

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

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

December 2003

## **Contents**

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	3
A. Legal Mandates	3
B. Court Interpreters Program	4
II. Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	8
A. Statewide	8
B. By County and Category	11
C. Summary of Findings From 20 Sample Courts	13
III. Availability of Certified and Registered Interpreters	17
IV. Recommendations to Increase the Numbers of Certified and Registered Court Interpreters	19
V. Conclusion	20
Appendix	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provision 4, item 0450-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2002 (Stats. 2002, ch. 379) 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 main body of this report provides a detailed response to and data for each of these items. Following are summary responses.

### A. Analysis of Expenditures

**Interpreter Coordinators.** Of the \$67 million appropriation for the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2002–2003, \$5.2 million was spent on trial court staff working as interpreter coordinators and staff interpreters. This represents a \$500,000 increase from fiscal year 2001–2002. The trial courts reported 15.5 authorized funded interpreter coordinator positions, 35 staff interpreters, and 471.1 pro tempore interpreters (see page 5) for fiscal year 2003–2004.<sup>1</sup> The data in Table 3 from Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget, detail court-reported allotments of staff in positions related to interpreting in the court.

**Certified and Registered Spoken Language Interpreters.** To provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by category of interpreter, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC from October 1, 2002, to September 30, 2003, collected detailed information from 20 trial courts that were using the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS);<sup>2</sup> these courts included large, urban trial courts and small, rural trial courts as well as northern, central, and southern trial courts. The 20 courts accounted for 61 percent of the expenditures of the AOC's Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2002–2003 and for 57 percent of total interpreting expenditures by the courts in the same period.

The 2003 legislative report differs from the 2002 legislative report in that it contains data from a full year—October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003. The data were obtained

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2002 legislative report contained an error in its reporting on interpreter coordinators. Instead of “60.92 interpreter coordinators,” it should have read “60.92 staff interpreters and 15.5 interpreter coordinators.”

<sup>2</sup> CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system used by the courts and the AOC to collect and analyze data on the use of and expenditures on spoken language interpreters in the trial courts.

from the CIDCS. This report also contains the most recent *full*-year expenditure data from the quarterly financial statements (QFS) for fiscal year 2002–2003 on *all* facets of court interpreting: court interpreter staff (excluding pro tempore interpreters) as well as travel and other operating expenses. Therefore, the data on expenditures by language and certification status that were obtained from CIDCS and are detailed in Tables 4 and 5 should not be compared to the discussion of the full QFS data for fiscal year 2002–2003, which are detailed in Table 2.

**Spoken Language Interpreters Who Are Not Registered or Certified, Including Provisionally Qualified Interpreters.** Approximately 14 percent of expenditures were on noncertified or nonregistered spoken language interpreters. Specific uses of noncertified or nonregistered interpreters varied widely, however, depending on the language and location.

## **B. Analysis of Availability and Numbers of Interpreters**

Although 86 percent of expenditures were on certified and registered spoken language interpreters, the availability of such 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 while other areas show a growing need for Eastern European languages. Additionally, some courts report anecdotally 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.

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

To address the chronic shortage of qualified spoken language interpreters, the AOC staff has developed a three-year plan that focuses on key areas such as recruitment, retention, and employee management efforts.

Additionally, the AOC staff continued the following recruitment activities in fiscal year 2002–2003:

- Renewed the Incremental Rate Program, which provides working noncertified spoken language interpreters with a financial incentive to gain the skills necessary for certification;
- Participated in a survey of private language schools to gauge the ultimate work goals of interpreting students; and
- Maintained the Telephone Interpreting Pilot Project for rural counties.

## 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>3</sup> In addition, the court must provide a spoken language 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>4</sup>

The Judicial Council is charged by statute to administer statewide standards for spoken language interpreter certification, certification renewal, professional standards, and continuing education as well as interpreter recruitment. Certified and registered spoken language interpreters are required by law to meet certain standards through testing, completion of ethics seminars, and mandated continuing education.<sup>5</sup> Government Code section 68561 and rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court require the trial court to appoint a certified spoken language court interpreter. Courts may use noncertified spoken language 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.

During fiscal year 2002–2003, the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, Government Code section 71800 et seq. (Sen. Bill 371; Stats. 2002, ch. 1047), noticeably affected the field of court interpreting. The intent of the act is to provide for fair treatment of interpreters, greater access to the court system for those who need interpreter services, and sound court management. The Legislature aims for an orderly transition to an employment-based interpreter structure for those eligible interpreters who seek court employment. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is working diligently to assist the courts with this transition.

The AOC and trial court staff have been heavily taxed by the myriad administrative tasks involved in this transition. For example, the act required the Judicial Council to develop rules for the creation and operation of Regional Court Interpreter Employment Relations Committees (RCIERCs).<sup>6</sup> The RCIERCs, in turn, had to set the terms and conditions of

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Const., art. I, §14.

<sup>4</sup> Evid. Code, § 752.

<sup>5</sup> Sen. Bill 1304; Stats. 1992, ch. 770.

<sup>6</sup> Section 71807(b) provides for the creation of a committee to represent each of the four trial court regions: (1) Region 1—Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties; (2) Region 2—counties of the First and Sixth Appellate Districts, except Solano County; (3) Region 3—counties of the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts; and (4) Region 4—Counties of the Fourth Appellate District.

employment for court interpreters and adopt reasonable rules and regulations for the administration of employer-employee relations by April 1, 2003.

By May 1, 2003, trial courts had to begin accepting applications from eligible<sup>7</sup> certified and registered spoken language<sup>8</sup> court interpreters working in the trial courts as independent contractors under Government Code section 71804(b). By March 1, 2003, the courts had to identify eligible interpreters who had worked as independent contractors between January 1, 2002, and January 1, 2003, and present to the council and the recognized employee organization a list of these interpreters.

AOC and trial court staff took on these and other Senate Bill 371 implementation tasks with minimal increase in personnel.<sup>9</sup> The state's uncertain fiscal climate has posed challenging barriers to the AOC's applications for funding to increase personnel (in both the trial courts and the AOC) to implement and administer the act.

## **B. Court Interpreters Program**

Pursuant to Government Code section 68561(a), the council has "designated" eight spoken languages for which certification examinations are administered—Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. In 2000 the council designated an additional five spoken languages for certification—Armenian, Khmer, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Russian. Due to fiscal constraints, the AOC has not been able to obtain funds to develop examinations for all five of these newly designated languages. However, Armenian and Mandarin certification examinations will be completed and administered in March 2004, and the Russian certification examination should be completed by the fall 2004 testing cycle. AOC staff has completed a budget change request for funds to develop examinations for Khmer and Punjabi. Until all the new certification examinations are completed, the courts are using *registered* interpreters in these spoken languages whenever possible.

- To become certified in a designated language, a spoken language interpreter must pass a state certification examination (with both written and oral components); register with the Judicial Council; pay the annual \$85 fee; and attend a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop.
- For any of the nondesignated spoken languages or the five newly designated spoken languages, an interpreter can register with the Judicial Council by passing an English proficiency exam (with both written and oral components); registering with the Judicial

---

<sup>7</sup> Govt. Code, § 71804(a) provides that an interpreter is *eligible for employment* if (1) he or she is certified or registered; (2) he or she has provided services to the same trial court as an independent contractor on at least either 30 court days or portions thereof in both calendar years 2001 and 2002, or 60 court days or portions thereof in calendar year 2002; (3) he or she has applied for the position or court interpreter pro tempore prior to July 1, 2003; and (4) the court has not rejected his or her application for cause.

<sup>8</sup> Govt. Code, § 71801(a) stipulates that the act does not apply to sign language interpreters.

<sup>9</sup> The AOC's Court Interpreters Program received funding for four regional coordinators to facilitate cross-assignments intra- and interregionally.

Council; paying the annual fee of \$50; attending a Judicial Council Code of Ethics and orientation workshop; and attending a Judicial Council Orientation Workshop.

- To *maintain* certification or registration, a spoken language interpreter must submit proof of 30 hours of continuing education and 40 law-related professional assignments biennially.

The 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 1,200 certified interpreters in the eight designated languages. An additional 406 interpreters are registered in one or more nondesignated or newly designated languages, for a total of 1,606 certified and registered spoken language interpreters.

Arabic	9
Cantonese	23
Japanese	10
Korean	45
Portuguese	6
Spanish	1,063
Tagalog	5
Vietnamese	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,200</b>

Source: Court Interpreters Program, AOC, October 2003

### Spoken Language Interpreters

Since July 1, 2003, spoken language interpreters used in the California court system can be divided into two categories—pro tempore employees and independent contractors. Pro tempore employees must be certified or registered. Independent-contract interpreters may be certified, noncertified, registered, nonregistered, “opt-out,” or provisionally qualified. These categories correspond to the languages the interpreters speak, their employment status under SB 371, and the level of screening they have passed. Definitions of the categories and subcategories follow.

- **Pro tempore employee:** A certified or registered spoken language interpreter who accepted employment with a superior court on or after July 1, 2003.<sup>10</sup>
  - *Certified interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who has passed the certification examination in one of the fourteen *designated* languages for which there is currently an examination, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biennial continuing education and professional requirements.
  - *Registered interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who has passed an English fluency exam, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics and orientation workshops, and meets biennial continuing education and professional requirements. A registered interpreter may interpret in any of the nondesignated spoken languages, as well as in any of the five newly designated languages until certification examinations are created.

<sup>10</sup> Govt. Code, § 71803(a) reads in pertinent part: “In each trial court, there shall be a new employee classification entitled ‘court interpreter pro tempore’ to perform simultaneous and consecutive interpretation and sight translation in spoken languages for the trial courts.”

- **Independent contractor:** An independent-contract court interpreter of a spoken language other than those independent contractors who opted out of pro tempore employment under the provisions set forth in Government Code section 71802(b) (known as opt-out independent contractors). “Regular” independent contractors may be certified or noncertified, registered or nonregistered.
  - *Noncertified interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the designated languages but has not yet met certification requirements.
  - *Nonregistered interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the nondesignated languages or the newly designated languages that do not yet have certification examinations but who has not yet met registration requirements.
  - *“Opt-out” independent contractor:* A certified or registered court interpreter of a spoken language who qualified to opt out of employment under the provisions set forth in Government Code section 71802(b).
  - *Provisionally qualified interpreter:*<sup>11</sup> A spoken language interpreter who interprets in the courts in any language who has: passed the written examination for that language, taken the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, been provisionally qualified under rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court, and applied for and been accepted in the incremental rate program.

### **American Sign Language Interpreters**

In September 2003, the Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Unit of the AOC’s Human Resources Division assumed administrative control of the American Sign Language Court Interpreters Program, which was previously under the charge of the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee’s Interpreters for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Working Group. Access and Fairness Advisory Committee staff from the Office of the General Counsel supported the working group.

Since 1996, the California Coalition for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CCASDHH) and the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) have been the two programs that certify interpreters for the deaf and hard of hearing on behalf of the Judicial Council. CCASDHH and RID submit a biennial progress report to the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee

---

<sup>11</sup> Any noncertified or nonregistered interpreter interpreting on the record in a criminal or juvenile proceeding must be provisionally qualified under rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court. 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 has submitted proof of the following is eligible for an additional \$13/half day or \$25/full day for two years: 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 higher rate. Out of 25 participants in the program, 12 have obtained certification or registration since its inception. For the purposes of this study, expenditures on provisionally qualified interpreters are included in the discussion of expenditures on noncertified, nonregistered interpreters.



of the Judicial Council to demonstrate full compliance with the *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hearing Impaired Persons*.<sup>12</sup>

In fall 2000, the advisory committee's Access for Persons With Disabilities Subcommittee determined that an insufficient number of qualified, certified court American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters are available in California. The progress reports revealed that only 39 persons were certified to interpret during legal proceedings in the California courts. Three years later, this number has increased to a mere 43.

CCASDHH and RID are responsible for establishing and maintaining their certification processes, including testing, certification, renewals, and continuing education requirements for ASL interpreters. In fiscal year 2003–2004, the CIP Unit will carry out an investigation into recruitment and retention of ASL interpreters and the use of ASL interpreters in California, in addition to overseeing the certification processes of CCASDHH and RID. These findings will be reported in the 2004 report to the Legislature.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Judicial Council adopted these guidelines in 1992 in an effort to monitor the performance of the entities it designated to certify American Sign Language interpreters.

## **II. EXPENDITURES ON AND USE OF INTERPRETERS**

### **A. Statewide**

All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements (QFS) to the AOC. The QFS for the courts in this study for fiscal year 2002–2003 are reported in Table 2. 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. Another source of statewide data on interpreters is the Salary and Position Worksheet—compiled by the AOC and reported on Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget—in which all trial courts report the salaries and job titles of authorized, funded staff as shown in Table 3. A third source of statewide data is the biannual report on each trial court’s use of registered, noncertified, and nonregistered interpreters. A fourth source of statewide data is CIDCS, the Internet-based data collection system in use by most of the superior courts in California.

Beginning in the second quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the AOC launched a centralized Web-based data collection system for tracking expenditures on interpreter services by language, case type, and event type. Known as the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS), this system is linked to all 58 trial courts through Serranus, the judicial branch’s internal Web site. As of November 1, 2003, 51 of the 58 courts had input data into the system.

CIDCS was created to supplement expenditure data on the use of interpreters in this report and in the budget change process. Due to the historical development of trial courts under a dual state-county system of funding, each trial court tracks detailed information on interpreters differently. Although estimates provided by the courts for the budget process distinguish between expenditures for two different categories of interpreters—that is, estimates of certified and registered expenditures are separated from those of noncertified and nonregistered expenditures—no distinction by language is made in these estimates. For fiscal year 2003–2004 and beyond, the AOC will be able to draw reports from CIDCS on use by language, certification status, and case type, subject to the superior courts’ fully using CIDCS to log interpreter assignments.

The data presented in Section C and the appendix are taken from CIDCS for the period from October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003—the first year of the system’s use. Table 4 illustrates data from 20 courts that reported full information on interpreter usage in CIDCS from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, as well as two months of data from Los Angeles (December 2002 and March 2003.) Through a special arrangement with the Court Interpreters Program, the Los Angeles court enters only one month of every quarter into CIDCS due to heavy usage of interpreters and low numbers of staff. Table 5 illustrates

data from the 19 courts that reported full information from July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003, when SB 371 first went into effect.

Data were collected on full- and half-day interpreting sessions by language and certification status as well as by other information such as case type and the number of cases. Only expenditure data by language and certification status will be presented here.

The data are broken into two tables. Table 4 details the information provided by the 20 sample courts from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. Table 5 details the information provided by 19 sample courts<sup>13</sup> from July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003, the first quarter of interpreter data collection when SB 371 was in effect. Table 5 also illustrates the impact of SB 371 by presenting the data broken down by pro tempore employees; contract, per-diem and opt-out interpreters; and noncertified or nonregistered interpreters in both language categories (designated and nondesignated.)

The 20 sample courts—which include courts of all sizes, from large urban courts such as San Diego to smaller, more rural courts such as Tuolumne—reported that they had used more than 67 languages during the period from October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003. As Table 4 illustrates, these 20 sample courts accounted for more than 61 percent of the \$67 million total spent on court interpreting in California and for 57 percent of the approximately \$1.9 billion total expenditures of the state trial courts in fiscal year 2002–2003.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Superior Court of Los Angeles County did not provide any data during this period.

**Table 2: Total Expenditures on Interpreters by Court, Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Total Court Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Superior Court of Los Angeles County	\$ 623,655,413	\$ 28,243,500	4.53%	42.19%
Superior Court of San Diego County	\$ 150,600,450	\$ 3,370,596	2.24%	5.03%
Superior Court of Sacramento County	\$ 75,049,156	\$ 1,887,405	2.51%	2.82%
Superior Court of Fresno County	\$ 39,135,698	\$ 1,656,489	4.23%	2.47%
Superior Court of San Mateo County	\$ 37,154,972	\$ 1,080,465	2.91%	1.61%
Superior Court of Contra Costa County	\$ 49,779,299	\$ 939,345	1.89%	1.40%
Superior Court of San Joaquin County	\$ 26,701,422	\$ 778,967	2.92%	1.16%
Superior Court of Santa Barbara County	\$ 22,201,974	\$ 746,071	3.36%	1.11%
Superior Court of Tulare County	\$ 16,475,299	\$ 675,687	4.10%	1.01%
Superior Court of Santa Cruz County	\$ 13,450,605	\$ 447,133	3.32%	0.67%
Superior Court of Madera County	\$ 5,190,886	\$ 357,270	6.88%	0.53%
Superior Court of Placer County	\$ 11,064,166	\$ 246,025	2.22%	0.37%
Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County	\$ 13,101,323	\$ 188,053	1.44%	0.28%
Superior Court of Sutter County	\$ 3,471,690	\$ 134,076	3.86%	0.20%
Superior Court of Shasta County	\$ 9,468,784	\$ 100,623	1.06%	0.15%
Superior Court of Nevada County	\$ 4,977,876	\$ 59,479	1.19%	0.09%
Superior Court of Del Norte County	\$ 1,947,987	\$ 32,300	1.66%	0.05%
Superior Court of Tuolumne County	\$ 3,132,444	\$ 21,666	0.69%	0.03%
Superior Court of Lassen County	\$ 2,006,628	\$ 11,638	0.58%	0.02%
Superior Court of Imperial County(1)				
<b>20 Surveyed courts</b>	<b>\$ 1,108,566,072</b>	<b>\$ 40,976,788</b>	<b>3.70%</b>	<b>61.21%</b>
<b>Rest of the state</b>	<b>\$ 818,563,505</b>	<b>\$ 22,417,417</b>	<b>2.74%</b>	<b>33.49%</b>
<b>Statewide consolidated</b>	<b>\$ 1,927,129,577</b>	<b>\$ 66,945,613</b>	<b>3.47%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2002-2003

(1) As of November 21, 2003, the Superior Court of Imperial County had not reported its QFS for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2002-2003

**Table 3: Fiscal Year 2003–2004 Authorized, Funded FTE Staff  
in Court Interpreters Program as of July 30, 2003**

	<i>Pro Tempore Interpreters (1)</i>	<i>Staff Interpreters</i>	<i>Interpreter Coordinators</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff FY 03–04</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff 02–03</i>	<i>Change 02–03 to 03–04</i>
Alameda	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Calaveras	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Colusa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contra Costa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
El Dorado	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fresno	0.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	1.0
Glenn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Humboldt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Imperial	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Kern	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Los Angeles	352.0	0.0	7.0	359.0	7.0	352.0
Madera	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Marin	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Mendocino	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Merced	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	-1.0
Mono	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Monterey	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	-1.0
Napa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orange	34.0	1.0	0.0	35.0	1.0	34.0
Riverside	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Sacramento	3.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	2.0	3.0
San Benito	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Bernardino	42.0	0.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	42.0
San Diego	10.5	7.0	0.0	17.5	7.9	9.6
San Francisco	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Joaquin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Mateo	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Santa Barbara	1.0	5.0	0.5	6.5	5.5	1.0
Santa Clara	6.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	6.5
Santa Cruz	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Shasta	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-0.3
Siskiyou	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Solano	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Sonoma	5.0	0.0	1.0	6.0	1.0	5.0
Stanislaus	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Sutter	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Tehama	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Tulare	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
Trinity	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tuolumne	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura	0.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	6.0	0.0
Yolo	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Yuba	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>471.1</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>521.6</b>	<b>52.65</b>	<b>468.95</b>

(1) Pro Tempore interpreters are an added category due to SB 371. These numbers will be updated quarterly with the Quarterly Financial Statements.

Table 4: Expenditures on Contract Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter, October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003(1)							Language as % of Interpreting Expenditures
	Designated Languages		Nondesignated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered			
Spanish	\$ 8,922,111	\$ 813,998			\$ 9,736,109	92%	80.3%
Korean	\$ 138,924	\$ 25,832			\$ 164,756	84%	1.4%
Vietnamese	\$ 199,941	\$ 114,645			\$ 212,062	94%	1.7%
Cantonese	\$ 58,816	\$ 107,244			\$ 186,353	32%	1.5%
Tagalog	\$ 29,312	\$ 50,100			\$ 136,331	22%	1.1%
Arabic	\$ 34,351	\$ 11,560			\$ 46,806	73%	0.4%
Japanese	\$ 19,886	\$ 11,482			\$ 34,870	57%	0.3%
Portuguese	\$ 13,942	\$ 11,042			\$ 19,263	72%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 9,417,284</b>	<b>\$ 1,145,904</b>			<b>\$ 10,536,550</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>86.9%</b>
Armenian (9)			\$ 163,110	\$ 5,543	\$ 168,653	97%	1.4%
Mandarin			\$ 98,870	\$ 4,477	\$ 103,347	96%	0.9%
Hmong			\$ 118,557	\$ 62,136	\$ 180,693	66%	1.5%
Russian			\$ 228,408	\$ 4,031	\$ 232,439	98%	1.9%
Cambodian			\$ 108,076	\$ 52,743	\$ 160,820	67%	1.3%
Farsi (10)			\$ 57,577	\$ 3,957	\$ 61,533	94%	0.5%
Asian Indian languages (2)			\$ 107,982	\$ 34,959	\$ 142,921	76%	1.2%
Mien			\$ 41,195	\$ 35,155	\$ 76,350	54%	0.6%
Eastern, Southern European languages (4)			\$ 48,631	\$ 6,194	\$ 54,825	89%	0.5%
Other Western European languages (7)			\$ 22,154	\$ 3,525	\$ 25,678	86%	0.2%
Middle Eastern languages (6)			\$ 14,610	\$ 5,523	\$ 20,133	73%	0.2%
Laotian			\$ 106,362	\$ 85,501	\$ 191,863	55%	1.6%
Tongan			\$ 19,970	\$ 11,532	\$ 31,502	63%	0.3%
African Languages (5)			\$ 4,241	\$ 33,449	\$ 37,690	11%	0.3%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)			\$ 21,603	\$ 14,919	\$ 36,522	59%	0.3%
Samoa			\$ 2,234	\$ 6,764	\$ 8,998	25%	0.1%
All Other Languages (8)			\$ -	\$ 54,332	\$ 54,332	0%	0.4%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 1,163,560</b>	<b>\$ 424,739</b>	<b>\$ 1,588,299</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,417,284</b>	<b>\$ 1,145,904</b>	<b>\$ 1,163,560</b>	<b>\$ 424,739</b>	<b>\$ 12,124,849</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes data from Los Angeles for December 2002 and March 2003 only. The rest of the submissions are for October 2002 through June 2003.

(2) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu, and Tamil.

(3) Includes Burmese, Fijian, Fijian Hindi, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai.

(4) Includes Albanian, Serbian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Slovakian, Ukrainian, and Georgian.

(5) Includes Amharic, Somali, and Tigrinya.

(6) Includes Kurdish, Chaldean, and Hebrew.

(7) Includes French, Italian, Greek, Swedish, and German.

(8) Includes Latin American languages such as Mixteco, Trique, Q'anjob'al, Tzotzil, and Zapateco.

(9) Armenian includes Armenian and Western Armenian.

(10) Farsi includes Farsi (Persian of Iran) and Dari (Persian of Afghanistan).

	Table S: Expenditures on Contract Per-Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter, July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003(1)							Language as % of Interpreter Expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Nondesignated Languages			Language Total		
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/Opt- Out	Noncertified	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/Opt- Out	Nonregistered			
Spanish	\$ 1,083,462	\$ 791,061	\$ 232,268				\$ 2,106,791	89%	79.0%
Vietnamese	\$ 17,207	\$ 28,976	\$ 26,937				\$ 73,119	63%	2.7%
Tagalog		\$ 8,010	\$ 24,902				\$ 32,911	24%	1.2%
Cantonese	\$ 4,050	\$ 10,138	\$ 2,438				\$ 16,626	85%	0.6%
Portuguese		\$ 5,235	\$ 6,019				\$ 11,254	47%	0.4%
Korean	\$ 629	\$ 3,180	\$ 6,975				\$ 10,783	35%	0.4%
Arabic		\$ 1,347	\$ 4,892				\$ 6,239	22%	0.2%
Japanese		\$ 588	\$ 4,636				\$ 5,224	11%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 1,105,348</b>	<b>\$ 848,535</b>	<b>\$ 309,066</b>				<b>\$ 2,262,949</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>84.8%</b>
Russian				\$ 49,324	\$ 12,718	\$ 1,206	\$ 63,248	98%	2.4%
Hmong				\$ 45,226	\$ 2,947	\$ 13,044	\$ 61,217	79%	2.3%
Laotian				\$ 18,486	\$ 19,992	\$ 19,000	\$ 57,478	67%	2.2%
Asian Indian languages (2)				\$ 10,431	\$ 22,994	\$ 8,017	\$ 41,443	81%	1.6%
Cambodian				\$ 10,765	\$ 7,167	\$ 14,782	\$ 32,713	55%	1.2%
All other languages (8)						\$ 23,259	\$ 23,259	0%	0.9%
Mien					\$ 13,945	\$ 9,279	\$ 23,224	60%	0.9%
Armenian (9)				\$ 18,537	\$ 2,803	\$ 1,757	\$ 23,097	92%	0.9%
Mandarin				\$ 2,646	\$ 15,930	\$ 992	\$ 19,568	95%	0.7%
Farsi (10)					\$ 9,550	\$ 3,835	\$ 13,385	71%	0.5%
Eastern, Southern European languages (4)					\$ 9,288	\$ 3,011	\$ 12,299	76%	0.5%
African languages (5)					\$ 2,911	\$ 7,231	\$ 10,142	29%	0.4%
South Asian, Pacific Island languages(3)				\$ 853	\$ 2,340	\$ 6,703	\$ 9,896	32%	0.4%
Tongan					\$ 4,191	\$ 2,466	\$ 6,657	63%	0.2%
Middle Eastern languages (6)				\$ 1,971	\$ 588	\$ 1,848	\$ 4,407	58%	0.2%
Other Western European languages (7)				\$ 265	\$ 412	\$ 900	\$ 1,577	43%	0.1%
Samoa					\$ 1,102	\$ 368	\$ 1,470	75%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 158,504</b>	<b>\$ 128,878</b>	<b>\$ 117,697</b>	<b>\$ 158,504</b>	<b>\$ 128,878</b>	<b>\$ 117,697</b>	<b>\$ 405,079</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,105,348</b>	<b>\$ 848,535</b>	<b>\$ 309,066</b>	<b>\$ 158,504</b>	<b>\$ 128,878</b>	<b>\$ 117,697</b>	<b>\$ 2,668,028</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) The information presented in this table does not include data from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

(2) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu, and Tamil.

(3) Includes Burmese, Fijian, Fijian Hindi, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai.

(4) Includes Albanian, Serbian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Slovakian, Ukrainian, and Georgian.

(5) Includes Amharic, Somali, and Tigrinya.

(6) Includes Kurdish, Chaldean, and Hebrew.

(7) Includes French, Italian, Greek, Swedish, and German.

(8) Includes Latin American languages such as Mixteco, Trique, Q'anjol'bal, Tzeltal, and Zapoteco.

(9) Armenian includes Armenian and Western Armenian.

(10) Farsi includes Farsi (Persian of Iran) and Dari (Persian of Afghanistan).

## B. By County and Category

Each court sends 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 Supplement to the Annual Budget*. In July 2003 the trial courts reported more than 520 full-time equivalent (FTE) authorized and funded staff positions in the trial courts' interpreter programs for fiscal year 2003–2004. The overwhelming majority of these positions were staff interpreters and pro tempore interpreters (as defined by SB 371).

Not all the courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, only about 40 percent of the superior courts—24 of 58—reported authorized funded staff in the interpreter programs for fiscal year 2003–2004. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the court interpreters reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state. Most courts still rely primarily on contract interpreters; however, SB 371 has caused an increase in the number of pro tempore interpreters. Many courts also use court personnel, such as courtroom or calendar clerks, to assist with interpreter coordination in addition to their other duties, but these positions are not listed in Schedule 7A.

The Judicial Council established statewide standards for interpreter pay and authorized increases in the amounts paid for full-day and half-day interpreting effective January 1, 1999. Two additional increases were authorized and made effective on July 1, 1999, and July 1, 2000.<sup>14</sup> Table 6 shows the changes in payment over time. Certified and registered interpreters are currently paid 32.5 percent more for a full day of interpreting 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 wages paid to noncertified and nonregistered interpreters to provide a financial incentive for new and existing court interpreters to become certified or registered. Despite the increases in pay for certified and registered interpreters, compensation for interpreters in the state trial courts still lags behind the \$305 paid to federally certified interpreters for a full day. The Judicial Council sought but did not receive funding for further rate increases in fiscal year 2001–2002, and it will continue to strive to ensure that California rates are made competitive with the federal rates.

	Table 6: Rates Paid for Interpreters							
	Certified (Registered)				Noncertified (Nonregistered)			
	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

<sup>14</sup> Prior to 1999, pay rates for interpreting varied among different courts.



### **C. Summary of Findings from 20 Sample Courts**

- ♦ **Needs for interpreting in the state courts are dominated by Spanish.** Of the \$14 million in expenditures reported in the 20 sample courts during the first year of CIDCS usage, 80 percent were for Spanish language interpreting.
- ♦ **Needs for interpreting are also dominated by the largest court in the state, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.** In the first year of CIDCS use, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County reported two months of interpreter data (December 2002 and March 2003). These two months accounted for approximately 31 percent of the total interpreter expenditures reported by the 20 sample courts during the first year of CIDCS usage. 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 County, where these languages are the second and third most frequently used, makes them the second and third largest expenses, respectively, after Spanish in our sample (see Table 4).
- ♦ **Statewide, the trial courts have very diverse interpreting needs.** As the example from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County indicates, statewide trends may not reflect needs for interpreting in individual courts. For the 20 courts in our sample, interpreters were used in more than 64 different languages, from Albanian to Vietnamese, during the first year of CIDCS usage. The expenditure data examined for this report indicate the following:
  - *Differing interpreting needs across courts can be seen in the diversity of the languages with the highest expenditures.* Although interpreting expenditures were highest in Spanish in every court, no two courts had the same language for the second highest expenditure. Asian Indian languages and Russian were the second highest expenditures in four courts, while the “Other” category used to capture mostly Meso-American languages was the second highest expenditure category in three courts.
  - *South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Eastern European languages are increasingly important.* In many of the courts, including many of the smaller courts such as the Superior Courts of Shasta and Placer Counties, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Eastern European languages have become particularly important. In both the Shasta and Placer courts, languages from these regions accounted for approximately half of expenditures on interpreting during the first year of CIDCS usage. In the Superior Court of Sacramento County, Russian, Hmong, and Armenian account for over 27 percent of total expenditures on interpreting, while Spanish accounts for approximately 42 percent.
  - *The availability of certified and registered interpreters varies across courts.* Although the majority of interpreting needs statewide are met with certified and

registered interpreters when available, within individual courts the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies considerably. For instance, while in the Superior Court of San Diego County 93 percent of interpreting was performed by certified or registered interpreters, in the Superior Court of Lassen County certified or registered interpreters did no interpreting.

- *The influence of the size of the court on the availability of certified and registered interpreters is not clear.* It would appear that larger courts have the advantage of being able to draw from a larger pool of certified and registered interpreters. The Superior Court of San Diego County, for example, is able to meet 100 percent of its needs for interpreting in Spanish and Russian with certified and registered interpreters. However, it also appears that smaller courts have found certified and registered interpreters to meet their needs. In the Superior Court of Del Norte County, certified or registered interpreters have performed 100 percent of interpreting. Additionally, in the Superior Court of Tuolumne County, certified and registered interpreters have performed 100 percent of interpreting in Korean and Hmong.

### III. AVAILABILITY OF CERTIFIED AND REGISTERED INTERPRETERS

The proportion of California's population that is foreign born—26 percent—is higher than that of any other state.<sup>15</sup> California is also the most linguistically diverse state, with 224 languages and innumerable dialects spoken here.<sup>16</sup> According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 39.5 percent of Californians (12,401,756) speak a language other than English in their homes, which represents an increase of more than 4 million from 1990. The 2000 U.S. Census also revealed that 20 percent of the state's population (6,277,779) reported not being able to speak English well and that 3.5 percent, or 1.11 million, of California's 31.4 million residents over age 5 were linguistically isolated or spoke no English at all.

California's statistics on legal immigration show an increasing rate of growth in ethnic groups unlikely to speak English as a first language. According to statistics released by the California Department of Finance,<sup>17</sup> yearly legal immigration to the state averages more than 200,000. In the period 1990–2000, legal immigration to California was 2,186,774. Population increases during this period were particularly significant among ethnic groups unlikely to have English as their first language.<sup>18</sup>

Although there are more than 1,600 certified and registered spoken language interpreters in California, the state's trial courts are facing a critical shortage of qualified interpreters. 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. Some courts report anecdotally that proceedings are being delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Additionally, Government Code section 71802(c)(2) limits the use of independent contract interpreters to 100 days per calendar year in each county. This limitation poses an additional threat to superior courts when attempting to obtain certified and registered spoken language interpreters for all cases in which spoken language interpreters are mandated. The AOC staff, with the help of interpreter coordinators, is surveying the state's courts to determine the extent of this threat and will choose an appropriate course of action after all data have been gathered.

Additionally, it is unlikely that 43 certified ASL interpreters are enough to meet the need for sign language interpreting in the state's courts.

---

<sup>15</sup> Public Policy Institute of California, *Just the Facts: Immigration in California* (July 2002).

<sup>16</sup> United States Census, *Language Use and English Ability, Persons Five Years of Age and Older*, by State (2000).

<sup>17</sup> California Department of Finance, *Legal Immigration to California by County, 1990–2000*.

<sup>18</sup> California Department of Finance, *Race-Ethnic Population Estimates: Components of Change in California Counties, April 1990–July 1999*.

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, while not having enough interpreters to meet these demands.

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

In 1998 the Judicial Council became responsible for setting payment rates and other compensation policies for court interpreters. In addition to the recruitment activities described on page 2, 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);
- Development of a plan highlighting specific steps to incorporate ASL interpreter issues into the AOC's Court Interpreters Program;
- Development of standards and/or rules related to the use of team interpreting for spoken language interpretations in trials of long duration;
- Development and implementation of a refresher course for interpreters who wish to return to the interpreting profession after being on inactive status;
- Creation of a policy or rule of court to establish standards for authorizing translation of documents of criminal proceedings in a format and manner approved by the Judicial Council;
- Expansion and implementation of a mentoring program in which experienced court interpreters serve as counselors and guide new interpreters in languages other than Spanish;
- Creation of a plan to work with spoken language and ASL interpreter associations to address language access issues;
- Development of a resource manual for court interpreters, including relevant rules of court, statutes, protocols, practices, standards, and service-related statistics; and
- Development of a plan to seek funds to assist prospective interpreters of languages other than Spanish in attending courses and workshops in legal interpreting.

Since January 1999, the Judicial Council has raised the pay rates for certified and registered spoken language 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). However, California's per diem rate for certified and registered spoken language interpreters remains lower than the federal rate of \$305 per day. Additionally, interpreters can earn significantly higher compensation for conference interpreting in the private sector, where rates range from \$400 to \$800 per day.

## **V. CONCLUSION**

As tables 4 and 5 show, certified or registered spoken language interpreters performed the vast majority of all interpreting in the trial courts. From October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, 87 percent of expenditures on interpreters in all languages in our sample of 20 courts were for certified and registered interpreters. From July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003, the percentage was 84 in our sample of 19 courts. In designated languages, these figures are still higher—with 89 percent of expenditures for spoken language interpreting going to certified interpreters from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, and 86 percent from July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003.

Statewide data showing high percentages of expenditures going to certified and registered spoken language interpreters, however, can mask local shortages of interpreters in specific languages. Although resolving these shortages would require only a small percentage of total statewide expenditures on interpreting, the missing languages are serious challenges to the courts' provision of access to non-English speakers.

Moreover, the current use of interpreters is limited to constitutionally and legally mandated interpreter services in criminal matters. It is unclear how interpreting needs are being met in other important areas of court operations, such as civil and family law, and in legal proceedings involving persons who are deaf or hard of hearing.

The Judicial Council is committed to seeking expanded funding to ensure that non-English speakers and individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing have access to the courts and an ability to participate in court proceedings in a manner equal to those of hearing, English-speaking people.

**Table 2: Total Expenditures on Interpreters by Court Fiscal Year 2002-2003.**

	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as a % of Total Court Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as a % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Superior Court of Los Angeles County	\$ 623,655,413	\$ 28,243,500	4.53%	42.19%
Superior Court of San Diego County	\$ 150,600,450	\$ 3,370,596	2.24%	5.03%
Superior Court of Sacramento County	\$ 75,049,156	\$ 1,887,405	2.51%	2.82%
Superior Court of Fresno County	\$ 39,135,698	\$ 1,656,489	4.23%	2.47%
Superior Court of San Mateo County	\$ 37,154,972	\$ 1,080,465	2.91%	1.61%
Superior Court of Contra Costa County	\$ 49,779,299	\$ 939,345	1.89%	1.40%
Superior Court of San Joaquin County	\$ 26,701,422	\$ 778,967	2.92%	1.16%
Superior Court of Santa Barbara County	\$ 22,201,974	\$ 746,071	3.36%	1.11%
Superior Court of Tulare County	\$ 16,475,299	\$ 675,687	4.10%	1.01%
Superior Court of Santa Cruz County	\$ 13,450,605	\$ 447,133	3.32%	0.67%
Superior Court of Madera County	\$ 5,190,886	\$ 357,270	6.88%	0.53%
Superior Court of Placer County	\$ 11,064,166	\$ 246,025	2.22%	0.37%
Superior Court of San Luis Obispo county	\$ 13,101,323	\$ 188,053	1.44%	0.28%
Superior Court of Sutter County	\$ 3,471,690	\$ 134,076	3.86%	0.20%
Superior Court of Shasta County	\$ 9,468,784	\$ 100,623	1.06%	0.15%
Superior Court of Nevada County	\$ 4,977,876	\$ 59,479	1.19%	0.09%
Superior Court of Del Norte County	\$ 1,947,987	\$ 32,300	1.66%	0.05%
Superior Court of Tuloumne County	\$ 3,132,444	\$ 21,666	0.69%	0.03%
Superior Court of Lassen County	\$ 2,006,628	\$ 11,638	0.58%	0.02%
Superior Court of Imperial County(1)				
<b>20 Surveyed courts</b>	<b>\$ 1,108,566,072</b>	<b>\$40,976,788</b>	<b>3.70%</b>	<b>61.21%</b>
<b>Rest of the State</b>	<b>\$ 818,563,505</b>	<b>\$22,417,417</b>	<b>2.74%</b>	<b>33.49%</b>
<b>State Wide Consolidated</b>	<b>\$ 1,927,129,577</b>	<b>\$ 66,945,613</b>	<b>3.47%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2002-2003

(1) As of November 21, 2003, the Superior Court of Imperial County had not reported their QFS for Q4 FY02-03

**Table 3: Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Authorized, Funded FTE Staff in Court Interpreters Program as of July 30, 2003**

	<i>Pro-Tempore Interpreters (1)</i>	<i>Staff Interpreters(2 )</i>	<i>Interpreter Coordinators</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff FY 03-04</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff 02-03</i>	<i>Change 02- 03 to 03-04</i>
Alameda	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butte	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calaveras	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.1
Colusa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Dorado	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno	0	6	0	6	5	1
Glenn	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humboldt	0	0	0	0	0	0
Imperial	0	3	0	3	3	0
Kern	0	2	1	3	3	0
Los Angeles	0	352	7	359	7	352
Madera	5	0	0	5	0	5
Marin	5	0	0	5	0	5
Mendocino	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merced	0	0	0	0	1	-1
Mono	1	0	0	1	0	1
Monterey	0	0	0	0	1	-1
Napa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	34	1	0	35	1	34
Riverside	0	1	0	1	1	0
Sacramento	3	2	0	5	2	3
San Benito	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Bernardino	42	0	0	42	0	42
San Diego	10.5	7	0	18	7.9	9.6
San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Joaquin	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Mateo	0	0	1	1	1	0
Santa Barbara	1	5	0.5	7	5.5	1
Santa Clara	6.5	0	0	7	0	6.5
Santa Cruz	0	0	1	1	1	0
Shasta	0	0	0	0	0.25	-0.25
Siskiyou	0	0	0	0	0	0
Solano	0	1	1	2	2	0
Sonoma	5	0	1	6	1	5
Stanislaus	0	1	1	2	2	0
Sutter	1	0	0	1	0	1
Tehama	1	1	0	2	1	1
Tulare	4	0	0	4	0	4
Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuolumne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ventura	0	5	1	6	6	0
Yolo	0	0	1	1	1	0
Yuba	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>119.1</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>52.65</b>	<b>468.95</b>

(1) Pro-Tempore interpreters are an added category due to SB 371. These numbers will be updated quarterly with the Quarterly Financial Statements. (2) Los Angeles reported their pro-tempore interpreters as staff interpreters.



Table 5: Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003(1)							Language as a % of Interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 8,922,111	\$ 813,998			\$ 9,736,109	92%	80.3%
Korean	\$ 138,924	\$ 25,832			\$ 164,756	84%	1.4%
Vietnamese	\$ 199,941	\$ 114,645			\$ 212,062	94%	1.7%
Cantonese	\$ 58,816	\$ 107,244			\$ 186,353	32%	1.5%
Taglog	\$ 29,312	\$ 50,100			\$ 136,331	22%	1.1%
Arabic	\$ 34,351	\$ 11,560			\$ 46,806	73%	0.4%
Japanese	\$ 19,886	\$ 11,482			\$ 34,870	57%	0.3%
Portuguese	\$ 13,942	\$ 11,042			\$ 19,263	72%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 9,417,284</b>	<b>\$ 1,145,904</b>			<b>\$ 10,536,550</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>86.9%</b>
Armenian (9)			\$ 163,110	\$ 5,543	\$ 168,653	97%	1.4%
Mandarin			\$ 98,870	\$ 4,477	\$ 103,347	96%	0.9%
Hmong			\$ 118,557	\$ 62,136	\$ 180,693	66%	1.5%
Russian			\$ 228,408	\$ 4,031	\$ 232,439	98%	1.9%
Cambodian			\$ 108,076	\$ 52,743	\$ 160,820	67%	1.3%
Farsi (10)			\$ 57,577	\$ 3,957	\$ 61,533	94%	0.5%
Asian Indian Languages (2)			\$ 107,962	\$ 34,959	\$ 142,921	76%	1.2%
Mien			\$ 41,195	\$ 35,155	\$ 76,350	54%	0.6%
Eastern, Southern European (4)			\$ 48,631	\$ 6,194	\$ 54,825	89%	0.5%
Other Western European (7)			\$ 22,154	\$ 3,525	\$ 25,678	86%	0.2%
Middle East (6)			\$ 14,610	\$ 5,523	\$ 20,133	73%	0.2%
Laotian			\$ 106,362	\$ 85,501	\$ 191,863	55%	1.6%
Tongan			\$ 19,970	\$ 11,532	\$ 31,502	63%	0.3%
African Languages (5)			\$ 4,241	\$ 33,449	\$ 37,690	11%	0.3%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)			\$ 21,603	\$ 14,919	\$ 36,522	59%	0.3%
Samoan			\$ 2,234	\$ 6,764	\$ 8,998	25%	0.1%
All Other Languages (8)			\$ -	\$ 54,332	\$ 54,332	0%	0.4%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 1,163,560</b>	<b>\$ 424,739</b>	<b>\$ 1,588,299</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,417,284</b>	<b>\$ 1,145,904</b>	<b>\$ 1,163,560</b>	<b>\$ 424,739</b>	<b>\$ 12,124,849</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes data from Los Angeles for December 2002 and March 2003 only. The rest of the submissions are for October 2002 to June 2003.

(2) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu and Tamil

(3) Includes Burmese, Fijian, Fijian Hindi, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai.

(4) Includes Albanian, Serbian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Slovakian, Ukrainian, and Georgian

(5) Includes Amharic, Somali, and Tigrinya

(6) Includes Kurdish, Chaldean, and Hebrew.

(7) Includes French, Italian, Greek, Swedish and German

(8) Includes Latin American Languages such as Mixteco, Trique, Q'anjo'bal, Tzeltal and Zapateco.

(9) Armenian Includes Armenian and Western Armenian

(10) Farsi Includes Farsi (Persian of Iran) & Dari (Persian of Afghanistan)

Table 6: Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation									Language as a % of Interpreter expenditures
by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003(1)									
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 1,083,462	\$ 791,061	\$ 232,268				\$ 2,106,791	89%	79.0%
Vietnamese	\$ 17,207	\$ 28,975	\$ 26,937				\$ 73,119	63%	2.7%
Taglog	\$ -	\$ 8,010	\$ 24,902				\$ 32,911	24%	1.2%
Cantonese	\$ 4,050	\$ 10,138	\$ 2,438				\$ 16,626	85%	0.6%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 5,235	\$ 6,019				\$ 11,254	47%	0.4%
Korean	\$ 629	\$ 3,180	\$ 6,975				\$ 10,783	35%	0.4%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 1,347	\$ 4,892				\$ 6,239	22%	0.2%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 588	\$ 4,636				\$ 5,224	11%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 1,105,348</b>	<b>\$ 848,535</b>	<b>\$ 309,066</b>				<b>\$ 2,262,949</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>84.8%</b>
Russian				\$ 49,324	\$ 12,718	\$ 1,206	\$ 63,248	98%	2.4%
Hmong				\$ 45,226	\$ 2,947	\$ 13,044	\$ 61,217	79%	2.3%
Laotian				\$ 18,486	\$ 19,992	\$ 19,000	\$ 57,478	67%	2.2%
Asian Indian Languages (2)				\$ 10,431	\$ 22,994	\$ 8,017	\$ 41,443	81%	1.6%
Cambodian				\$ 10,765	\$ 7,167	\$ 14,782	\$ 32,713	55%	1.2%
All Other Languages (8)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,259	\$ 23,259	0%	0.9%
Mien				\$ -	\$ 13,945	\$ 9,279	\$ 23,224	60%	0.9%
Armenian (9)				\$ 18,537	\$ 2,803	\$ 1,757	\$ 23,097	92%	0.9%
Mandarin				\$ 2,646	\$ 15,930	\$ 992	\$ 19,568	95%	0.7%
Farsi (10)				\$ -	\$ 9,550	\$ 3,835	\$ 13,385	71%	0.5%
Eastern, Southern European (4)				\$ -	\$ 9,788	\$ 3,011	\$ 12,799	76%	0.5%
African Languages (5)				\$ -	\$ 2,911	\$ 7,231	\$ 10,142	29%	0.4%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)				\$ 853	\$ 2,340	\$ 6,703	\$ 9,896	32%	0.4%
Tongan				\$ -	\$ 4,191	\$ 2,466	\$ 6,657	63%	0.2%
Middle East (6)				\$ 1,971	\$ 588	\$ 1,848	\$ 4,407	58%	0.2%
Other Western European (7)				\$ 265	\$ 412	\$ 900	\$ 1,577	43%	0.1%
Samoan				\$ -	\$ 1,102	\$ 368	\$ 1,470	75%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 158,504</b>	<b>\$ 128,878</b>	<b>\$ 117,697</b>	<b>\$ 405,079</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,105,348</b>	<b>\$ 848,535</b>	<b>\$ 309,066</b>	<b>\$ 158,504</b>	<b>\$ 128,878</b>	<b>\$ 117,697</b>	<b>\$ 2,668,028</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) The information presented in this table does not include data from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

(2) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu and Tamil

(3) Includes Burmese, Fijian, Fijian Hindi, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai.

(4) Includes Albanian, Serbian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Slovakian, Ukrainian, and Georgian

(5) Includes Amharic, Somali, and Tigrinya

(6) Includes Kurdish, Chaldean, and Hebrew.

(7) Includes French, Italian, Greek, Swedish and German

(8) Includes Latin American Languages such as Mixteco, Trique, Q'anjob'al, Tzeltal and Zapateco.

(9) Armenian Includes Armenian and Western Armenian

(10) Farsi Includes Farsi (Persian of Iran)& Dari (Persian of Afghanistan)



**Appendix A**  
**Expenditures for Interpreter Services in 20 Courts**  
**October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003**

To make a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Research & Planning Unit collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the superior courts of 20 counties: Contra Costa, Del Norte, Fresno, Imperial, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Sutter, Tulare, and Tuolumne.<sup>1</sup>

The principal source of data was the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS). CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system housed on Serranus, the court personnel Web site, and came online in October 2002. The data in this appendix are the first year's data collected through CIDCS. All of the courts represented in this appendix have verified that they entered complete information in CIDCS as of September 30, 2003.

CIDCS data are collected from the interpreters' Daily Activity Logs and entered by the interpreter coordinator in each court. An interpreter completes a Daily Activity Log for every half day or full day worked. The log contains information on the interpreter, the language(s) interpreted, the session worked (full or half day), the expenditures associated with the session, the total number of cases interpreted, and when possible, the case numbers and case types.

Each of the following court studies begins with data reported to the AOC to provide some points of comparison: County population and number of staff in the interpreters program according to the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004. Then come data collected via CIDCS specifically for this report: expenditures by language and by certification status of interpreter. The courts are organized by the level of interpreting expenditures reported from greatest to least.

Note that the expenditure data collected for this report do not include American Sign Languages interpreting. Additionally, because the collection periods for the data in the quarterly financial statements (QFS) and the data presented by language and certification status for this report differed, comparisons should not be made between the two.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data for these counties were collected from October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003, with the exception of Los Angeles, where data were available only for December 2002 and March 2003.

## **1. Superior Court of Los Angeles County**

Los Angeles County is the most populous county in the state with 9,806,577 inhabitants, or 28 percent of California's population, according to U.S. Census Department estimates for the year 2003. The court uses interpreters in 640 courtrooms at 63 locations throughout the county. According to Schedule 7A data, the court employs seven full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members as interpreter coordinators to manage its court interpreters program.

In December 2002 and March 2003, the Los Angeles County court expended a total of \$4,631,095. Table 1 shows the expenditures for contract per diem interpreters by language and certification status. Table 1 also 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; expenditures for Spanish interpreting totaled more than \$3.8 million of the two months in our Los Angeles study.

The second largest expenditure by language in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is Korean, at \$131,500 in December 2002 and March 2003 combined. In this period, approximately 96 percent of all expenditures for Korean interpreting were for the services of certified interpreters.

## **2. Superior Court of San Diego County**

San Diego County is in the extreme southwestern corner of the state, bordered by Mexico on the south and the Pacific Ocean on the west. The U.S. Census Department estimates that the population of San Diego County in 2003 is just fewer than 3 million, at 2,906,660. The court reports seven FTE staff working in its court interpreters program, all of whom are staff interpreters in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 2A shows expenditures for spoken language contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County by language and certification status totaling \$2,134,552 for the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. As in Los Angeles County and the rest of the state, Spanish is the dominant language. Approximately \$1.8 million—slightly less than 88 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters—goes to Spanish language interpreters, dwarfing the second highest most interpreted language, Vietnamese, for which \$96,371 (approximately 5 percent of the total) was spent from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003.

Table 2B shows expenditures for spoken language interpreters—both contract and pro tempore—from July 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003 (hereafter July–September 2003). The Superior Court of San Diego County spent approximately \$749 million during this period. Eighty-seven percent was spent on Spanish

language interpreting, and 3 percent was spent on Vietnamese language interpreting.

The percentage of total expenditures for certified and registered contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County—approximately 93 percent—is somewhat lower than that in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

When expenditures are broken down by language in Tables 2A and 2B, 100 percent of Spanish interpreting was performed by certified interpreters. Among the designated languages, all expenditures for Tagalog, Cantonese, and Japanese went to noncertified interpreters, with Tagalog being the largest expense. Expenditures for the other designated and newly designated languages were split between certified/registered interpreters and noncertified/nonregistered 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. The U.S. Census Department estimates that Sacramento County is the eighth largest county by population with 1.3 million inhabitants in 2003. In the Schedule 7A, the court reports five authorized, funded FTE staff positions in the interpreters program—2 staff interpreters and 3 pro tempore interpreters— in fiscal year 2003–2004.

As shown in Table 3A, expenditures for contract per diem interpreters totaled \$1.1 million in the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. Approximately 89 percent of the spoken language interpreters used in Sacramento County were certified or registered; a full 99.53 percent of the Spanish interpreters were certified. Spanish is the language interpreted most frequently, followed by Vietnamese, Russian, and Hmong. One hundred percent of expenditures for Russian interpreting were on certified or registered interpreters, and 6 of the next 10 most widely interpreted languages show a majority of expenditures on certified and registered interpreters.

As shown in Table 3B, expenditures for per diem interpreters, including pro tempore interpreters, totaled \$335,278 in July–September 2003. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 41 percent of the total expenditures, and within Spanish language expenditures, 50 percent were on pro tempore interpreters and 50 percent were on contract interpreters. One hundred percent of the Spanish interpreting was performed by certified interpreters, as well as 100 percent of the Arabic, Portuguese, Japanese, and Russian interpreting.

#### **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 Monterey County on the west. The U.S. Census Department estimates the population of Fresno County in 2003 at 834,632, making it the 10th largest County in the state. In the Schedule 7A, the court reports six FTE staff working in its court interpreters program in fiscal year 2003–2004. All of these positions are identified as staff interpreters.

Table 4A shows expenditures for contract per diem interpreters from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, totaling \$760,274. The data indicate that 67 percent of these expenditures went to certified or registered interpreters. For Spanish, Mien, Cambodian, Tagalog, Hmong, and Laotian in Fresno County, interpreter needs are met using a combination of certified/registered and noncertified/nonregistered interpreters. In Spanish, for example, 71 percent of expenditures for interpreting went to certified interpreters (\$398,004).

Table 4B shows expenditures for per diem interpreters in July–September 2003, totaling \$275,921. Approximately 75 percent of the expenditures (\$206,257) were for Spanish language interpreting and 73 percent of the Spanish language expenditures were on pro tempore Spanish interpreters (\$151,242). None of the other designated languages used a pro tempore interpreter during this period.

#### **5. Superior Court of San Mateo County**

San Mateo County is bordered on the north by San Francisco and on the south by Santa Clara, and has a population of 703,202 according to 2003 U.S. Census Department estimates making it the 13th largest county in the state. As reported in the Schedule 7A, San Mateo County had one FTE interpreter coordinator in its court interpreters program in fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreting from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, totaled \$456,121, as shown in Table 5A. Certified or registered interpreters perform approximately 89 percent of all interpreting in the Superior Court of San Mateo County. Eighty-four percent of the expenditures (\$381,026) in this period were for Spanish, and 97 percent of the expenditures for Spanish were on certified interpreters, as shown in Table 5A. Tagalog was the second most interpreted language, with more than 89 percent of the Tagalog interpreting performed by certified interpreters. Of the 14 nondesignated languages, 6 had expenditures for nonregistered interpreters. However, these expenditures accounted for only 2.6 percent of the total spent on interpreting.

Table 5B shows expenditures for per diem interpreting in July–September 2003, totaling \$194,592. Seventy-six percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting (\$147,470), with 51 percent of the Spanish language

interpreting performed by pro tempore interpreters. Certified interpreters performed 100 percent of interpreting in Vietnamese and Cantonese. Additionally, registered interpreters performed all Mandarin, Tongan, Russian, Samoan, and Punjabi interpreting.

#### **6. Superior Court of Contra Costa County**

Contra Costa County is one of the Bay Area counties and has a population of 992,358, according to 2003 U.S. Census Department estimates. The court reported no FTEs in its court interpreters program in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

From October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, expenditures for contract per diem interpreters totaled \$533,510; they are shown on table 6A. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 77 percent of all expenditures during this period (\$410,685), and certified interpreters performed 73 percent of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for Asian Indian language interpreting, accounting for 4 percent of the total expenditures (\$19,945).

Table 6B shows expenditures for per diem interpreters in July–September 2003. The expenditures during this period totaled \$180,565. Certified and registered interpreters performed 73 percent of all interpreting. The highest expenditure (\$141,019) were for Spanish language interpreting, 78 percent of all interpreting expenditures, while Asian Indian languages accounted for 3 percent (\$5,716). Pro tempore interpreters performed less than 1 percent of the interpreting during this period.

#### **7. Superior Court of San Joaquin County**

San Joaquin County is one of the larger Central Valley counties, with an estimated population of 614,302 in 2003 according to the U.S. Census Department. The Superior Court of San Joaquin County listed no FTE positions in fiscal year 2003–2004 for its court interpreters program. The court also spent approximately \$505,584 on contract per diem interpretations during the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, as shown in Table 7A.

Certified or registered interpreters in the Superior Court of San Joaquin County performed two-thirds of all interpreting during this period as shown in Table 7A. Of these, Spanish language interpreting had the highest expenditures (\$370,032) accounting for 73 percent of all expenditures, followed by Cambodian and “Other.” Certified interpreters performed 80 percent of Spanish interpreting.

Table 7B shows the expenditures for per diem interpreters in July–September 2003 in the Superior Court of San Joaquin County. Expenditures totaled \$188,761 during this period, and 58 percent of all interpreting was performed by certified or



registered interpreters. Twenty-two percent of interpreting was in non-designated languages during this period (\$41,917), and registered interpreters performed only 23 percent. No interpreting by pro tempore interpreters was reported during this period.

#### **8. Superior Court of Santa Barbara County**

Santa Barbara County is one of the medium-sized counties in our study with a population of 403,084, according to 2003 U.S. Census Department estimates. The Superior Court of Santa Barbara County reported 6.5 FTE interpreter staff in fiscal year 2003–2004—1 pro tempore interpreter, 5 staff interpreters and .5 interpreter coordinator—in the Schedule 7A.

Table 8A shows expenditures for interpretations in the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County from October 1, 2002, through September 30, 2003, on contract per diem interpreters totaling \$414,416. Certified or registered interpreters performed 88 percent of all interpreting, and 95 percent of all expenditures (\$395,239) were for Spanish language interpreting.

Expenditures for interpreting in July–September 2003 are shown in Table 8B and totaled \$145,137. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 93 percent of interpreter expenditures (\$135,139), and certified contract or opt-out interpreters performed almost 100 percent of Spanish language interpreting. Registered contract or opt-out interpreters performed 95 percent of interpreting in nondesignated languages.

#### **9. Superior Court of Tulare County**

Tulare County, in the Central Valley, is one of the medium-sized counties in our study with a population of 381,772 according to U.S. Census Department estimates for 2003. The Schedule 7A lists four pro tempore FTE positions for the court interpreters program staff in Tulare County for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreters in the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, totaled \$479,992. Certified or registered interpreters performed approximately 62 percent of all interpreting as shown in Table 9A. All of certified interpreting was in Spanish, whose expenditures accounted for 96 percent of the total. Certified or registered interpreters performed none of the other interpreting in designated or nondesignated languages.

Table 9B shows expenditures for per diem interpreters in the period in July–September 2003. Expenditures in this period totaled \$172,452. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures were on certified or registered interpreters, and 32 percent of the expenditures went to pro tempore interpreters (\$55,058). A

registered pro tempore interpreter performed 100 percent of Cambodian interpreting.

#### **10. Superior Court of Santa Cruz County**

Santa Cruz County is one of the medium sized counties in our study with a population of 253,814, according to U.S. Census Department estimates for 2003. The Schedule 7A lists one interpreter coordinator FTE position for court interpreter staff in Santa Cruz County in fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreters in the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, totaled \$295,919 and are shown in Table 10A. Certified or registered interpreters performed 90 percent of interpreting, and Spanish language interpreting accounted for 96 percent of expenditures (\$284,134). Among the nondesignated languages, registered interpreters interpreted all Mandarin, Russian, and Khmer.

Expenditures for per diem interpreters in the period in July–September 2003 are shown in Table 10B and totaled \$104,477. Certified and registered interpreters performed 75 percent of interpreting, and 32 percent of that was performed by pro tempore interpreters. Ninety-six percent of expenditures were for interpreting in designated languages, while only 4 percent for interpreting in nondesignated languages.

#### **11. Superior Court of Imperial County**

Imperial County is one of the smaller counties in our study, with a population of 146,248 according to the 2003 U.S. Census Department estimates. The Superior Court of Imperial County reported three staff interpreter FTEs on the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 11A shows expenditures for contract per diem interpreting during the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, which totaled \$227,782; 98 percent of interpreting was performed by certified and registered interpreters. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 98 percent of expenditures during this period.

Expenditures during the period July–September 2003 are shown in Table 11B and totaled \$72,311. As in Table 11A, certified and registered interpreters performed 98 percent of interpreting during this period, and 98 percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting.

#### **12. Superior Court of Madera County**

Madera County is in the Central Valley ringed by Fresno, Merced, Mariposa, and Mono Counties. It is one of the smaller counties in our study, with a population estimated at 130,265 according to U.S. Census Department estimates for 2003.

The Schedule 7A lists 5 pro tempore interpreter positions in the court interpreters program for fiscal year 2003–2004 at the Superior Court of Madera County.

Expenditures during the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, are shown in Table 12A, and totaled \$187,366. Certified and registered interpreters performed 79 percent of interpreting, and 99 percent of interpreting expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting.

Table 12B shows the expenditures for per diem interpreters in July–September 2003, totaling \$70,827. Certified and registered interpreters performed 86 percent of interpreting during this period, and Spanish language interpreting accounted for 98 percent of interpreting expenditures.

### **13. Superior Court of Placer County**

Placer County is in the heart of Gold Country and has a population of 278,509 in 2003 according to U.S. Census Department estimates. No FTE court interpreter program positions were reported in the Schedule 7A for Placer County for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreters during the period of October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, are shown in Table 13A. Expenditures during this period totaled \$123,666, and 63 percent of the expenditures (\$77,458) were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed 81 percent of the interpreting.

Table 13B shows expenditures by language and certification status in July–September 2003. Expenditures during this period totaled \$45,154, and 54 percent of the expenditures (\$24,360) were on Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed 78 percent of interpreting overall and 100 percent of the interpreting in Vietnamese, Cantonese, Arabic, Punjabi, Romanian, Mandarin, and Hindi.

### **14. Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County**

San Luis Obispo County is one of the medium-sized counties in our study in terms of population but is one of the smaller counties in regard to interpreting expenditures. The U.S. Census Department estimates the 2003 population of San Luis Obispo County at 253,408. No FTEs are reported in the Schedule 7A in the court interpreters program in San Luis Obispo County in fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 14A shows expenditures by language and certification status for contract per diem interpreters in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. Expenditures during this period totaled \$135,634, nearly all (99 percent) of which were for Spanish language interpreting.

Expenditures for per diem interpreting during the period July–September 2003 are shown in Table 14B and totaled \$44,295. Ninety-nine percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting, and certified and registered interpreters performed 82 percent of the total interpreting.

#### **15. Superior Court of Sutter County**

Sutter County is one of the smaller counties in our study, as the U.S. Census Department estimates its total population at 82,580 in 2003. One pro tempore interpreter FTE is listed for the Superior Court of Sutter County in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreters during the period from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, are shown in Table 15A and totaled \$79,396. Sixty-four percent of the expenditures (\$50,708) were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed 83 percent of interpreting overall and 100 percent of the Vietnamese, Hindi, Mien, Khmer, and Ukrainian interpreting.

Table 15B shows expenditures for per diem interpreters during the period in July–September 2003, which totaled \$24,010. Expenditures for Spanish language interpreting accounted for 75 percent of interpreter expenditures (\$17,982), while expenditures for Punjabi language interpreting accounted for 16 percent (\$3,945). Certified and registered interpreters performed 75 percent of all interpreting during this period, and pro tempore interpreters performed 72 percent of the total interpreting.

#### **16. Superior Court of Shasta County**

Shasta County’s population is estimated to be 171,799 in 2003, according to the U.S. Census Department. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program are reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 16A shows expenditures for contract per diem interpreters for the period from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. These expenditures totaled \$52,796. Spanish language interpreting was the most expensive (\$21,281), followed by Lao and Mien (\$14,053 and \$11,948, respectively). Certified and registered interpreters did 39 percent of all interpreting.

Expenditures for per diem interpreters during the period July–September 2003 are shown in Table 16B, and totaled \$23,041. In contrast with the other courts in our study, Lao language interpreting accounted for 34 percent of the expenditures (\$7,790), as compared to Spanish language interpreting with 32 percent (\$7,449), and Mien language interpreting with 31 percent (\$7,065). Certified and registered

interpreters performed 62 percent of the interpreting. Pro tempore interpreters performed no interpreting during this period.

#### **17. Superior Court of Nevada County**

Nevada County is bordered by Placer County on the south, the state of Nevada on the east and Sierra and Yuba counties on the north. Its population in 2003 is estimated at 95,047 according to the U.S. Census Department. The Superior Court of Nevada County reported no FTE positions in its court interpreters program in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures for contract per diem interpreters during the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, are shown in Table 17A. The expenditures during this period totaled \$26,335; nearly all of this (96 percent) was for Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters accounted for only 26 percent of interpreting during this period. This may be due to the relatively remote location of Nevada County.

Table 17B shows expenditures for per diem interpreters during the period in July–September 2003, totaling \$14,797. Eighty-four percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed 51 percent of interpreting overall and did all of the interpreting in Vietnamese and Portuguese. Pro tempore interpreters performed no interpreting during this period.

#### **18. Superior Court of Del Norte County**

Del Norte County has a population of 27,482 according to the 2003 estimates provided by the U.S. Census Department. The Superior Court of Del Norte County reported no FTE positions in the court interpreters program in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Expenditures totaling \$14,418 during the period October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, are shown in Table 18A. Spanish was the only language interpreted during this period, and a certified interpreter performed all interpreting.

Table 18B shows expenditures on interpreting during the period in July–September 2003, which totaled \$5,350. As in Table 17A, all of the interpretations were in Spanish and a certified opt-out interpreter performed all interpreting.

#### **19. Superior Court of Tuolumne County**

Tuolumne County is the third smallest county in our study, with an estimated population of 55,850 in 2003 according to the U.S. Census Department. The Superior Court of Tuolumne County reported no FTEs in the court interpreters program in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 19A shows expenditures on contract per diem interpreting from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. These expenditures totaled \$8,428. Seventy-eight percent of the expenditures (\$6,445) were for Spanish language interpreting, and 12 percent were for Korean language interpretation (\$1,027). Certified and registered interpreters performed 91 percent of all interpreting during this period.

Expenditures on per diem interpreters from July–September 2003 are shown in Table 19B. Expenditures during this period totaled \$4,772. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 83 percent of the expenditures during this period (\$3,970), while “Other” language interpretations accounted for 13 percent (\$600). Certified and registered interpreters performed 83 percent of all interpreting during this period. Pro tempore interpreters performed no interpreting during this period.

## **20. Superior Court of Lassen County**

The Superior Court of Lassen County is the second smallest county in our study with an estimated population of 34,007 in 2003, according to the U.S. Census Department. The Superior Court of Lassen County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2003–2004.

Table 20A shows expenditures on contract per-diem interpreters from October 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003. These expenditures totaled \$7,848, and 100 percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed 13 percent of the interpreting.

Table 20B shows expenditures on per diem interpretations totaling \$2,701 in July–September 2003. All of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting, and noncertified or nonregistered interpreters performed all interpreting.

Table 1: Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, December 2002 and March 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 3,695,823	\$ 140,090			\$ 3,835,913	96%	82.8%
Korean	\$ 126,838	\$ 4,672			\$ 131,510	96%	2.8%
Vietnamese	\$ 75,876	\$ 12,001			\$ 87,877	86%	1.9%
Cantonese	\$ 33,386	\$ 4,600			\$ 37,986	88%	0.8%
Taglog	\$ 13,242	\$ 8,762			\$ 22,004	60%	0.5%
Arabic	\$ 23,066	\$ 839			\$ 23,905	96%	0.5%
Japanese	\$ 16,202	\$ 2,836			\$ 19,038	85%	0.4%
Portuguese	\$ 3,994	\$ 1,041			\$ 5,034	79%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 3,988,427</b>	<b>\$ 174,841</b>			<b>\$ 4,163,267</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>89.9%</b>
Armenian (1)			\$ 111,162	\$ 736	\$ 111,898	99%	2.4%
Mandarin			\$ 64,910	\$ -	\$ 64,910	100%	1.4%
Russian			\$ 60,927	\$ 298	\$ 61,225	100%	1.3%
Cambodian			\$ 40,651	\$ 10,770	\$ 51,421	79%	1.1%
Farsi (2)			\$ 27,017	\$ 368	\$ 27,385	99%	0.6%
Asian Indian Languages (3)			\$ 21,283	\$ 3,644	\$ 24,927	85%	0.5%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)			\$ 17,411	\$ 2,720	\$ 20,131	86%	0.4%
Laotian			\$ 10,872	\$ 9,237	\$ 20,109	54%	0.4%
Other Western European (5)			\$ 16,977	\$ 490	\$ 17,467	97%	0.4%
Hmong			\$ 11,227	\$ 5,108	\$ 16,335	69%	0.4%
Eastern, Southern European (4)			\$ 11,300	\$ 2,037	\$ 13,337	85%	0.3%
Mien			\$ 4,163	\$ 5,507	\$ 9,669	43%	0.2%
All Other Languages (8)			\$ -	\$ 8,100	\$ 8,100	0%	0.2%
Tongan			\$ 3,291	\$ 4,713	\$ 8,004	41%	0.2%
Middle East (6)			\$ 4,604	\$ 569	\$ 5,173	89%	0.1%
African Languages (7)			\$ 1,942	\$ 2,627	\$ 4,569	43%	0.1%
Samoan			\$ 314	\$ 2,853	\$ 3,168	10%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 408,052</b>	<b>\$ 59,776</b>	<b>\$ 467,828</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,988,427</b>	<b>\$ 305,033</b>	<b>\$ 408,052</b>	<b>\$ 59,776</b>	<b>\$ 4,631,095</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Armenian, Western Armenian

(2) Includes Farsi, Dari, and Pashto

(3) Includes Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(4) Includes Bulgarian, Bosnian, Croatian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Ukrainian

(5) Includes French, German, Greek, Italian

(6) Includes Chaldean, Hebrew, Kurdish, Turkish

(7) Includes Amharic, Somali, Tigrinya

(8) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, Taiwanese

(9) Includes Latin American Languages

Table 2A: Superior Court of San Diego County

	Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003				Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages				
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 1,853,648	\$ 460			\$ 1,854,108	100%	86.9%
Vietnamese	\$ 51,336	\$ 45,035			\$ 96,371	53%	4.5%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 23,146			\$ 23,146	0%	1.1%
Korean	\$ 1,043	\$ 7,830			\$ 8,873	12%	0.4%
Arabic	\$ 2,864	\$ 5,972			\$ 8,836	32%	0.4%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 6,882			\$ 6,882	0%	0.3%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 4,571			\$ 4,571	0%	0.2%
Portuguese	\$ 2,352	\$ 657			\$ 3,009	78%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 1,911,243</b>	<b>\$ 94,551</b>			<b>\$ 2,005,795</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>94.0%</b>
African Languages (1)			\$ -	\$ 25,834	\$ 25,834	0%	1.2%
Laotian			\$ 13,708	\$ 6,916	\$ 20,624	66%	1.0%
Middle East (2)			\$ 10,006	\$ 4,954	\$ 14,960	67%	0.7%
Russian			\$ 13,352	\$ -	\$ 13,352	100%	0.6%
Farsi			\$ 11,193	\$ 1,716	\$ 12,909	87%	0.6%
Cambodian			\$ -	\$ 12,606	\$ 12,606	0%	0.6%
Mandarin			\$ 10,106	\$ 368	\$ 10,474	96%	0.5%
Other			\$ -	\$ 4,395	\$ 4,395	0%	0.2%
Eastern, Southern European (3)			\$ 2,699	\$ 1,362	\$ 4,061	66%	0.2%
Other Western European (4)			\$ 1,029	\$ 1,840	\$ 2,869	36%	0.1%
Asian Indian Languages (5)			\$ 516	\$ 1,817	\$ 2,333	22%	0.1%
Hmong			\$ -	\$ 1,187	\$ 1,187	0%	0.1%
Armenian			\$ 265	\$ 828	\$ 1,093	24%	0.1%
Samoa			\$ -	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,080	0%	0.1%
South Asian, Pacific Island (6)			\$ 798	\$ 184	\$ 982	81%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 63,671</b>	<b>\$ 65,086</b>	<b>\$ 128,757</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,911,243</b>	<b>\$ 94,551</b>	<b>\$ 63,671</b>	<b>\$ 65,086</b>	<b>\$ 2,134,552</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

- (1) Includes Tigrinya, Somali, Amharic (2) Includes Chaldean, Hebrew, Kurdish (3) Includes Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian  
 (4) Includes French, German, Italian (5) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu (6) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, Thai

Table 2B: Superior Court of San Diego County

	Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003						Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages					
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 550,492	\$ 112,415	\$ 617				\$ 663,524	100%	88.6%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 16,047	\$ 7,600				\$ 23,647	68%	3.2%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,387				\$ 9,387	0%	1.3%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,616				\$ 4,616	0%	0.6%
Korean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,397				\$ 2,397	0%	0.3%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,056				\$ 2,056	0%	0.3%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,003				\$ 1,003	0%	0.1%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 559	\$ 92				\$ 651	86%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 550,492</b>	<b>\$ 129,021</b>	<b>\$ 27,768</b>				<b>\$ 707,280</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>94.4%</b>
African Languages (1)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,231	\$ 7,231	0%	1.0%
Lao				\$ 4,472	\$ -	\$ 2,558	\$ 7,030	64%	0.9%
Farsi (2)				\$ -	\$ 2,470	\$ 1,818	\$ 4,288	58%	0.6%
Mandarin				\$ 2,205	\$ 1,911	\$ -	\$ 4,116	100%	0.5%
Middle Eastern Languages (3)				\$ 1,971	\$ 588	\$ 1,388	\$ 3,947	65%	0.5%
All Other Languages (4)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,811	\$ 3,811	0%	0.5%
Cambodian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,653	\$ 3,653	0%	0.5%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 2,940	\$ -	\$ 2,940	100%	0.4%
Eastern European Languages (5)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,487	\$ 1,487	0%	0.2%
Western European Languages (6)				\$ 265	\$ 147	\$ 694	\$ 1,106	37%	0.1%
Thai				\$ 853	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 853	100%	0.1%
Punjabi				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 722	\$ 722	0%	0.1%
Armenian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 368	\$ 368	0%	0.0%
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
Samoa				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 9,766</b>	<b>\$ 8,056</b>	<b>\$ 23,914</b>	<b>\$ 41,736</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 550,492</b>	<b>\$ 129,021</b>	<b>\$ 27,768</b>	<b>\$ 9,766</b>	<b>\$ 8,056</b>	<b>\$ 23,914</b>	<b>\$ 749,016</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

- (1) Includes Amharic, Somali, Tigrinya (2) Includes Farsi, Dari, Pashto (3) Includes Chaldean, Kurdish, Turkish  
 (4) Includes Meso-American Languages (5) Includes Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak, Ukrainian  
 (6) Includes French, German, Italian



**Table 3A: Superior Court of Sacramento County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 440,484	\$ -			\$ 440,484	100%	44.0%
Vietnamese	\$ 44,839	\$ 27,365			\$ 72,204	62%	7.2%
Cantonese	\$ 13,692	\$ 11,181			\$ 24,873	55%	2.5%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 6,938			\$ 6,938	0%	0.7%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 3,890			\$ 3,890	0%	0.4%
Japanese	\$ 3,137	\$ 92			\$ 3,229	97%	0.3%
Arabic	\$ 2,764	\$ -			\$ 2,764	100%	0.3%
Portuguese	\$ 306	\$ -			\$ 306	100%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 505,222</b>	<b>\$ 49,466</b>			<b>\$ 554,688</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>
Russian			\$ 124,245	\$ -	\$ 124,245	100%	12.4%
Hmong			\$ 70,280	\$ 20,654	\$ 90,934	77%	9.1%
Armenian (9)			\$ 47,458	\$ -	\$ 47,458	100%	4.7%
Lao			\$ 30,874	\$ 8,378	\$ 39,252	79%	3.9%
Asian Indian Languages (1)			\$ 35,726	\$ -	\$ 35,726	100%	3.6%
Mien			\$ 21,081	\$ 11,745	\$ 32,825	64%	3.3%
Eastern, Southern European (2)			\$ 27,196	\$ 2,098	\$ 29,294	93%	2.9%
Farsi			\$ 15,078	\$ -	\$ 15,078	100%	1.5%
Cambodian			\$ 9,227	\$ -	\$ 9,227	100%	0.9%
Tongan			\$ 2,618	\$ 6,359	\$ 8,977	29%	0.9%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)			\$ 853	\$ 4,452	\$ 5,305	16%	0.5%
Samoan			\$ -	\$ 2,831	\$ 2,831	0%	0.3%
Other Western European (4)			\$ 1,923	\$ 92	\$ 2,015	95%	0.2%
Mandarin			\$ 1,294	\$ 552	\$ 1,846	70%	0.2%
Other			\$ -	\$ 1,104	\$ 1,104	0%	0.1%
Amharic			\$ 929	\$ 92	\$ 1,021	91%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 388,782</b>	<b>\$ 58,356</b>	<b>\$ 447,138</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>44.6%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 505,222</b>	<b>\$ 49,466</b>	<b>\$ 388,782</b>	<b>\$ 58,356</b>	<b>\$ 1,001,826</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Bosnian, Croatian, Czech, Hungarian, Romanian, Serbian

(3) Includes Fijian Hindustani, Indonesian, Thai

(4) Includes French, Greek, Italian

**Table 3B: Superior Court of Sacramento County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 68,762	\$ 69,751	\$ -				\$ 138,514	100%	41.3%
Vietnamese	\$ 16,722	\$ -	\$ 9,647				\$ 25,369	62%	7.6%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 8,055	\$ 1,012				\$ 9,067	89%	2.7%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,058				\$ 3,058	0%	0.9%
Korean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,208				\$ 2,208	0%	0.7%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 588	\$ -				\$ 588	100%	0.2%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 294	\$ -				\$ 294	100%	0.1%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 147	\$ -				\$ 147	100%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 84,484</b>	<b>\$ 78,835</b>	<b>\$ 15,925</b>				<b>\$ 179,244</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>53.5%</b>
Russian				\$ 38,770	\$ 4,795	\$ -	\$ 43,565	100%	13.0%
Hmong				\$ 31,463	\$ 2,766	\$ 2,825	\$ 37,054	92%	11.1%
Armenian				\$ 18,537	\$ -	\$ 736	\$ 19,273	96%	5.7%
Asian Indian Languages (1)				\$ 7,561	\$ 6,429	\$ -	\$ 13,990	100%	4.2%
Mien				\$ -	\$ 9,619	\$ 1,923	\$ 11,542	83%	3.4%
Lao				\$ -	\$ 9,884	\$ 368	\$ 10,252	96%	3.1%
Eastern European Languages (2)				\$ -	\$ 7,818	\$ 1,003	\$ 8,821	89%	2.6%
Farsi				\$ -	\$ 4,764	\$ -	\$ 4,764	100%	1.4%
South Asian Languages (3)				\$ -	\$ 2,193	\$ 1,333	\$ 3,526	62%	1.1%
Tongan				\$ -	\$ 524	\$ 2,190	\$ 2,714	19%	0.8%
African Languages (4)				\$ -	\$ 1,851	\$ -	\$ 1,851	100%	0.6%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 853	\$ 184	\$ 1,037	82%	0.3%
Cambodian				\$ -	\$ 481	\$ -	\$ 481	100%	0.1%
Samoan				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	0%	0.1%
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 96,330</b>	<b>\$ 51,978</b>	<b>\$ 10,930</b>	<b>\$ 159,238</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>47.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 84,484</b>	<b>\$ 78,835</b>	<b>\$ 12,867</b>	<b>\$ 96,330</b>	<b>\$ 51,978</b>	<b>\$ 10,930</b>	<b>\$ 335,278</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Bosnian, Croatian, Czech, Hungarian, Romanian, Serbian

(3) Includes Fijian Hindustani, Indonesian, Thai

(4) Includes Amharic, Somali, Tigrinya

Table 4A: Superior Court of Fresno County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 398,004	\$ 164,645			\$ 562,649	71%	74.0%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 4,611			\$ 4,611	0%	0.6%
Arabic	\$ 814	\$ 2,098			\$ 2,912	28%	0.4%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 1,466			\$ 1,466	0%	0.2%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 989			\$ 989	0%	0.1%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 936			\$ 936	0%	0.1%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 184			\$ 184	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 398,818</b>	<b>\$ 174,930</b>			<b>\$ 573,748</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>75.5%</b>
Lao			\$ 31,848	\$ 25,213	\$ 57,061	56%	7.5%
Hmong			\$ 34,804	\$ 19,413	\$ 54,217	64%	7.1%
Cambodian			\$ 33,731	\$ 8,491	\$ 42,222	80%	5.6%
Asian Indian Languages (1)			\$ 3,764	\$ 10,717	\$ 14,481	26%	1.9%
Armenian			\$ 3,356	\$ 4,154	\$ 7,510	45%	1.0%
Other			\$ -	\$ 4,559	\$ 4,559	0%	0.6%
Mien			\$ 3,482	\$ -	\$ 3,482	100%	0.5%
Russian			\$ 767	\$ 1,582	\$ 2,349	33%	0.3%
African Languages (2)			\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	0%	0.0%
Italian			\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0.0%
Indonesian			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
Mandarin			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 111,753</b>	<b>\$ 74,774</b>	<b>\$ 186,526</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 398,818</b>	<b>\$ 174,930</b>	<b>\$ 111,753</b>	<b>\$ 74,774</b>	<b>\$ 760,274</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Somali, Tigrinya

Table 4B: Superior Court of Fresno County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 151,242	\$ 9,892	\$ 45,123				\$ 206,258	78%	74.8%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,932				\$ 1,932	0%	0.7%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 882	\$ 184				\$ 1,066	0%	0.1%
Korean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 237				\$ 237	83%	0.4%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 151,242</b>	<b>\$ 10,774</b>	<b>\$ 47,476</b>				<b>\$ 209,493</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>76.0%</b>
Lao				\$ 14,014	\$ -	\$ 7,965	\$ 21,979	64%	8.0%
Hmong				\$ 13,132	\$ -	\$ 4,366	\$ 17,498	75%	6.3%
Cambodian				\$ 10,468	\$ -	\$ 994	\$ 11,462	91%	4.2%
Asian Indian Languages (1)				\$ -	\$ 2,118	\$ 3,764	\$ 5,882	36%	2.1%
Armenian				\$ -	\$ 2,470	\$ 736	\$ 3,206	77%	1.2%
Other (3)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,231	\$ 2,231	0%	0.6%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 1,332	\$ 757	\$ 2,089	64%	0.8%
Mien				\$ -	\$ 1,078	\$ -	\$ 1,078	100%	0.4%
Turkish				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 460	\$ 460	0%	0.2%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 267	\$ 267	0%	0.1%
Other Western European (2)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0.1%
Farsi				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 37,614</b>	<b>\$ 6,998</b>	<b>\$ 21,817</b>	<b>\$ 66,428</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 151,242</b>	<b>\$ 10,774</b>	<b>\$ 47,476</b>	<b>\$ 37,614</b>	<b>\$ 6,998</b>	<b>\$ 21,817</b>	<b>\$ 275,921</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes French, Italian

**Table 5A: Superior Court of San Mateo County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 370,267	\$ 10,759			\$ 381,026	97%	84%
Tagalog	\$ 15,389	\$ 1,899			\$ 17,288	89%	4%
Cantonese	\$ 9,665	\$ -			\$ 9,665	100%	2%
Vietnamese	\$ 6,237	\$ -			\$ 6,237	100%	1%
Korean	\$ 5,617	\$ 486			\$ 6,104	92%	1%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 2,449			\$ 2,449	0%	1%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 528			\$ 528	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 407,176</b>	<b>\$ 16,122</b>			<b>\$ 423,297</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>93%</b>
Tongan			\$ 12,258	\$ -	\$ 12,258	100%	3%
Mandarin			\$ 9,481	\$ 252	\$ 9,733	97%	2%
Russian			\$ 4,504	\$ -	\$ 4,504	100%	1%
Samoan			\$ 1,751	\$ -	\$ 1,751	100%	0.4%
Lao			\$ 857	\$ -	\$ 857	100%	0.2%
Punjabi			\$ 441	\$ 325	\$ 766	58%	0.2%
Urdu			\$ 677	\$ -	\$ 677	100%	0.1%
Ukrainian			\$ 640	\$ -	\$ 640	100%	0%
French			\$ 285	\$ 282	\$ 567	50%	0.1%
Burmese			\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	0%	0.1%
Farsi			\$ -	\$ 267	\$ 267	0%	0.1%
German			\$ 265	\$ -	\$ 265	100%	0.1%
Hindi			\$ 169	\$ -	\$ 169	100%	0.0%
Persian of Afgan.(Dari)			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 31,330</b>	<b>\$ 1,494</b>	<b>\$ 32,823</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 407,176</b>	<b>\$ 16,122</b>	<b>\$ 31,330</b>	<b>\$ 1,494</b>	<b>\$ 456,121</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 5B: Superior Court of San Mateo County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 75,283	\$ 55,713	\$ 16,475				\$ 147,470	89%	76%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 7,211	\$ 4,774				\$ 11,985	60%	6%
Vietnamese	\$ 1,485	\$ 5,559	\$ -				\$ 7,044	100%	4%
Cantonese	\$ 3,293	\$ 1,778	\$ -				\$ 5,071	100%	3%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,453				\$ 3,453	0%	2%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,209				\$ 2,209	0%	1%
Korean	\$ 482	\$ 529	\$ -				\$ 1,011	100%	1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 80,543</b>	<b>\$ 70,790</b>	<b>\$ 26,911</b>				<b>\$ 178,244</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>92%</b>
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 9,726	\$ -	\$ 9,726	100%	5%
Tongan				\$ -	\$ 1,735	\$ -	\$ 1,735	100%	1%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 1,403	\$ -	\$ 1,403	100%	1%
Samoan				\$ -	\$ 1,102	\$ -	\$ 1,102	100%	1%
Punjabi				\$ -	\$ 735	\$ -	\$ 735	100%	0%
Croatian				\$ -	\$ 492	\$ -	\$ 492	100%	0%
Farsi				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 350	0%	0%
Hindi				\$ -	\$ 294	\$ -	\$ 294	100%	0%
Burmese				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0%
Lao				\$ -	\$ 179	\$ -	\$ 179	100%	0%
Urdu				\$ -	\$ 147	\$ -	\$ 147	100%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 15,814</b>	<b>\$ 534</b>	<b>\$ 16,348</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 80,543</b>	<b>\$ 70,790</b>	<b>\$ 26,911</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 15,814</b>	<b>\$ 534</b>	<b>\$ 194,592</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 6A: Superior Court of Contra Costa County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 301,327	\$ 109,359			\$ 410,685	73%	77%
Vietnamese	\$ 11,721	\$ 5,648			\$ 17,369	67%	3%
Portuguese	\$ 6,723	\$ 3,724			\$ 10,446	64%	2%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 7,807			\$ 7,807	0%	1%
Cantonese	\$ 3,782	\$ 1,747			\$ 5,529	68%	1%
Korean	\$ 2,606	\$ 1,187			\$ 3,793	69%	1%
Arabic	\$ 1,228	\$ -			\$ 1,228	100%	0%
Japanese	\$ -	\$ 961			\$ 961	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 327,385.84</b>	<b>\$ 130,432.78</b>			<b>\$ 457,819</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>86%</b>
Asian Indian Languages (1)			\$ 18,381	\$ 1,564	\$ 19,945	92%	4%
Mien			\$ 7,936	\$ 9,525	\$ 17,461	45%	3%
Mandarin			\$ 10,499	\$ 179	\$ 10,677	98%	2%
Lao			\$ 5,932	\$ 1,783	\$ 7,715	77%	1%
Farsi			\$ 4,219	\$ 460	\$ 4,679	90%	1%
Russian			\$ 3,975	\$ -	\$ 3,975	100%	1%
Eastern European (2)			\$ 2,526	\$ 441	\$ 2,967	85%	1%
Tongan			\$ 1,803	\$ 552	\$ 2,355	77%	0%
Cambodian			\$ -	\$ 2,146	\$ 2,146	0%	0%
Italian			\$ 1,675	\$ -	\$ 1,675	100%	0%
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 920	\$ 920	0%	0%
Tigrinya			\$ 824	\$ -	\$ 824	100%	0%
All Other Languages			\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0%
Samoa			\$ 169	\$ -	\$ 169	100%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 57,937</b>	<b>\$ 17,754</b>	<b>\$ 75,691</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 327,386</b>	<b>\$ 130,433</b>	<b>\$ 57,937</b>	<b>\$ 17,754</b>	<b>\$ 533,510</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Bulgarian, Croatian, Polish

Table 6B: Superior Court of Contra Costa County

Expenditures on Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 106,291	\$ 34,728				\$ 141,019	75%	78%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 3,109	\$ 1,393				\$ 4,403	71%	2%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 168	\$ 3,396				\$ 3,563	5%	2%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 4,117	\$ 214				\$ 4,332	95%	2%
Cantonese	\$ 756	\$ 147	\$ 423				\$ 1,326	68%	1%
Korean	\$ 147	\$ 294	\$ 649				\$ 1,090	40%	1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 903</b>	<b>\$ 114,126</b>	<b>\$ 40,704</b>				<b>\$ 155,733</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>86%</b>
Asian Indian Languages (1)				\$ -	\$ 5,716	\$ -	\$ 5,716	100%	3%
Lao				\$ -	\$ 3,284	\$ 227	\$ 3,511	94%	2%
Mien				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,170	\$ 3,170	0%	2%
Farsi (2)				\$ -	\$ 1,498	\$ 1,158	\$ 2,656	56%	1%
Cambodian				\$ -	\$ 35	\$ 2,250	\$ 2,285	2%	1%
Mandarin				\$ 441	\$ 1,841	\$ -	\$ 2,282	100%	1%
Tongan				\$ -	\$ 1,932	\$ 276	\$ 2,208	87%	1%
Tigrinya				\$ -	\$ 1,060	\$ -	\$ 1,060	100%	1%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 999	\$ -	\$ 999	100%	1%
Ilocano				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 543	\$ 543	0.0%	0%
Bulgarian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 308	\$ 308	0.0%	0%
All Other Languages				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0.0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 441</b>	<b>\$ 16,366</b>	<b>\$ 8,025</b>	<b>\$ 24,832</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 903</b>	<b>\$ 114,126</b>	<b>\$ 40,704</b>	<b>\$ 441</b>	<b>\$ 16,366</b>	<b>\$ 8,025</b>	<b>\$ 180,565</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Farsi, Dari, Pashto

**Table 7A: Superior Court of San Joaquin County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 297,076	\$ 72,957			\$ 370,032	80%	73%
Vietnamese		\$ 17,562			\$ 17,562	0%	3%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 1,340			\$ 1,340	0%	0.3%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 1,111			\$ 1,111	0%	0.2%
Cantonese	\$ 494	\$ -			\$ 494	100%	0.1%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 363			\$ 363	0%	0.1%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 92			\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 297,570</b>	<b>\$ 93,426</b>			<b>\$ 390,995</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>77%</b>
Cambodian			\$ 22,954	\$ 18,998	\$ 41,952	55%	8%
Other			\$ -	\$ 23,583	\$ 23,583	0%	5%
Lao			\$ -	\$ 14,247	\$ 14,247	0%	3%
Punjabi			\$ 12,404	\$ 1,300	\$ 13,704	91%	3%
Hmong			\$ 1,294	\$ 12,204	\$ 13,498	10%	3%
Mandarin			\$ -	\$ 2,300	\$ 2,300	0%	0.5%
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 1,381	\$ 1,381	0%	0.3%
Urdu			\$ -	\$ 1,281	\$ 1,281	0%	0%
Hindi			\$ 882	\$ 106	\$ 988	89%	0%
Farsi			\$ -	\$ 667	\$ 667	0%	0.1%
Fijian Hindustani			\$ -	\$ 378	\$ 378	0%	0%
Romanian			\$ 319	\$ -	\$ 319	100%	0.1%
Croatian			\$ -	\$ 106	\$ 106	0%	0.0%
Russian			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
Mien			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 37,853</b>	<b>\$ 76,735</b>	<b>\$ 114,588</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 297,570</b>	<b>\$ 93,426</b>	<b>\$ 37,853</b>	<b>\$ 76,735</b>	<b>\$ 505,584</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 7B: Superior Court of San Joaquin County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 100,142	\$ 39,349				\$ 139,490	72%	73.9%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,228				\$ 6,228	0%	3.3%
Korean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 249				\$ 249	0%	0.1%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 785				\$ 785	0%	0.4%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92				\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 100,142</b>	<b>\$ 46,702</b>				<b>\$ 146,844</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>77.8%</b>
Cambodian				\$ -	\$ 6,650	\$ 7,885	\$ 14,535	46%	7.7%
All Other Languages (8)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,634	\$ 9,634	0%	5.1%
Lao				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,896	\$ 4,896	0%	2.6%
Punjabi				\$ -	\$ 2,978	\$ 1,564	\$ 4,542	66%	2.4%
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,419	\$ 4,419	0%	2.3%
Ilocano				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,901	\$ 1,901	0%	1.0%
Urdu				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 979	\$ 979	0%	0.5%
Fijian Hindustani				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 552	\$ 552	0%	0.3%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	0%	0.1%
Russian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
Dan				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,628</b>	<b>\$ 32,289</b>	<b>\$ 41,917</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 100,142</b>	<b>\$ 46,702</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,628</b>	<b>\$ 32,289</b>	<b>\$ 188,761</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8A: Superior Court of Santa Barbara County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 356,400	\$ 38,838			\$ 395,239	90%	95%
Korean	\$ 971	\$ 848			\$ 1,820	53%	0.4%
Arabic	\$ 1,692	\$ 92			\$ 1,784	95%	0.4%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 1,181			\$ 1,181	0%	0.3%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 750			\$ 750	0%	0.2%
Vietnamese	\$ 413	\$ -			\$ 413	100%	0.1%
Japanese	\$ 336	\$ -			\$ 336	100%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 359,813</b>	<b>\$ 41,710</b>			<b>\$ 401,523</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>97%</b>
Other			\$ -	\$ 8,250	\$ 8,250	0%	2%
Mandarin			\$ 2,045	\$ 252	\$ 2,297	89%	1%
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 678	\$ 678	0%	0.2%
Ukrainian			\$ 640	\$ -	\$ 640	100%	0.2%
Russian			\$ 422	\$ -	\$ 422	100%	0.1%
Punjabi			\$ -	\$ 325	\$ 325	0%	0.1%
Hmong			\$ -	\$ 282	\$ 282	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 3,106</b>	<b>\$ 9,787</b>	<b>\$ 12,893</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 359,813</b>	<b>\$ 41,710</b>	<b>\$ 3,106</b>	<b>\$ 9,787</b>	<b>\$ 414,416</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 8B: Superior Court of Santa Barbara County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 15,053	\$ 119,766	\$ 320				\$ 135,139	80%	93%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 2,356	\$ 184				\$ 2,540	0%	2%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 695	\$ -				\$ 695	39%	0%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166				\$ 166	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 15,053</b>	<b>\$ 122,817</b>	<b>\$ 670</b>				<b>\$ 138,541</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>95%</b>
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	0%	3%
Armenian				\$ -	\$ 333	\$ 319	\$ 652	51%	0%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 641	\$ -	\$ 641	100%	0%
Ilocano				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 542	\$ 542	100%	0%
Italian				\$ -	\$ 265	\$ -	\$ 265	100%	0%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 212	\$ -	\$ 212	99%	0%
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,451</b>	<b>\$ 5,146</b>	<b>\$ 6,597</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,053</b>	<b>\$ 122,817</b>	<b>\$ 670</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,451</b>	<b>\$ 5,146</b>	<b>\$ 145,137</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 9A: Superior Court of Tulare County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified Registered</b>	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 299,387	\$ 159,935			\$ 459,322	65%	96%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 1,264			\$ 1,264	0%	0%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 1,196			\$ 1,196	0%	0%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 421			\$ 421	0%	0%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 304			\$ 304	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 299,387</b>	<b>\$ 163,119</b>			<b>\$ 462,506</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>96%</b>
Lao			\$ -	\$ 10,438	\$ 10,438	0%	2%
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 3,166	\$ 3,166	0%	1%
Hmong			\$ -	\$ 2,855	\$ 2,855	0%	1%
Punjabi			\$ -	\$ 914	\$ 914	0%	0%
Other			\$ -	\$ 112	\$ 112	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 17,486</b>	<b>\$ 17,486</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 299,387</b>	<b>\$ 163,119</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 17,486</b>	<b>\$ 479,992</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 9B: Superior Court of Tulare County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003**

	<i>Designated Languages</i>			<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>			<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified Registered</b>	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 55,058	\$ 52,106	\$ 59,494				\$ 166,658	64%	97%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 819				\$ 819	0%	0%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 237				\$ 237	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 55,058</b>	<b>\$ 52,106</b>	<b>\$ 60,550</b>				<b>\$ 167,714</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>97%</b>
Lao				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,840	\$ 1,840	0%	1%
Ilocano				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,371	\$ 1,371	0%	1%
Punjabi				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 436	\$ 436	0%	0.3%
Mien				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 368	\$ 368	0%	0.2%
Armenian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 334	\$ 334	0%	0.2%
Cambodian				\$ 297	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 297	100%	0.2%
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 297</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,441</b>	<b>\$ 4,738</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 55,058</b>	<b>\$ 52,106</b>	<b>\$ 60,550</b>	<b>\$ 297</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,441</b>	<b>\$ 172,452</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 10A: Superior Court of Santa Cruz County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 259,745	\$ 24,390			\$ 284,134	91%	96%
Arabic	\$ 1,577	\$ 184			\$ 1,761	90%	1%
Korean	\$ 969	\$ 457			\$ 1,425	68%	0%
Tagalog	\$ 828	\$ 115			\$ 943	88%	0%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 393			\$ 393	0%	0%
Vietnamese	\$ 179	\$ 117			\$ 297	60%	0%
Japanese	\$ 211	\$ -			\$ 211	100%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 263,509</b>	<b>\$ 25,655</b>			<b>\$ 289,164</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>98%</b>
Other			\$ -	\$ 1,883	\$ 1,883	0%	1%
Russian			\$ 1,616	\$ -	\$ 1,616	100%	1%
Khmer			\$ 983	\$ -	\$ 983	100%	0%
Punjabi			\$ 744	\$ 174	\$ 918	81%	0%
Thai			\$ 376	\$ 453	\$ 828	45%	0%
Italian			\$ -	\$ 227	\$ 227	0%	0%
Mandarin			\$ 184	\$ -	\$ 184	100%	0%
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 115	\$ 115	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 3,903</b>	<b>\$ 2,852</b>	<b>\$ 6,755</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 263,509</b>	<b>\$ 25,655</b>	<b>\$ 3,903</b>	<b>\$ 2,852</b>	<b>\$ 295,919</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 10B: Superior Court of Santa Cruz County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 33,933	\$ 55,105	\$ 9,706				\$ 98,744	90%	95%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ 631	\$ 494				\$ 1,125	56%	1%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 371				\$ 371	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 33,933</b>	<b>\$ 55,736</b>	<b>\$ 10,571</b>				<b>\$ 100,240</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>96%</b>
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,477	\$ 1,477	0%	1%
Russian				\$ -	\$ 821	\$ -	\$ 821	100%	1%
Punjabi				\$ 171	\$ 592	\$ -	\$ 764	100%	1%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 545	\$ -	\$ 545	100%	1%
Croatian				\$ -	\$ 517	\$ -	\$ 517	100%	0%
Italian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 114	\$ 114	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 171</b>	<b>\$ 2,475</b>	<b>\$ 1,590</b>	<b>\$ 4,237</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,933</b>	<b>\$ 55,736</b>	<b>\$ 10,571</b>	<b>\$ 171</b>	<b>\$ 2,475</b>	<b>\$ 1,590</b>	<b>\$ 104,477</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Table 11A: Superior Court of Imperial County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 222,276	\$ 1,804			\$ 224,080	99%	98%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 2,444			\$ 2,444	0%	1%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 1,083			\$ 1,083	0%	0.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 222,276</b>	<b>\$ 5,330</b>			<b>\$ 227,607</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Mandarin			\$ -	\$ 175	\$ 175	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 175</b>	<b>\$ 175</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 222,276</b>	<b>\$ 5,330</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 175</b>	<b>\$ 227,782</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 11B: Superior Court of Imperial County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 47,073	\$ 23,922	\$ -				\$ 70,995	100%	98%
Korean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,051				\$ 1,051	0%	1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 47,073</b>	<b>\$ 23,922</b>	<b>\$ 1,051</b>				<b>\$ 72,046</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 265	\$ 265	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 265</b>	<b>\$ 265</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 47,073</b>	<b>\$ 23,922</b>	<b>\$ 1,051</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 265</b>	<b>\$ 72,311</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 12A: Superior Court of Madera County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 147,970	\$ 37,592			\$ 185,562	80%	99%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 147,970</b>	<b>\$ 37,592</b>			<b>\$ 185,562</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>99%</b>
Punjabi			\$ -	\$ 736	\$ 736	0.0%	0.4%
Russian			\$ -	\$ 359	\$ 359	0.0%	0.2%
Other			\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 350	0.0%	0.2%
Hmong			\$ -	\$ 267	\$ 267	0.0%	0.1%
Urdu			\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,804</b>	<b>\$ 1,804</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 147,970</b>	<b>\$ 37,592</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,804</b>	<b>\$ 187,366</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 12B: Superior Court of Madera County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 60,797	\$ -	\$ 8,842				\$ 69,639	87%	98%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 60,797</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 8,842</b>				<b>\$ 69,639</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>98%</b>
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 853	\$ 853	0%	1%
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 335	\$ 335	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,188</b>	<b>\$ 1,188</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 60,797</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 8,842</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,188</b>	<b>\$ 70,827</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 13A: Superior Court of Placer County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 63,076	\$ 14,363			\$ 77,458	81%	63%
Vietnamese	\$ 7,678				\$ 7,678	100%	6%
Tagalog		\$ 3,264			\$ 3,264	0%	3%
Portuguese		\$ 892			\$ 892	0%	1%
Arabic	\$ 515				\$ 515	100%	0%
Cantonese		\$ 114			\$ 114	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 71,268</b>	<b>\$ 18,653</b>			<b>\$ 89,921</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>73%</b>
Russian			\$ 17,501	\$ 1,367	\$ 18,868	93%	15%
Asian Indian Languages (1)			\$ 4,879	\$ 663	\$ 5,542	88%	4%
Romanian			\$ 3,904		\$ 3,904	100%	3%
Other			\$ -	\$ 1,475	\$ 1,475	0%	1%
Other European (2)			\$ -	\$ 934	\$ 934	0%	1%
Armenian			\$ 870		\$ 870	100%	1%
Farsi			\$ 482	\$ 285	\$ 768	63%	1%
Mandarin			\$ 499	\$ 244	\$ 743	67%	1%
Hmong			\$ -	\$ 341	\$ 341	0%	0%
Lao			\$ 301		\$ 301	100%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 28,436</b>	<b>\$ 5,309</b>	<b>\$ 33,745</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 71,268</b>	<b>\$ 18,653</b>	<b>\$ 28,436</b>	<b>\$ 5,309</b>	<b>\$ 123,666</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Includes Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu

(2) Includes Bosnian, German

Table 13B: Superior Court of Placer County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003								Language as a % of interpreter expenditures	
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total		% Certified, Registered
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 19,384	\$ 4,976				\$ 24,360	80%	54%
Tagalog	\$ -		\$ 3,535				\$ 3,535	0%	8%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 1,224					\$ 1,224	100%	3%
Portuguese	\$ -		\$ 656				\$ 656	0%	1%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 159					\$ 159	100%	0%
Arabic	\$ -	\$ 171					\$ 171	100%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 20,938</b>	<b>\$ 9,167</b>				<b>\$ 30,105</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>67%</b>
Russian				\$ 10,554	\$ -	\$ 147	\$ 10,701	99%	24%
Punjabi				\$ 2,001	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,001	100%	4%
Farsi				\$ -	\$ 818	\$ 337	\$ 1,155	71%	3%
Romanian				\$ -	\$ 461	\$ -	\$ 461	100%	1%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 226	\$ -	\$ 226	100%	1%
Hmong				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212.6	\$ 213	0%	0.5%
Hindi				\$ 171	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 171	100%	0.4%
Bosnian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 121	\$ 121	0%	0.3%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 12,727</b>	<b>\$ 1,505</b>	<b>\$ 817</b>	<b>\$ 15,050</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 20,938</b>	<b>\$ 9,167</b>	<b>\$ 12,727</b>	<b>\$ 1,505</b>	<b>\$ 817</b>	<b>\$ 45,154</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 14A: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County**

**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003**

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 133,659	\$ -			\$ 133,659	100%	99%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 133,659</b>	<b>\$ -</b>			<b>\$ 133,659</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99%</b>
Ilocano			\$ -	\$ 1,660	\$ 1,660	0%	1%
Mandarin				\$ 315	\$ 315	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,975</b>	<b>\$ 1,975</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 133,659</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,975</b>	<b>\$ 135,634</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 14B: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County**

**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003**

	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 43,326	\$ 359				\$ 52,168	83%	99%
Tagalog	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92				\$ 92	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 43,326</b>	<b>\$ 451</b>				<b>\$ 43,777</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>99%</b>
Ilocano				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276	\$ 276	0%	1%
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 242	\$ 242	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 518</b>	<b>\$ 518</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 43,326</b>	<b>\$ 451</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 518</b>	<b>\$ 44,295</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 15A: Superior Court of Sutter County**

**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003**

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 49,981	\$ 727			\$ 50,708	99%	64%
Vietnamese	\$ 530	\$ -			\$ 530	100%	1%
Korean	\$ -	\$ 265			\$ 265	0%	0%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 184			\$ 184	0%	0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 50,511</b>	<b>\$ 1,176</b>			<b>\$ 51,687</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Punjabi			\$ 8,963	\$ 12,020	\$ 20,983	43%	26%
Hindi			\$ 1,697	\$ -	\$ 1,697	100%	2%
Hmong			\$ 1,470	\$ 92	\$ 1,562	94%	2%
Russian			\$ 1,375	\$ -	\$ 1,487	92%	2%
Mien			\$ 871	\$ -	\$ 871	100%	1%
Khmer			\$ 530	\$ -	\$ 530	100%	1%
Lao			\$ 182	\$ 129	\$ 312	58%	0%
Ukrainian			\$ 195	\$ -	\$ 195	100%	0%
Farsi (Persian)			\$ -	\$ 184	\$ 184	0%	0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 15,283</b>	<b>\$ 12,425</b>	<b>\$ 27,821</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 50,511</b>	<b>\$ 1,176</b>	<b>\$ 15,283</b>	<b>\$ 12,425</b>	<b>\$ 79,396</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 15B: Superior Court of Sutter County**

**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003**

	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 16,577	\$ 1,044	\$ 362				\$ 17,983	98%	75%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 306	\$ -				\$ 306	100%	1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 16,577</b>	<b>\$ 1,350</b>	<b>\$ 362</b>				<b>\$ 18,289</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>76%</b>
Punjabi				\$ -	\$ 3,393	\$ 552	\$ 3,945	0%	16%
Hmong				\$ 631	\$ 181	\$ -	\$ 812	100%	3%
Hindi				\$ -	\$ 592	\$ -	\$ 592	100%	2%
Mandarin				\$ -	\$ 186	\$ -	\$ 186	100%	1%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 631</b>	<b>\$ 4,539</b>	<b>\$ 552</b>	<b>\$ 5,722</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,577</b>	<b>\$ 1,350</b>	<b>\$ 362</b>	<b>\$ 631</b>	<b>\$ 4,539</b>	<b>\$ 552</b>	<b>\$ 24,010</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 1: Superior Court of Shasta County**  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 4,909	\$ 16,372			\$ 21,282	23%	40%
Vietnamese	\$ 1,293				\$ 1,293	100%	2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 6,203</b>	<b>\$ 16,372</b>			<b>\$ 22,575</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>43%</b>
Lao			\$ 10,994	\$ 3,060	\$ 14,053		78%
Mien			\$ 3,661	\$ 8,287	\$ 11,948		31%
Thai			\$ 2,165	\$ -	\$ 2,165		100%
Punjabi			\$ 1,949	\$ -	\$ 1,949		100%
Russian			\$ -	\$ 105	\$ 105		0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 18,769</b>	<b>\$ 11,452</b>	<b>\$ 30,221</b>		<b>62%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,203</b>	<b>\$ 16,372</b>	<b>\$ 18,769</b>	<b>\$ 11,452</b>	<b>\$ 52,796</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 16B: Superior Court of Shasta County**  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003

	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 3,863	\$ 3,587				\$ 7,449	52%	32%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,863</b>	<b>\$ 3,587</b>				<b>\$ 7,449</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>32%</b>
Lao				\$ -	\$ 6,645	\$ 1,145	\$ 7,790		85%
Mien				\$ -	\$ 3,248	\$ 3,818	\$ 7,066		46%
Punjabi				\$ 526	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 526		100%
Russian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210	\$ 210		0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ 526</b>	<b>\$ 9,893</b>	<b>\$ 5,173</b>	<b>\$ 15,592</b>		<b>67%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,863</b>	<b>\$ 3,587</b>	<b>\$ 526</b>	<b>\$ 9,893</b>	<b>\$ 5,173</b>	<b>\$ 23,041</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 17A: Superior Court of Nevada County**  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 6,009	\$ 19,227			\$ 25,236	24%	96%
Vietnamese	\$ 369	\$ -			\$ 369	100%	1%
Portuguese	\$ 567	\$ -			\$ 567	100%	2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 6,946</b>	<b>\$ 19,227</b>			<b>\$ 26,173</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>99%</b>
Punjabi			\$ -	\$ 162	\$ 162		0.0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 162</b>	<b>\$ 162</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,946</b>	<b>\$ 19,227</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 162</b>	<b>\$ 26,335</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 17B: Superior Court of Nevada County**  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003

	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 7,991	\$ 4,144				\$ 12,135	47%	84%
Vietnamese	\$ -	\$ 2,035	\$ -				\$ 2,035	100%	10%
Portuguese	\$ -	\$ 412	\$ -				\$ 412	100%	1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,438</b>	<b>\$ 4,144</b>				<b>\$ 14,582</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>96%</b>
Russian				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 215	\$ 215		0%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 215</b>	<b>\$ 215</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,438</b>	<b>\$ 4,144</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 215</b>	<b>\$ 14,797</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 18A: Superior Court of Del Norte County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 14,418	\$ -			\$ 14,418	100%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 14,418</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 14,418</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 18B: Superior Court of Del Norte County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 5,350	\$ -				\$ 5,350	100%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,350</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,350</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 19A: Superior Court of Tuolumne County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages		Non-Designated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 6,437	\$ 117			\$ 6,554	98%	78%
Korean	\$ 1,027	\$ -			\$ 1,027	100%	12%
Cantonese	\$ -	\$ 348			\$ 348	0%	4%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ 7,464</b>	<b>\$ 465</b>			<b>\$ 7,929</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>
Other			\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 300	0%	4%
Hmong			\$ 199	\$ -	\$ 199	100%	2%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>			<b>\$ 199</b>	<b>\$ 300</b>	<b>\$ 499</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,464</b>	<b>\$ 465</b>	<b>\$ 199</b>	<b>\$ 300</b>	<b>\$ 8,428</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 19B: Superior Court of Tuolumne County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	Designated Languages			Non-Designated Languages			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ 3,970	\$ -				\$ 3,970	100%	83%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,970</b>	<b>\$ -</b>				<b>\$ 3,970</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83%</b>
Other				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600	\$ 600	0%	13%
Farsi				\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202	\$ 202	0%	4%
<b>Total Non-Designated Languages</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 802</b>	<b>\$ 802</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,970</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 802</b>	<b>\$ 4,772</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 20A: Superior Court of Lassen County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, October 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Non-Certified	Registered	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ 1,013	\$ 6,835			\$ 7,848	13%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,013</b>	<b>\$ 6,835</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,848</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 20B: Superior Court of Lassen County**

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003									Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
	<i>Designated Languages</i>			<i>Non-Designated Languages</i>			Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Pro-Tempore	Certified Contract/Opt Out	Non-Certified	Pro-Tempore	Registered Contract/Opt Out	Non-Registered			
Spanish	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,701				\$ 2,701	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,701</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,701</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>