181	308,357			2,340,538	86.83%
Tagalog	-	23,023			23,023	0.00%
Vietnamese	5,726	14,307			20,033	28.58%
Korean	1,900	11,578			13,478	14.10%
Japanese	1,739	6,714			8,453	20.57%
Cantonese	4,917	3,110			8,027	61.26%
Arabic	-	7,093			7,093	0.00%
Portuguese	-	3,491			3,491	0.00%
Laotian			25,267	22,569	47,836	52.82%
Cambodian			7,500	24,712	32,212	23.28%
Somali			-	21,828	21,828	0.00%
Russian			16,634	-	16,634	100.00%
Mandarin			-	10,108	10,108	0.00%
Ethiopian			-	7,077	7,077	0.00%
Farsi			6,145	644	6,789	90.51%
Other			331	2,976	3,307	10.01%
Kurdish			-	2,577	2,577	0.00%
Italian			-	2,356	2,356	0.00%
Mixteco			-	1,730	1,730	0.00%
Armenian			570	792	1,362	41.85%
Polish			-	1,122	1,122	0.00%
Croatian			-	1,116	1,116	0.00%
Bulgarian			-	810	810	0.00%
Urdu			-	644	644	0.00%
Swahili			-	552	552	0.00%
French			447	-	447	100.00%
Nuer			-	368	368	0.00%
Somoan			-	276	276	0.00%
Hebrew			-	184	184	0.00%
Punjabi			-	184	184	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,046,463</b>	<b>377,673</b>	<b>56,894</b>	<b>102,625</b>	<b>2,583,655</b>	<b>81.41%</b>

**Table 4, Superior Court of Sacramento County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 193,288	\$ 31,136			\$ 224,424	86.13%
Vietnamese	29,014	37,029			66,043	43.93%
Korean	-	41,623			41,623	0.00%
Cantonese/Mandarin	16,044	-			16,044	100.00%
Tagalog	-	7,480			7,480	0.00%
Arabic	5,246	-			5,246	100.00%
Japanese	-	2,117			2,117	0.00%
Portuguese	15	-			15	100.00%
Russian			127,916	32,249	160,165	79.87%
Hmong			1,197	71,928	73,125	1.64%
Romanian			26,701	20,527	47,228	56.54%
Hindi/Punjabi/Urdu			18,757	21,880	40,637	46.16%
Laotian			-	31,752	31,752	0.00%
Mein			21,202	344	21,546	98.40%
Thai			-	21,330	21,330	0.00%
Farsi			10,579	2,727	13,306	79.51%
Cambodian/Khmer			11,436	-	11,436	100.00%
Samoan			-	5,387	5,387	0.00%
Serbian/Croatian			-	3,929	3,929	0.00%
Dari/Pashto			-	1,698	1,698	0.00%
Greek			-	1,243	1,243	0.00%
Fijian/Hindi			-	400	400	0.00%
Czech			-	374	374	0.00%
Dutch			-	285	285	0.00%
Ethiopian			-	24	24	0.00%
Bulgarian			-	22	22	0.00%
Italian			20	-	20	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 243,607</b>	<b>\$ 119,385</b>	<b>\$ 217,808</b>	<b>\$ 216,099</b>	<b>\$ 796,899</b>	<b>57.90%</b>

<b>Table 5, Superior Court of Fresno County</b>						
<b>Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001</b>						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 767,152	\$ 202,059			\$ 969,211	79.15%
Vietnamese	-	10,762			10,762	0.00%
Arabic	-	4,887			4,887	0.00%
Korean	-	2,538			2,538	0.00%
Cantonese/Chinese	-	2,015			2,015	0.00%
Japanese	-	552			552	0.00%
Portuguese	-	451			451	0.00%
Tagalog	-	451			451	0.00%
Hmong/Lao			-	109,609	109,609	0.00%
Cambodian			-	39,538	39,538	0.00%
Punjabi			-	16,261	16,261	0.00%
Armenian			-	9,159	9,159	0.00%
Russian			-	4,665	4,665	0.00%
Mixteco			-	4,160	4,160	0.00%
Mien			3,621	-	3,621	100.00%
Ilocano			-	1,970	1,970	0.00%
Indonesian			-	1,362	1,362	0.00%
Tigrinya			-	1,077	1,077	0.00%
Zapoteco			-	1,068	1,068	0.00%
Somali			-	1,003	1,003	0.00%
Farsi			-	828	828	0.00%
Amharic			-	368	368	0.00%
Mandarin			-	368	368	0.00%
Italian			-	359	359	0.00%
Thelgu			-	175	175	0.00%
Trique			-	175	175	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 767,152</b>	<b>\$ 223,715</b>	<b>\$ 3,621</b>	<b>\$ 192,145</b>	<b>\$ 1,186,633</b>	<b>64.95%</b>

<b>Table 6<sup>15</sup></b>	
<b>Superior Court of San Francisco County</b>	
<b>Expenditures for Contract Per Diem Interpreters</b>	
<b>by Case Type FY 2000-2001</b>	
Criminal	\$ 1,160,373
Juvenile Delinquency	151,082
Juvenile Dependency	81,301
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,392,757</b>

<sup>15</sup> Note: The Superior Court of San Diego County and the Superior Court of San Francisco County are the only two courts in our study that collected data on interpreter usage by case type.

**Table 7, Superior Court of San Francisco County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 686,837	\$ 51,513			\$ 738,350	93.02%
Cantonese	292,209	4,827			297,036	98.37%
Vietnamese	68,119	4,441			72,560	93.88%
Tagalog	46,220	10,834			57,054	81.01%
Arabic	15,892	3,046			18,938	83.92%
Korean	9,325	11,707			21,032	44.34%
Portuguese	4,062	1,466			5,528	73.48%
Japanese	-	6,344			6,344	0.00%
Russian			17,396	30,531	47,927	36.30%
Laotian			10,151	6,518	16,669	60.90%
Punjabi			-	16,057	16,057	0.00%
Cambodian			-	8,601	8,601	0.00%
French			3,267	3,651	6,918	47.22%
Samoan			4,165	2,715	6,880	60.54%
Amharic			4,131	1,777	5,908	69.92%
Mandarin			4,331	382	4,713	91.89%
Thai			971	3,519	4,490	21.63%
Urdu			-	2,955	2,955	0.00%
Polish			-	2,842	2,842	0.00%
Hungarian			-	2,394	2,394	0.00%
Tongan			337	1,746	2,083	16.18%
Hindi			-	1,978	1,978	0.00%
Italian			288	1,629	1,917	15.02%
Mongolian			1,911	-	1,911	100.00%
Creole			-	1,784	1,784	0.00%
Farsi			847	810	1,657	51.12%
Burmese			-	1,279	1,279	0.00%
Tigrinian			1,118	92	1,210	92.40%
Croatian			1,178	-	1,178	100.00%
Ilocano			-	664	664	0.00%
German			-	534	534	0.00%
Greek			-	460	460	0.00%
Armenian			-	368	368	0.00%
Visayan			-	359	359	0.00%
Indonesian			-	358	358	0.00%
Swedish			265	-	265	100.00%
Hebrew			-	184	184	0.00%
Yiddish			-	147	147	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,664</b>	<b>\$ 94,178</b>	<b>\$ 50,356</b>	<b>\$ 94,334</b>	<b>\$ 1,361,532</b>	<b>86.15%</b>



**Table 8, Superior Court of Monterey County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 376,006	\$ 100,963			\$ 476,969	78.83%
Vietnamese	11,130	12,506			23,636	47.09%
Korean	-	5,239			5,239	0.00%
Tagalog	-	4,582			4,582	0.00%
Cantonese	-	372			372	0.00%
Portuguese	-	242			242	
Navajo			-	5,093	5,093	0.00%
Mixteco			-	3,464	3,464	0.00%
Lao/Mien			-	1,642	1,642	0.00%
Hindi/Punjabi			-	1,196	1,196	0.00%
Spanish/Hindi			-	644	644	0.00%
Italian			-	617	617	0.00%
Chinese not specified			-	280	280	0.00%
Hindi			-	180	180	0.00%
Tongan			-	150	150	0.00%
Russian			-	147	147	0.00%
Bisayan/Tagalog			-	92	92	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 387,136</b>	<b>\$ 123,904</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 13,505</b>	<b>\$ 524,545</b>	<b>73.80%</b>

**Table 9, Superior Court of Merced County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 49,149	\$ 245,170			\$ 294,319	16.70%
Portuguese	-	6,938			6,938	0.00%
Vietnamese	-	1,275			1,275	0.00%
Korean	-	1,200			1,200	0.00%
Arabic	-	760			760	0.00%
Japanese	-	700			700	0.00%
Cantonese	225	-			225	100.00%
Hmong			82,400	-	82,400	100.00%
Thai			-	35,104	35,104	0.00%
Mien			16,131	5,765	21,896	73.67%
Punjabi			-	21,642	21,642	0.00%
Laotian			-	6,272	6,272	0.00%
Cambodian			2,100	-	2,100	100.00%
Tzotzil			-	1,185	1,185	0.00%
Trique			-	1,012	1,012	0.00%
Russian			-	585	585	0.00%
Chinese			-	540	540	0.00%
Farsi			-	525	525	0.00%
Armenian			-	455	455	0.00%
Mixteco			-	450	450	0.00%
Hungarian			-	190	190	0.00%
Assyrian			-	95	95	0.00%
German			-	75	75	0.00%
Hindi			-	75	75	0.00%
Pashto			-	75	75	0.00%
Mandarin			-	75	75	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,374</b>	<b>\$ 256,043</b>	<b>\$ 100,631</b>	<b>\$ 74,120</b>	<b>\$ 480,168</b>	<b>31.24%</b>

<b>Table 10, Superior Court of Yolo County</b>						
<b>Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001</b>						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	143,488	-			143,488	100.00%
Vietnamese	-	4,855			4,855	0.00%
Cantonese	1,639	2,452			4,091	40.07%
Tagalog	-	2,215			2,215	0.00%
Cantonese/ Mandarin	-	948			948	0.00%
Arabic	505	-			505	100.00%
Korean	-	114			114	0.00%
Russian			21,045	-	21,045	100.00%
Punjabi/Hindi			-	11,149	11,149	0.00%
Laotain/Mien			-	8,093	8,093	0.00%
Cambodian			4,217	113	4,330	97.40%
Mien			820	1,120	1,940	42.26%
Farsi			-	1,576	1,576	0.00%
Hindi			-	1,285	1,285	0.00%
Hmong			-	1,242	1,242	0.00%
Pashtu			-	973	973	0.00%
Fijian			-	719	719	0.00%
Bosnian/Serbian/ Croatian			-	220	220	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 145,632</b>	<b>\$ 10,584</b>	<b>\$ 26,082</b>	<b>\$ 26,490</b>	<b>\$ 208,788</b>	<b>82.24%</b>

<b>Table 11, Superior Court of Napa County</b>						
<b>Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2000-2001</b>						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified, Registered</b>
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 138,750	4 75,950			\$ 214,700	64.63%
Cantonese/Mandarin	1,325	368			1,693	78.26%
Tagalog	1,029	276			1,305	78.85%
Arabic	441	441			882	50.00%
Hungarian			1,060	-	1,060	100.00%
Czech			-	1,050	1,050	0.00%
Punjabi			265	-	265	100.00%
Russian			265	-	265	100.00%
Cambodian			-	175	175	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 141,545</b>	<b>\$ 77,035</b>	<b>\$ 1,590</b>	<b>\$ 1,225</b>	<b>\$ 221,395</b>	<b>64.65%</b>