



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on February 19, 2015

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Fiscal Year 2013–2014 Expenditures of the Trial Court Interpreters Program	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	February 19, 2015
Recommended by	Date of Report
Donna Hershkowitz, Director Court Operations Services, Judicial Council	January 20, 2015
	Contact
	Catharine Price, 415-865-7783 cat.price@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Judicial Council's Court Operations Services office recommends approving the annual report on trial court interpreter expenditures for submission to the Legislature and the Department of Finance. This report is required by the Budget Act of 2013.

Recommendation

The Judicial Council's Court Operations Services office respectfully recommends that the Judicial Council, effective February 19, 2015:

1. Approve the attached report to the Legislature summarizing the fiscal year 2013–2014 trial court interpreter expenditures in conformance with the requirements of the Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20); and
2. Direct staff to submit the report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance.

Previous Council Action

At the Judicial Council business meeting on February 20, 2014, the Judicial Council approved the *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2012–2013* for submission to the Legislature, summarizing the fiscal year 2012–2013 trial court interpreter expenditures in conformance with the requirements of the Budget Act of 2012 (Stats. 2012, ch. 21) and directed submission of the report to the Legislature. The Judicial Council has also approved previous reports submitted in prior years. Copies of previous reports can be found at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

Rationale for Recommendation

The Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 3 states that “[t]he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4).” In fulfillment of that provision, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreters.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This report was not circulated for comment. Preparation and submission of this report is mandated by the annual Budget Act, and thus no alternatives were considered.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

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

Attachments

1. Attachment A: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*

ATTACHMENT A



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. KENNETH K. SO
*Chair, Policy Coordination and
Liaison Committee*

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
Chair, Rules and Projects Committee

HON. JAMES E. HERMAN
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
Hon. Brian John Back
Hon. Richard Bloom
Mr. Mark G. Bonino
Hon. James R. Brandlin
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. David De Alba
Hon. Emilie H. Elias
Mr. James P. Fox
Ms. Donna D. Melby
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Debra Elaine Pole
Hon. David Rosenberg
Hon. Dean T. Stout
Hon. Martin J. Tangeman

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Daniel J. Buckley
Mr. Richard D. Feldstein
Hon. David E. Gunn
Hon. Morris D. Jacobson
Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Mr. Frank A. McGuire
Hon. Marsha G. Slough
Ms. Mary Beth Todd
Hon. Charles D. Wachob
Hon. Joan P. Weber

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

Report Summary

Report title: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2013–2014*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20)

Date of report: February 19, 2015


The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with provision 3, item 0250-101-0932, of the Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20).

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

Funding appropriated in the Trial Court Trust Fund line item for Program 45.45 in fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014 was \$92,794,000. Reimbursements reported for allowable court interpreter expenditures incurred in FY 2013–2014 totaled \$92,471,280, an increase of \$4,662,760, a 5.31 percent increase over FY 2012–2013 expenditures (\$87,808,520).

Of the 5.31 percent increase in expenditures, \$2,442,546 is attributable to costs related to court interpreter services for all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases with a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases, as well as for expenditures on court interpreter services for indigent parties in civil cases as authorized by the Judicial Council in January 2014.

The full *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2013–2014* is available at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm. A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-4288.



Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2013–2014

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
FEBRUARY 2015



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

COURT LANGUAGE ACCESS
SUPPORT PROGRAM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Mr. Martin Hoshino
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

Mr. Curtis L. Child
Chief Operating Officer
**OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS
DIVISION**

COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES
Ms. Donna Hershkowitz
Director

Court Language Access Support Program
Ms. Catharine Price
Manager

Ms. Sonia Sierra Wolf
Primary Author of Report

I. Background

Mandates to Provide Court Interpreting Services

Article I, section 14, of the California Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide that “[a] person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings.” This provision establishes a mandate for the courts to provide interpreters in criminal matters to all defendants who have a limited ability to understand or speak English. Further state court rulings subsequent to the constitutional amendment established the right to a court interpreter in delinquency and some family law matters for individuals with limited English proficiency. On January 23, 2014, the Judicial Council took action to expand the allowable expenditures authorized for reimbursement from the Trial Court Trust Fund, Program 45.45 appropriation.¹

In addition to the constitutional mandate and state court rulings, under federal law, individuals with hearing disabilities who require sign language interpreters must receive court interpreter services at no cost in all court proceedings.

Statutory Requirement to Report on Expenditures

The Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule (4), provides appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 3 states that “[t]he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4).” Consistent with the requirements, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreter services.

Program 45.45 Funding

- Funding appropriated in the Trial Court Trust Fund for Program 45.45 in fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014 was \$92,794,000, of which \$92,707,000 was available for reimbursement to courts for allowable court interpreter costs.²
- The appropriation amount has remained unchanged since FY 2009–2010.
- Program 45.45 savings are restricted by the Judicial Council to be used for court interpreter costs.³
- Court reimbursements reported for allowable court interpreter expenditures incurred in FY 2013–2014 totaled \$92,471,280, or 99.74 percent of available funds, an increase of \$4,662,760 (5.31 percent) over FY 2012–2013 appropriated funds (\$87,808,520).

¹ The full report to the council is available on the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140123-itemD.pdf.

² Of the TCTF Program 45.45 appropriation, \$87,000 is authorized for funding the Court Interpreter Data Collection System.

³ On October 29, 2010, the Judicial Council approved the savings from FY 2009–2010 and any future expenditure savings to be set aside to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs. The cumulative savings exclude the \$3 million redirected by the Judicial Council at its July 22, 2011, meeting to offset trial court budget reductions.

- Of the 5.31 percent increase in expenditures, \$2,442,546 is attributable to costs related to court interpreter services for all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases with a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases, as well as for expenditures on court interpreter services for indigent parties in civil cases as authorized by the Judicial Council in January 2014.

II. Allowable Expenditures

The following expenditures qualify for reimbursement under Program 45.45:

1. Contract court interpreters, including per diems (see section III) and travel;
2. Certified and registered court interpreters employed by the courts, including salaries, benefits, and travel;
3. Court interpreter coordinators who are certified or registered court interpreters, including salaries and benefits; and
4. Four court interpreter supervisor positions: two in Los Angeles County, one in Orange County, and one in San Diego County. These are the only positions funded under Program 45.45 that include funding for standard operating expenses and equipment.⁴

On January 23, 2014, the Judicial Council adopted the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Joint Working Group to Address Court Interpreter Issues to expand the allowable use of the Program 45.45 appropriation (funding for court interpreter services). The Judicial Council authorized trial courts to request reimbursement from the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45 appropriation for costs related to court interpreter services for all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases with a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases. The council also approved that trial courts can request reimbursement from the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45 appropriation, and any unused savings from that appropriation, for expenditures on court interpreter services for indigent parties in civil cases.

Attachment 1 provides a summary by court, as well as by category, of the reimbursements for allowable court interpreter expenditures.

III. Rates of Pay for Court Interpreters

The Judicial Council first established statewide standards for court interpreter compensation in January 1999 at two defined levels, a full-day rate and a half-day rate.

⁴ Limited by item 0250-101-0932, provision 3, of the Budget Act of 2013 to 1.0 personnel year (PY) each for counties in classes 1–15, 0.5 PY each for counties in classes 16–31, and 0.25 PY each for counties in classes 32–58. The Budget Act of 2013 defines county classes based on size of population: counties in classes 1–15 have populations greater than 500,000; classes 16–31 have populations between 130,000 and 500,000; and classes 32–58 have populations less than 130,000.

Statewide Standard Rate for Certified and Registered Contract Court Interpreters

Effective September 1, 2007, the Judicial Council increased the statewide standard pay rate for certified and registered independent contractor interpreters to \$282.23 for a full day and \$156.56 for a half day. The full-day rate of \$282.23 represents a 41 percent increase over the original January 1999 rate of \$200.

Certified Court Interpreters vs. Registered Court Interpreters

Interpreters who pass the Written Exam and the Bilingual Interpreting Exam or the required exam for American Sign Language and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements are referred to as certified court interpreters. Currently, California recognizes 15 certified languages: American Sign Language, Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.

An interpreter of a spoken language that is not a certified language is required to pass the Written Exam and a two-part Oral Proficiency Exam; one in English and one in the non-English (foreign) language. In order to be recognized as registered interpreters, these interpreters must also fulfill all corresponding Judicial Council requirements.

Statewide Standard for Noncertified and Nonregistered Interpreters

During FY 2013–2014, the statewide standard rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters remained \$175 for a full day and \$92 for a half day, the same rate established by the Judicial Council in July 1999. Actual rates paid to contract interpreters, whether certified/registered or noncertified/nonregistered, often exceed the statewide standards because each assignment must be negotiated by the trial court and is subject to current market rates, including supply and demand.

Noncertified and Nonregistered Interpreters

Noncertified and nonregistered court interpreters who have not taken or passed the required examinations but who have demonstrated language proficiency may be provisionally qualified by the court. They may be used when no certified or registered interpreter is available, as may be the case when a rare dialect or indigenous language is needed.⁵

⁵ The court is required to appoint a certified interpreter to interpret in a language designated by the Judicial Council (Gov. Code, § 68561) or a registered interpreter to interpret in a language not designated by the Judicial Council. The court may appoint a noncertified interpreter if the court (1) on the record finds good cause to appoint a noncertified interpreter and finds the interpreter to be qualified and (2) follows the procedures adopted by the Judicial Council (Gov. Code, §§ 68561(c), 68564(d) and (e); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.893). The court may appoint nonregistered interpreters only if (1) a registered interpreter is unavailable and (2) the good cause qualifications and procedures adopted by the Judicial Council under Government Code section 68561(c) have been followed. (See Gov. Code, § 71802(b)(1) and (d).)

Comparison with Federal Rates

Provision 3 of the Budget Act states that “*the Judicial Council shall set statewide or regional rates and policies for payment of court interpreters, not to exceed the rate paid to certified interpreters in the federal court system.*”

The current federal rates for contract court interpreters are \$412/full day and \$233/half day for certified interpreters and \$198/full day and \$109/half day for noncertified interpreters.⁶ California employee court interpreters negotiate salaries, benefits, and working conditions regionally. They receive health and retirement benefits that increase the total value of their compensation by 30 to 35 percent. The federal system relies almost exclusively on contract interpreters, whereas court interpreter assignments in the California state courts are increasingly performed by employee court interpreters.

IV. Expenditures for Employee and Contract Interpreters in Mandated Cases

Expenditures for Certified and Registered Employees and Contract Interpreters

Table 1 details reimbursed expenditures for the past five years for employee-related and contract court interpreter costs expended for mandated cases. Total employee-related expenditures were 77.36 percent of total interpreter reimbursements in FY 2009–2010, progressively increasing to 84.35 percent of total interpreter reimbursements in FY 2013–2014. Contract interpreter expenditures, in the same period decreased from 22.64 percent to 15.65 percent. The trend of expenditures, both in actual dollars expended and percentage of total expenditures continues to shift toward employee-related costs.

Table 1. Expenditures for Certified and Registered Employees and Contract Interpreters for Mandated Cases

Fiscal Year	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Total Employee-Related Expenditures	\$68,042,596	\$71,763,311	\$72,835,667	\$73,871,935	\$75,939,519
% of Total	77.36	79.78	81.67	84.13	84.35
Total Contractor Expenditures	\$19,912,471	\$18,188,643	\$16,351,818	\$13,936,585	\$14,089,215
% of Total	22.64	20.22	18.33	15.87	15.65
Total	\$87,955,067	\$89,951,954	\$89,187,485	\$87,808,520	\$90,028,374

⁶ Federal rates of pay for court interpreters are available at www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/UnderstandingtheFederalCourts/DistrictCourts/CourtInterpreters/ContractInterpretersFees.aspx.

Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters


During FY 2013–2014, statewide expenditures for noncertified contract interpreters equaled \$1,233,769, or 1.33 percent of total statewide expenditures (\$92,471,280). Statewide expenditures for nonregistered contract interpreters equaled \$745,004, or 0.81 percent of total statewide expenditures. Statewide expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters decreased by \$40,856 from the prior year and accounted for 2.14 percent of total statewide interpreter costs.

Table 2 illustrates annual statewide expenditures over the past five years (excluding travel) for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters, and the percentage of total reimbursements for court interpreter services for mandated cases (\$90,028,374). The annual percentages show a continuous downward trend, from 4.18 percent in FY 2009–2010 to 2.14 percent in FY 2013–2014.

Table 2. Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters for Mandated Cases

Fiscal Year	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Noncertified Expenditures	\$2,816,013 3.20%	\$2,488,385 2.77%	\$1,642,989 1.84%	\$1,338,401 1.52%	\$1,233,769 1.37%
Nonregistered Expenditures	\$862,814 0.98%	\$797,239 0.89%	\$735,860 0.83%	\$681,188 0.78%	\$745,004 0.83%
Combined Expenditures	\$3,678,827 4.18%	\$3,285,624 3.65%	\$2,378,849 2.67%	\$2,019,589 2.30%	\$1,978,733 2.14%

Figure 1 depicts total reimbursed court interpreter expenditures over the past five years.



V. Distribution of Reimbursed Expenditures

Table 4 lists the 11 courts that received the largest reimbursements for allowable court interpreter expenditures in FY 2013–2014. These 11 courts accounted for \$73,011,489 or 78.96 percent of the state’s reimbursed expenditures for court interpreters.

Table 4. Distribution of Reimbursed Expenditures		
Superior Court	FY 2013–2014 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$)	Percentage of Statewide Total
Los Angeles	33,487,246	36.21%
Orange	8,454,234	9.14
San Diego	5,703,061	6.17
San Bernardino	4,383,902	4.74
Santa Clara	4,022,324	4.35
Alameda	3,974,706	4.30
Sacramento	3,420,909	3.70
Riverside	3,341,903	3.61
Kern	2,186,666	2.36
Fresno	2,060,261	2.23
San Francisco	1,976,637	2.14
Subtotal	73,011,849	78.96
Remaining Courts	19,459,431	21.04
Statewide Total	\$92,471,280	100.00%

VI. Conclusion

In FY 2013–2014, the state appropriation was sufficient to provide all courts with full reimbursement of their reported allowable court interpreter expenditures. However, the expansion of services to provide interpreters in all civil proceedings may result in the need for future additional funding to continue to adequately meet the anticipated increase in services provided.

The California judicial branch is committed to providing meaningful language access to the state’s seven million limited-English-proficient individuals by expanding language access services statewide. In April 2013, the Joint Working Group for California’s Language Access Plan (JWG) was established. The JWG’s final report, *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, was adopted by the Judicial Council on January 22, 2015. The Language Access Plan provides recommendations to expand language access in the courts, including the need to expand court interpreter services to all civil proceedings.

VII. Attachment

1. FY 2013–2014 Court Interpreters Program 45.45 Year-End Reimbursed Expenditures Using TCTF Program 45.45 (Court Interpreter) Appropriation

Reimbursement of Courts

FY 2013-2014 Court Interpreter-Related Expenditures Using TCTF Program 45.45 (Court Interpreter) Appropriation

Court	Mandated Cases -- Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs							Total Employee-Related Costs H (D+E+F+G)
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignment Costs	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	CIP Arbitration Awards	Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount	Supervisor Salaries, Benefits, & OE&E (\$12,500/FTE)	
	A	B	C	D (A + B + C)	E	F	G	
Alameda	3,220,338	11,028		3,231,366		138,298		3,369,664
Alpine				-				-
Amador				-				-
Butte				-				-
Calaveras				-				-
Colusa				-				-
Contra Costa	1,457,238	3,222		1,460,460				1,460,460
Del Norte				-				-
El Dorado	110,140	3,311		113,451				113,451
Fresno	1,741,470	5,974	5,483	1,752,927		133,164		1,886,091
Glenn				-				-
Humboldt				-				-
Imperial	420,144	329		420,473				420,473
Inyo				-				-
Kern	1,835,771	17,000		1,852,771				1,852,771
Kings	190,794	1,437		192,231				192,231
Lake				-				-
Lassen				-				-
Los Angeles	29,148,770	346	390,603	29,539,719			319,393	29,859,112
Madera	357,012			357,012				357,012
Marin	426,603	985		427,588				427,588
Mariposa				-				-
Mendocino	131,213			131,213				131,213
Merced	587,352	2,973		590,325				590,325
Modoc				-				-
Mono	26,766			26,766				26,766
Monterey	612,541	170	535	613,246				613,246
Napa	307,881			307,881				307,881
Nevada				-				-
Orange	6,888,765	6,233	72,106	6,967,104			163,195	7,130,299
Placer	127,509			127,509				127,509
Plumas				-				-
Riverside	2,617,805	1,366	1,067	2,620,238				2,620,238
Sacramento	2,593,887	9,508	190,910	2,794,305				2,794,305
San Benito				-				-
San Bernardino	3,933,903	177	2,975	3,937,055				3,937,055
San Diego	5,050,349	6,844	23,850	5,081,043			48,627	5,129,670
San Francisco	1,513,745	259	9,527	1,523,531				1,523,531
San Joaquin	647,430	1,099	133,308	781,837				781,837
San Luis Obispo	360,331	435		360,766				360,766
San Mateo	1,331,642	1,442	311	1,333,395				1,333,395
Santa Barbara	960,814	923		961,737				961,737
Santa Clara	3,239,055	13,517	95,872	3,348,444				3,348,444
Santa Cruz	801,570	8		801,578				801,578
Shasta				-				-
Sierra				-				-
Siskiyou				-				-
Solano	108,840			108,840				108,840
Sonoma	1,034,735	23	23,988	1,058,746				1,058,746
Stanislaus	284,682	337		285,019		10,514		295,533
Sutter	115,514	407		115,921				115,921
Tehama	242,717			242,717				242,717
Trinity				-				-
Tulare	730,089			730,089				730,089
Tuolumne				-				-
Ventura	705,971	479		706,450		97,522		803,972
Yolo	62,526			62,526		62,527		125,053
Yuba				-				-
TOTAL	73,925,912	89,832	950,535	74,966,279	-	442,025	531,215	75,939,519

FY 2013-2014 Court Interpreter-Related Expenditures Using TCTF Program 45.45 (Court Interpreter) Appropriation

Court	Mandated Cases -- Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs									Mandated Cases Total Reimbursed Expenditures
	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Telephonic Interpreting	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals, & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs	
	I	J	K	L	M	N	(I thru N)	P	(O + P)	
Alameda	79,237	186,528	60,721	75,618	80,553	1,550	484,207	83,745	567,952	3,937,616
Alpine						294	294		294	294
Amador		10,597					10,597	10,105	20,702	20,702
Butte	2,701	67,814	525	1,333	7,589	1,043	81,005	58,639	139,644	139,644
Calaveras		7,152	744	1,898			9,794	2,525	12,319	12,319
Colusa		65,112			595		65,707	27,596	93,303	93,303
Contra Costa	50,441	162,549	4,444	33,521	430		251,385	27,392	278,777	1,739,237
Del Norte		24,179					24,179	7,906	32,085	32,085
El Dorado		23,892		3,752		1,446	29,090	9,825	38,915	152,366
Fresno	14,629	50,530	12,320	39,501	36,630		153,610	4,632	158,242	2,044,333
Glenn		5,167		26,368		126	31,661	21,144	52,805	52,805
Humboldt		48,001					48,001	25,869	73,870	73,870
Imperial		8,471				332	8,803	6,084	14,887	435,360
Inyo		23,847		175		600	24,622	11,231	35,853	35,853
Kern	46,392	118,248	8,213	72,650			245,503	60,076	305,579	2,158,350
Kings		54,768	6,733	175	2,715		64,391	19,030	83,421	275,652
Lake		61,503			920		62,423	9,071	71,494	71,494
Lassen		1,976		692	847	103	3,618	5,032	8,650	8,650
Los Angeles	152,490	1,117,829	207,187	89,694	732,088		2,299,288	326,638	2,625,926	32,485,038
Madera		70,681		21,359			92,040	45,507	137,547	494,559
Marin		35,830		3,978			39,808	15,086	54,894	482,482
Mariposa	282	8,553		452			9,287	12,571	21,858	21,858
Mendocino	17,600	34,564	40		2,474		54,678	64,868	119,546	250,759
Merced	13,254	64,420	1,187	15,120	5,520		99,501	107,307	206,808	797,133
Modoc	462	157	4,725				5,344	335	5,679	5,679
Mono		170		895	1,217		2,282	3,738	6,020	32,786
Monterey	30,299	95,553	23,607	60,154	1,400		211,013	43,785	254,798	868,044
Napa		143,869		92			143,961	26,305	170,266	478,147
Nevada		17,163		467	938	1,558	20,126	3,060	23,186	23,186
Orange	35,090	822,629	56,210	125,906	152,765		1,192,600	31,231	1,223,831	8,354,130
Placer	19,501	69,390	938	24,501	27,163	132	141,625	79,406	221,031	348,540
Plumas	1,690	706			313		2,709	6,897	9,606	9,606
Riverside	20,912	211,837	10,578	14,626	152,516	115	410,584	99,862	510,445	3,130,683
Sacramento	113,954	238,955	28,289	30,692	11,710		423,600	117,158	540,758	3,335,063
San Benito		93,076		1,044			94,120		94,120	94,120
San Bernardino	17,874	183,290	26,932	11,989			240,085	34,231	274,316	4,211,371
San Diego	85,600	213,253	37,742	133,399		1,992	471,986	77,328	549,314	5,678,984
San Francisco	50,022	182,078	40,080	64,056	33,714		369,950	31,869	401,819	1,925,350
San Joaquin	39,541	228,422	20,788	40,325			329,076	74,063	403,139	1,184,976
San Luis Obispo	3,960	31,458	1,231		8,450		45,099	11,847	56,946	417,712
San Mateo	24,302	122,116	18,422	62,135	7,112		234,087	35,145	269,232	1,602,627
Santa Barbara	32,898	204,463	24,869	530	8,427	311	271,498	54,569	326,067	1,287,804
Santa Clara	15,973	166,337	54,205	86,830	84,000		407,345	59,478	466,823	3,815,267
Santa Cruz	7,212	5,346	2,503	-	4,140		19,201	13,803	33,004	834,582
Shasta	41,236	35,787	847	11,633	10,897		100,400	122,424	222,824	222,824
Sierra		42				689	731		731	731
Siskiyou	220	38,247		875		2,025	41,367	19,045	60,412	60,412
Solano	11,850	123,360	5,507	57,339	20,369		218,425	23,522	241,947	350,787
Sonoma	19,789	70,558	13,011	4,656	24,953	29	132,996	26,867	159,863	1,218,609
Stanislaus	31,544	188,269	8,329	23,914	14,006		266,062	93,680	359,742	655,275
Sutter	7,051	9,779	3,854	21,741	3,231		45,656	31,329	76,985	192,906
Tehama	1,129	6,188	147	350	313		8,127	7,730	15,857	258,574
Trinity		6,072	92	92			6,256	10,140	16,396	16,396
Tulare	20,971	446,138	6,626	29,800	46,489		550,024	112,918	662,942	1,393,031
Tuolumne		12,064		92			12,156	3,093	15,249	15,249
Ventura	24,699	657,525	19,120	31,162			732,506	72,420	804,926	1,608,898
Yolo	28,581	226,924	34,081	8,188	4,606		302,380	116,740	419,120	544,173
Yuba	5,076	16,649	157		783	884	23,549	12,901	36,450	36,450
TOTAL	1,068,462	7,120,081	745,004	1,233,769	1,489,873	13,229	11,670,418	2,418,798	14,089,215	90,028,734

Reimbursement of Courts

FY 2013-2014 Court Interpreter-Related Expenditures Using TCTF Program 45.45 (Court Interpreter) Appropriation

Court	Newly Eligible Expenditures				Total Newly Eligible Expenditures	Total
	Domestic Violence	Family Law with Domestic Violence Issues	Elder/ Dependent Adult Physical Abuse (non- financial)	Civil Cases with Indigent Parties		
	S	T	U	V		
Alameda	37,090				37,090	3,974,706
Alpine					-	294
Amador					-	20,702
Butte		4,013			4,013	143,657
Calaveras					-	12,319
Colusa					-	93,303
Contra Costa		89,057			89,057	1,828,294
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	32,085
El Dorado	442	5,164			5,606	157,972
Fresno		15,928			15,928	2,060,261
Glenn					-	52,805
Humboldt	1,870	3,508		456	5,834	79,704
Imperial	21,136				21,136	456,496
Inyo	6,290	8,573			14,863	50,716
Kern	28,316				28,316	2,186,666
Kings					-	275,652
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	71,494
Lassen					-	8,650
Los Angeles	464,490	498,792	5,682	33,244	1,002,208	33,487,246
Madera	37,306				37,306	531,865
Marin	7,633	1,604			9,237	491,719
Mariposa					-	21,858
Mendocino					-	250,759
Merced	4,511				4,511	801,644
Modoc	70				70	5,749
Mono					-	32,786
Monterey	24,207				24,207	892,251
Napa	6,757	6,238			12,995	491,142
Nevada	422				422	23,608
Orange	100,104				100,104	8,454,234
Placer		15,533			15,533	364,073
Plumas					-	9,606
Riverside	137,293	73,927			211,220	3,341,903
Sacramento	85,846				85,846	3,420,909
San Benito					-	94,120
San Bernardino	49,324	119,831	3,376		172,531	4,383,902
San Diego		24,077			24,077	5,703,061
San Francisco	51,287				51,287	1,976,637
San Joaquin		1,007			1,007	1,185,983
San Luis Obispo					-	417,712
San Mateo	5,663	7,760			13,423	1,616,050
Santa Barbara	3,122	10,998			14,120	1,301,924
Santa Clara	207,057				207,057	4,022,324
Santa Cruz					-	834,582
Shasta	3,904	19,978			23,882	246,706
Sierra		2,190			2,190	2,921
Siskiyou					-	60,412
Solano		10,240			10,240	361,027
Sonoma		24,306			24,306	1,242,915
Stanislaus	36,034	50			36,084	691,359
Sutter	8,324	12,524			20,848	213,754
Tehama					-	258,574
Trinity					-	16,396
Tulare		36,610	459	50,750	87,819	1,480,850
Tuolumne		645			645	15,894
Ventura	22,078				22,078	1,630,976
Yolo	1,883				1,883	546,056
Yuba	342	1,516		1,709	3,567	40,017
TOTAL	1,352,801	994,069	9,517	86,159	2,442,546	92,471,280