

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

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

December 2002

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	4
A. Legal Mandates	4
B. Court Interpreters Program	4
II. Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	6
A. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	6
B. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters by County and Category	7
C. Statewide Expenditures On and Use of Contract Interpreters	9
III. Availability of Certified and Registered Interpreters	15
IV. Recommendations to Increase the Numbers of Certified and Registered Interpreters	16
V. Conclusion	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provision 4, item 0450-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2001 (Stats. 2001, ch. 106) provides that the Judicial Council shall report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Legislature's fiscal committees regarding:

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

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

1. Analysis of Expenditures

Interpreter coordinators. Of the \$62 million appropriation in expenditures for the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2001–2002, \$4.7 million was spent on trial court staff who work as interpreter coordinators and staff interpreters. This represents a \$200,000 increase from fiscal year 2000–2001. The trial courts reported 60.92 authorized, funded interpreter coordinator positions and 34.4 authorized funded staff interpreter positions for fiscal year 2002–2003. The Schedule 7A data presented in table 3 details the court-reported allotment of staff in positions related to interpretation in the court.

Certified interpreters and registered interpreters. In order to provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by category of interpreter, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC collected detailed information for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 from 34 of the 58 trial courts in California, representing large, urban trial courts and small, rural trial courts as well as Northern, Central, and Southern California trial courts. These 34 courts accounted for 73 percent of the total program expenditures in fiscal year 2001–2002, and 68 percent of total expenditures in all programs by courts during this same period.

The 2002 Legislative Report differs from the 2001 report in that it only contains expenditure data on contract, per diem interpreters categorized by language and certification status from the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. This report also contains the most recent *full* year expenditure data from Quarterly Financial Statements (QFS) for fiscal year 2001–2002 on *all* facets of court interpretations: court interpreter staff (including staff interpreters) as well as travel and other

operating expenses. Therefore, the first quarter of expenditures for fiscal year 2002–2003 by language and certification status detailed in Table 6 and in the Appendix should not be compared to the discussion of the full QFS data for fiscal year 2001–2002 as detailed in Table 5.

Interpreters who are not registered or certified, including provisionally qualified interpreters. Approximately 13 percent of expenditures were on noncertified or nonregistered interpreters. Specific use of noncertified and nonregistered interpreters varied widely, however, depending on the language and location studied.

2. Analysis of Availability and Numbers of Interpreters

Although 87 percent of expenditures were on certified and registered interpreters, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely in the state. Specific language needs also vary widely, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages. In addition, some courts are reporting that proceedings are sometimes delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Considering that California continues to attract large numbers of new immigrants, the courts will likely experience a steady increase in both the need for interpreter services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

3. Recommendations for Increasing Numbers to Meet Demand

In order to address the chronic shortage of qualified interpreters, the AOC staff launched a recruitment campaign in July 2002. The campaign, “One Law, Many Languages,” was coordinated by New California Media, an editorial and marketing association of more than 400 ethnic news organizations run by the non-profit Pacific News Service. This marked the first time that the AOC partnered with ethnic media organizations to release both advertisements and editorial messages to reach audiences most impacted by the state’s shortage of interpreters.

The campaign involved multi-lingual ad placements, media briefings in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Fresno; Public Service Announcements translated into Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese that were aired on various television and radio stations throughout the state; and postcards that were mailed to hundreds of community-based ethnic and cultural groups, language schools, and ethnic and specialty bar associations. The campaign resulted in a tenfold increase of hits to the AOC’s Court Interpreters Program Web site.

In addition, the AOC staff continued the following recruitment activities in fiscal year 2001–2002:

- Offered preparation and assessment workshops to prepare Spanish oral exam applicants;

- Offered a mentoring program for Spanish oral exam candidates from counties that have little or no access to certified court interpreters;
- Renewed the Incremental Rate Program, which provides a financial incentive for working noncertified interpreters to gain the skills necessary for certification;
- Sponsored a statewide conference for court interpreter coordinators to share information and to resolve common issues;
- Participated in a task force of educators in the interpreting field to discuss recruitment strategies and training models;
- Participated in a task force of state agencies on recruiting high school students for public sector jobs; 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.”¹ In addition, the court must provide an interpreter for any witness who is unable to understand, or express him- or herself in English well enough to be “understood directly by counsel, court and jury.”²

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

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

B. Court Interpreters Program

Pursuant to Government Code section 68561(a), the council has “designated” 8 languages for which certification exams are administered—Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. In 2000, the council designated an additional 5 languages for certification—Armenian, Khmer, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Russian. Certification examinations for these newly designated languages are currently under development. Until the abovementioned exams are complete, the courts are using registered interpreters in these languages whenever possible.

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

¹ Cal. Const., art. I, §14.

² Evid. Code, § 752.

³ Stats. 1992, ch. 770; Sen. Bill 1304.

⁴ Cal. Rules of Court, rule 984.4.

written and oral components) and attending a Judicial Council Code of Ethics and orientation workshop. To maintain certification or registration, an interpreter must submit proof of 30 hours of continuing education and 40 law-related professional assignments biannually.

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 1,163 certified interpreters in the eight designated languages. An additional 335 interpreters are registered in one or more of the nondesignated languages, for a total of 1,498 certified and registered interpreters.

Arabic	9
Cantonese	23
Japanese	8
Korean	45
Portuguese	4
Spanish	1,030
Tagalog	5
Vietnamese	39
Total	1,163

Source: Court Interpreters Program, AOC, October 2002

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

- *Certified interpreter*: An interpreter who has passed the certification exam in one of the eight *designated* languages, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biannual continuing education and professional requirements.
- *Registered interpreter*: An interpreter who has passed an English fluency exam, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biannual continuing education and professional requirements. A registered interpreter may interpret in any of the nondesignated languages, as well as in any of the five newly designated languages until certification exams are created.
- *Noncertified interpreter*: An interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the designated languages but has not successfully met certification requirements.
- *Nonregistered interpreter*: An interpreter who interprets in the courts in one of the nondesignated or newly designated languages but has not successfully met registration requirements.
- *Provisionally qualified interpreter*⁵: An interpreter who interprets in the courts in any language who has passed the written exam, taken the Judicial Council Code of Ethics

⁵ Any noncertified or nonregistered interpreter interpreting on the record in a criminal or juvenile proceeding must be provisionally qualified under California Rule of Court, Rule 984.2. However, in 1999 the Judicial Council created a program to provide a financial incentive for noncertified or nonregistered interpreters to obtain certification. Under this program, an interpreter who submitted proof of the following is eligible for an additional \$13/per half-day or \$25/per full day rate increase for two years. The criteria are as follows: the interpreter must pass the written exam and attend a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop. In addition, the interpreter must take the oral exam within 24 months of provisional qualification to retain the additional rate. Out of 25 participants in the program, 12 have

workshop has been provisionally qualified under California Rule of Court 984.2 and has applied for and been accepted in the incremental rate program.

II. EXPENDITURES ON AND USE OF INTERPRETERS

A. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters

In fiscal year 2001–2002, the trial courts spent \$62 million on interpreting services, approximately 3 percent of their total expenditures of \$1.9 billion. As shown in Table 2, over 90 percent of expenditures on interpreting in the trial courts—almost \$56 million—were spent on per-diem interpreters who work as contractors for the courts on a daily basis. The second largest line item in the interpreters budget—\$4.7 million—was spent on trial court staff who work as interpreters, on interpreter coordinators, and in other areas of court operations in support of interpreter programs. “Transportation and travel” and “Other expenditures” make up the remaining \$1.2 million spent by the trial courts on interpreting in fiscal year 2001–2002.

The amount spent on interpretations in the courts was approximately \$6.4 million higher than in 2000–2001 as shown in Table 2. This increase was due to an increase in the appropriation from the Legislature to help cover the increase in expenditures from fiscal year 1999–2000 to fiscal year 2001–2002. Expenditures in excess of appropriation in the amount of \$200,000 were covered by the trial courts from their individual operating funds, each in proportion to its expenditures.

Line	A	B	C	D	E
Item	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	
1	Salaries and Benefits	3,907,057	4,190,537	4,447,947	4,690,928
2	Transportation and Travel	724,833	662,401	955,517	1,144,919
3	Per Diem Contracts and Agency Contracts	39,248,489	46,636,671	51,667,001	55,729,560
4	Total Program Expenditures	43,880,379	51,489,609	57,070,465	61,565,407
5					0.079
6	Non-Allowable Coordinator Expenses	(1,008,242)	(1,059,263)	(1,345,106)	(1,971,937)
7	LA Translation Expenses	(730,599)	(718,355)	(962,036)	
8	Total Allowable Expenses (incl. Non-TCTF)	42,141,538	49,711,991	54,763,323	59,593,470
9					0.088
10	Rate-Increase Appropriation	(1,704,000)	(3,408,000)	(3,408,000)	
11	Rate-Increase Appropriation		(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	
12	Rate-Increase Appropriation			(3,000,000)	
13	Rate Adjusted 'Allowable Expenditures'	40,437,538	43,803,991	45,855,323	
14	YTY Percent Increase, Non-Rate Related		8.33%	4.68%	
15					
16					
17	Appropriation Amount (may include BR's)	44,686,618	49,646,991	54,471,643	57,348,000
18	LA Translation Funds	(762,410)	(762,410)	(762,410)	-
19	Final Adjusted Allocation Amount	43,924,208	48,884,581	53,709,233	57,348,000
20					
21	Final Adjusted Allocation Amount	43,924,208	48,884,581	53,709,233	57,348,000
22	Total Allowable Expenses (incl. Non-TCTF)	42,141,538	49,711,991	54,763,323	59,593,470
23	Surplus/(Shortfall)	1,782,670	(827,410)	(1,054,090)	(2,245,470)

obtained certification or registration since its inception. For the purposes of this study, provisionally qualified interpreter expenditures are included in the discussion of expenditures on noncertified, nonregistered interpreters.

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

1. *Trial Court Staff*

Each trial court provides an annual report to the AOC listing the number of authorized, funded positions, by position title and program budget area. This report is called *Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplements to the Annual Budget*. In June 2002, the trial courts reported over 95 full-time equivalent (FTE) authorized and funded staff positions in the Court Interpreters Program for fiscal year 2002–2003.

Not all the courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, only about two-thirds of the superior courts—39 of 58—reported authorized, funded staff in the court interpreters program for fiscal year 2002–2003. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the court interpreters reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state. Most courts have historically relied primarily on contract interpreters, while a few have interpreters and interpreter coordinators as court employees. Many courts use court personnel, such as courtroom clerks who assist in coordinating interpreter services in addition to their other duties, but these positions are not listed in Schedule 7A. However, this is likely to change pursuant to Senate Bill 371 (Gov. Code §§71800–71829, Stats. 2002, ch. 1047 [Escutia]), which provides for employment status for court interpreters. SB 371 requires that the courts give assignments to employees before using independent contractors or noncertified, nonregistered interpreters.

Table 3: Fiscal Year 2002-2003 Authorized, Funded FTE Staff in Court Interpreters Program⁶

	<i>Staff Interpreters</i>	<i>Interpreter Coordinators (1)</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff FY 02-03</i>	<i>Total Interpreter Staff 00-01</i>	<i>Change 00-01 to 02-03</i>
Alameda	0	3	3	3	0
Butte	0	0.75	0.75	1.4	-0.65
Calaveras	0	0.1	0.1	0.25	-0.15
Colusa	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0
Contra Costa	0	2.25	2.25	2.25	0
El Dorado	0	0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.3
Fresno	5	7.62	12.62	9.8	2.82
Glenn	0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
Humboldt	0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0
Imperial	3	0.25	3.25	3.25	0
Kern	2	1	3	3	0
Los Angeles	0	14	14	17	-3
Marin	0	1	1	1	0
Mendocino	0	0	0	1	-1
Merced	0	1	1	0.5	0.5
Monterey	0.25	1	1.25	2	-0.75
Napa	0	1	1	1	0
Nevada	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0
Orange	1	2.25	3.25	5.25	-2
Riverside	1	0	1	1	0
Sacramento	2	2	4	4	0
San Benito	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.1
San Bernardino	0	0	0	0.25	-0.25
San Diego	6.9	4.5	11.4	7.4	4
San Francisco	0	1	1	1	0
San Joaquin	0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
San Mateo	0	2	2	2	0
Santa Barbara	5	0.5	5.5	5.5	0
Santa Clara	0	5	5	4	1
Santa Cruz	0	1	1	1	0
Shasta	0	0.75	0.75	0.25	0.5
Siskiyou	0	0.25	0.25	0.5	-0.25
Solano	1	1	2	2	0
Sonoma	0	2	2	1	1
Stanislaus	1	1.5	2.5	2	0.5
Sutter	0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
Tehama	0.25	0	0.25	1	-0.75
Trinity	0	0.05	0.05	0.05	0
Tuolumne	0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0
Ventura	6	0	6	6	0
Yolo	0	1	1	1	0
Yuba	0	0.75	0.75	0.75	0
Statewide	34.4	60.92	95.32	94	1.32

Source: Schedule 7A, FY2002-2003

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

⁶The AOC only allows _____ interpreter coordinators to be funded from Court Interpreter Program funds.

2. Contract Interpreters

The Judicial Council established statewide standards for interpreter pay and authorized increases in the amounts paid for full-day and half-day interpretations effective January 1, 1999. Two additional increases were authorized and made effective on July 1, 1999, and July 1, 2000.⁶ Table 4 shows the changes in payment over time. Certified and registered interpreters are currently paid 32.5 percent more for a full-day interpretation than they were when the Judicial Council first established statewide standards for interpreter pay in January 1999. At the same time, the Judicial Council lowered the rates paid to noncertified and nonregistered interpreters to provide a financial incentive for new and existing court interpreters to become certified or registered. Despite these increases in rates for certified and registered interpreters, compensation for interpreters in the state trial courts still lags behind that for federally certified interpreters who are paid \$305 for a full day. The Judicial Council sought, but did not receive, funding for further rate increases in fiscal year 2001–2002 and will continue to strive to ensure that California rates are set competitively with the federal rates.

	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

C. Statewide Expenditures on and Use of Contract Interpreters

All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements to the AOC. The QFS for the courts in this study for fiscal year 2001–2002 are reported in table 5. These data are reported in broad categories that include expenditures on personnel (court staff who administer the court interpreter programs as well as court staff employed as interpreters), expenditures on contract, per diem interpreters, and expenditures on travel for contract per-diem interpreters. Another source of statewide data on interpreters is the *Salary and Position Worksheet* compiled by the AOC and reported on Schedule 7A, in which all trial courts report the salaries and job titles of authorized, funded staff, 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.

⁶ Prior to 1999, rates for interpreting varied among different courts.

Table 5: Total Expenditures on Interpreters by Court, Fiscal Year 2001–2002				
	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Total Court Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Superior Court of Butte County	\$ 8,874,676	\$ 185,771	2.09%	0.30%
Superior Court of Colusa County	1,320,752	82,306	6.23%	0.13%
Superior Court of Del Norte County	2,349,202	29,332	1.25%	0.05%
Superior Court of El Dorado County	8,380,630	78,787	0.94%	0.13%
Superior Court of Fresno County	43,029,242	1,493,550	3.47%	2.41%
Superior Court of Glenn County	1,720,016	95,113	5.53%	0.15%
Superior Court of Inyo County	1,812,306	24,470	1.35%	0.04%
Superior Court of Kings County	6,603,028	247,126	3.74%	0.40%
Superior Court of Lake County	3,234,679	93,753	2.90%	0.15%
Superior Court of Los Angeles County	612,519,624	26,691,186	4.36%	42.99%
Superior Court of Merced County	9,073,010	505,754	5.57%	0.81%
Superior Court of Monterey County	17,225,137	558,663	3.24%	0.90%
Superior Court of Napa County	10,540,544	321,761	3.05%	0.52%
Superior Court of Nevada County	6,142,912	57,393	0.93%	0.09%
Superior Court of Placer County	11,783,919	240,437	2.04%	0.39%
Superior Court of Riverside County	79,054,888	1,954,783	2.47%	3.15%
Superior Court of Sacramento County	74,189,380	1,707,780	2.30%	2.75%
Superior Court of San Benito County	1,848,108	52,003	2.81%	0.08%
Superior Court of San Diego County	154,160,744	3,345,767	2.17%	5.39%
Superior Court of San Francisco County	81,810,174	1,543,961	1.89%	2.49%
Superior Court of San Joaquin County	26,218,901	778,923	2.97%	1.25%
Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County	15,035,662	183,618	1.22%	0.30%
Superior Court of San Mateo County	38,117,865	968,066	2.54%	1.56%
Superior Court of Shasta County	11,048,016	85,492	0.77%	0.14%
Superior Court of Sierra County	633,961	1,436	0.23%	0.00%
Superior Court of Siskiyou County	4,925,914	60,159	1.22%	0.10%
Superior Court of Solano County	22,542,553	279,815	1.24%	0.45%
Superior Court of Sonoma County	23,900,400	772,796	3.23%	1.24%
Superior Court of Stanislaus County	20,023,116	494,291	2.47%	0.80%
Superior Court of Sutter County	3,529,986	123,102	3.49%	0.20%
Superior Court of Tehama County	3,235,163	137,372	4.25%	0.22%
Superior Court of Tulare County	16,055,335	652,965	4.07%	1.05%
Superior Court of Ventura County	37,299,500	919,049	2.46%	1.48%
Superior Court of Yolo County	9,020,969	347,816	3.86%	0.56%
Superior Court of Yuba County	4,229,049	53,634	1.27%	0.09%
34 Surveyed Courts	\$1,371,489,361	\$45,168,230	3.29%	72.75%
Rest of the State	\$625,885,047	\$16,919,348	2.70%	27.25%
State Wide Consolidated	\$1,997,374,408	\$59,593,470	3.11%	100.00%
Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2001–2002				

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 the judicial branch internal Web site. As of November 1, 2002, 51 of the 58 trial courts had input data into the system.

CIDCS was created to supplement expenditure data on the use of interpreters, for this report and for 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—estimates of certified and registered expenditures are separated from 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, case type, and proceeding type.

In order to provide a detailed analysis of expenditures by language and certification status of interpreter for fiscal year 2001–2002, staff from the Research and Planning Unit of the AOC collected detailed information from 34 courts representing large, urban courts and small, rural courts as well as Northern, Central, and Southern California courts. As table 5 illustrates, these 34 courts comprised more than 72 percent of the \$62 million total court interpreting expenditures in California, and 68 percent of the approximately \$1.9 billion total expenditures by the state’s trial courts, in fiscal year 2001–2002.

The principal source of data for these 34 case studies was the Interpreter Coordinator (or the court staff person charged with interpreter duties). Data was collected on full- and half-day interpretation sessions by certification status and language; these 34 courts reported that 91 languages were used during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Some superior courts were able to provide this information using the Court Interpreter Data Collection System, while others submitted a manual report directly to Research and Planning.

The appendix to this report provides a discussion of interpreter use in these 34 courts, along with tables showing each court’s use of contract, per diem interpreters by language and certification status. The 34 case studies provide a detailed picture of expenditures on interpreters. Following are some of the principal findings from the 34 courts in the sample.

D. Summary of Findings from the 34 Sample Courts

- *Interpreter needs in the state courts are dominated by Spanish:* Of the \$8.2 million in interpreting expenditures in the 34 sample courts during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, 84 percent went to Spanish language interpretation.

- *Interpreter needs are also dominated by the largest court in the state, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County:* In the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County generated 43 percent of all the statewide expenditures for interpreters. The influence of Los Angeles is evident in examining the frequency of Korean and Armenian interpreting in the courts. Neither Korean nor Armenian interpreting was a significant expense in the smaller courts in our sample. The need for Korean and Armenian interpreting in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, where they represent the second and third most frequently used languages, makes these two languages the second and third largest expenses, respectively, after Spanish in our sample (see Table 6).

- *Different courts have different interpreter needs:* As the example from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County indicates, statewide trends may not reflect interpreter needs in individual courts. The expenditure data examined for this report indicate the following:
 - *South Asian and Southeast Asian languages are increasingly important:* In many of the courts, including many of the smaller courts such as the Superior Courts of Shasta and Siskiyou Counties, South Asian and Southeast Asian languages have become extremely important. In both the Superior Court of Shasta County and the Superior Court of Siskiyou Counties, languages from Southern and Southeast Asia accounted for approximately half of expenditures on interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. In the Superior Court of San Mateo County, Mandarin, Tongan, and Shangzhai, are only a few of the fourteen different South Asian and Southeast Asian languages used in the court. These languages represent close to 25 percent of the expenditures on interpretation in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. In the Superior Court of Butte County, the Hmong language alone represents 22 percent of total expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

 - *The availability of certified and registered interpreters varies across courts:* Although the vast majority of interpreting needs statewide are met with certified and registered interpreters where available, within individual courts the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies considerably. For instance, whereas 97 percent of all interpreting in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is performed by certified and registered interpreters, in the Superior Court of Merced County only 31 percent of all interpreting is performed by certified and registered interpreters.

 - *The influence of the size of the court upon the availability of certified and registered interpreters is not clear:* At first glance, it would appear that large courts have the advantage of being able to draw from a larger pool of certified and registered interpreters. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County, for example, is able to meet 100 percent of its needs for interpreting

in Cantonese, Arabic, and Japanese with certified interpreters. Upon closer examination, however, it appears that smaller courts have found certified and registered interpreters to meet their needs in certain languages. In the Superior Court of Placer County, 100 percent of interpreting in Vietnamese and Tagalog is performed by certified interpreters, while in the Superior Court of Butte County, 100 percent of interpreting in Mien and Hmong is performed by registered interpreters. In the Superior Court of Yolo County, registered interpreters perform 100 percent of Russian interpreting.

- o *Different Interpretation Needs across Courts Can Also Be Seen in the Diversity of the Languages with the Highest Expenditures:* Although expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters were highest for all courts in Spanish, no two courts had the same languages as their second highest expenditures. The second highest expenditures by language were different in all of the 34 courts. Punjabi and Hmong had 4 courts reporting one or the other as their second highest expenditure. Tagalog, Vietnamese, and Cambodian each had three courts reporting one of them as the second highest expenditure. Fourteen percent (7 courts) of the courts had only Spanish language expenditures for interpretations in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.
- *Expenditure Data Do Not Capture Important Aspects of Interpreter Use in the Courts:* Interviews with interpreter coordinators in the courts indicate that there is important information that is not captured by examining expenditures on interpreters sorted by language and certification status of the interpreter. Perhaps most important, expenditure data do not capture the numbers of delayed proceedings caused by the unavailability of a certified or registered interpreter. The manager of interpreter services for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County estimates that more than 40 proceedings are continued every day because of the unavailability of a certified or registered interpreter.⁷ The recently launched CIDCS is designed to capture this information.
- *The Interpretation Needs of the Trial Courts are Extremely Diverse:* For the 34 courts in our sample, contract, per diem interpreters were used for over 64 languages during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003: literally from A to Z (Albanian to Zapoteco).

7

⁷ Personal communication, Gregory Drapac, Manager of Interpreter Services, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, September 13, 2002.

Table 6: Expenditures on Contract, Per-Diem Interpreters							Language as a % of interpreter expenditures
by Language and Certification Status of Interpreter, FY 2002-2003 Q1 ⁽¹⁾							
	Designated Languages		Nondesignated Languages		Language Total	% Certified, Registered	
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered			
Spanish	5,710,098	678,892			6,876,515	83%	83.9%
Korean	199,455	17,783			217,238	92%	2.7%
Vietnamese	173,860	38,202			212,062	82%	2.6%
Cantonese/Mandarin	167,050	19,891			186,353	90%	2.3%
Tagalog	47,392	22,384			136,331	35%	1.7%
Arabic	36,940	9,866			46,806	79%	0.6%
Japanese	21,555	13,315			34,870	62%	0.4%
Portuguese	7,226	12,203			19,263	38%	0.2%
Japanese/Korean	4,917	0			4,917	100%	0.1%
Armenian (10)			193,873	8,194	202,067	96%	2.5%
Hmong			114,004	38,664	152,668	75%	1.9%
Russian			100,757	5,692	106,449	95%	1.3%
Cambodian			79,895	30,497	110,392	72%	1.3%
Farsi (11)			57,187	8,177	65,364	87%	0.8%
Asian Indian Languages (2)			43,747	45,275	89,022	49%	1.1%
Mien			41,319	12,564	53,883	77%	0.7%
Eastern, Southern European (4)			27,225	7,717	34,942	78%	0.4%
Other Western European (8)			24,853	6,279	31,132	80%	0.4%
Middle East (7)			22,465	2,374	24,839	90%	0.3%
Laotian			22,352	28,098	50,450	44%	0.6%
Tongan			5,178	7,723	12,901	40%	0.2%
African Languages (6)			4,081	6,629	10,710	38%	0.1%
South Asian, Pacific Island (3)			2,619	5,697	8,316	31%	0.1%
Meso-American (5)			2,058	13,185	15,243	14%	0.2%
Thai			2,322	36,107	38,429	6%	0.5%
Samoan			1,265	2,733	3,998	32%	0.0%
All Other Languages (9)			0	700	700	0%	0.0%
Total	6,368,493	812,536	745,199	266,305	8,192,533	87%	100.0%

(1) Includes data from San Francisco for July 2002 only. The rest of the submissions are for July to September 2002.

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

(3) Excludes Bengali, Hindi, Hmong, Lao, Mien, Punjabi, Tagalog, Thai, Urdu, Samoan, Tongan and Vietnamese. Includes Burmese, Fijian, Ilocano, Indonesian, Shangzhai, Malayam, Hugar, Taiwanese, and Mongolian.

(4) Excludes Armenian and Russian. Includes Albanian, Serbian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish and Romanian.

(5) Includes Mixteco, Trique, Q'anjo'bal, Tzotzil, and Zapoteco

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

(7) Includes Assyrian, Turkish, Kurdish, Chaldean, "Hebrew/Russian" and Hebrew.

(8) Includes Dutch, French, Italian, Greek, Danish, Swedish and German

(9) Includes non-contiguous language combinations such as Navajo, San Carlos Navajo.

(10) Armenian includes Armenian, "Armenian/Russian" and "Armenian/Farsi/Russian"

(11) Farsi includes Farsi, "Hebrew/Farsi" and "Farsi/Dari/Pashto"

III. AVAILABILITY OF CERTIFIED AND REGISTERED INTERPRETERS

The proportion of California's population that is foreign born—26 percent—is higher than any other state.⁸ California is also the most linguistically diverse state, with 224 languages and innumerable dialects spoken here.⁷ According to the 2000 U.S. Census,⁹ 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 reported that 20 percent of the state's population (6,277,779) reported that they did not speak English well and 3.5 percent, or 1.11 million, of California's 31.4 million residents over the age of 5 were linguistically isolated or speak no English at all.

California's legal immigration statistics show an increasing rate of growth in ethnic groups less likely to speak English as a first language. According to statistics released by the California Department of Finance,¹⁰ yearly legal immigration to the state averages over 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 less likely to have English as their first language.¹¹

Although there are more than 1,400 certified court and registered interpreters in California, the state's trial courts are facing a critical shortage of qualified interpreters. For fiscal year 2002–2003 the AOC projects that workload for the court interpreter program will increase by 7 percent. As already discussed, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely among courts. The needs for specific languages also vary widely among courts, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages. In all of the courts sampled, the availability of interpreters in languages other than Spanish varies. In addition, some courts are reporting that proceedings are being delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. Overall, it is clear that California will experience a steady increase in both the need for court interpreting services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

⁸ Public Policy Institute of California, *Just the Facts: Immigration in California*, July 2002.

⁸

⁷ United States Census, *Language Use and English Ability, Persons Five Years of Age and Older, by State (2000)*.

⁹

¹⁰

¹¹

⁹ United States Census, Language Use and English Ability, Persons Five Years of Age and Older, by State (2000).

¹⁰ California State Department of Finance, *Legal Immigration to California by County, 1990–2000*.

¹¹ California State Department of Finance, *Race-Ethnic Population Estimates: Components of Change in California Counties, April 1990–July 1999*.

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

In 1998 the council became responsible for setting payment rates and other compensation policies for court interpreters. A multi-pronged strategy, in addition to the recruitment activities described on page 3, 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); and
- Working with local trial courts by:
 - Ensuring that courts explore all possible avenues in seeking certified interpreters,
 - Providing registers of certified court and registered interpreters available throughout California,
 - Assisting courts in locating certified court and registered interpreters, and
 - Ensuring that funding allocated for certified interpreters is used only for that purpose.

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

V. CONCLUSION

As Table 6 shows, the vast majority of all interpreter services in the trial courts are performed by certified or registered interpreters. Eighty-seven percent of expenditures on interpreters in all languages in our sample of 34 courts went to certified and registered interpreters; in designated languages, the figure is still higher, with 79 percent of expenditures for interpretation going to certified interpreters for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Statewide data showing high percentages of expenditures going to certified and registered interpreters, however, can mask local shortages of interpreters in specific languages. Although local shortages represent a small percentage of total expenditures statewide on interpretation, they present serious challenges to the courts in providing access to non-English speakers. Moreover, the current use of interpreters is limited to constitutionally and legally mandated interpreter services in criminal matters. It is unclear how interpreter needs are being met in other important areas of court operations such as civil and family law. The council is committed to seeking expanded funding to ensure that non-English speakers have equal access to the courts and an equal ability to participate in court proceedings.

Appendix A
Tables of Expenditures for Interpreter Services in 34 Sample Courts
Fiscal Year 2002–2003

In order to provide a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Research and Planning Unit collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the superior courts of 34 counties: Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Inyo, Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Benito, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba.¹

The principal source of data was an Excel spreadsheet distributed to the interpreter coordinators in June 2002 containing a detailed list of more than 90 languages. Interpreter coordinators entered the number of full and half days as well as the number and amount of “unusual” expenditures for certified, registered, noncertified, and nonregistered interpretations for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.² The numbers of full and half days were multiplied by the appropriate amount for the certification status: \$265/\$147 for certified and registered interpreter full and half days and \$175/\$92 for noncertified or nonregistered full and half days. The number of “unusual days” was then multiplied by the amount indicated by the interpreter coordinator. The sums of these expenses by language are presented in the following analysis.

Each of the following case studies begins with statewide data reported to the AOC to provide some points of comparison for each court: county population, filings data, and number of staff in the interpreter program. The case studies then report data collected specifically for this report through the Excel spreadsheet—expenditures by language and certification status of interpreter. The courts are organized by the amount of expenditures reported from largest to smallest.

It should be noted that the expenditure data collected for this report does not include American Sign Language interpretations. It should also be noted that the QFS data presented in this report is for fiscal year 2001–2002. Data for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 is not available at this time. Therefore, the expenditure data on contract, per diem interpreters reported by the courts for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 should not be compared to the QFS data as they do not cover the same fiscal years.

¹ Data for these counties was collected for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 with the exception of San Francisco where data was available only for July 2002.

² An “unusual” expenditure is any expenditure above and beyond the rate usually paid to the interpreter. This may include travel expenses, hotel accommodations, or a meal stipend.

(1) Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County is the most populous county in the state with 9,884,300 inhabitants, or 29 percent of California's population according to Department of Finance estimates for the year 2000. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is also the largest court in California. The court received 2,567,142 filings in 2000–2001,³ approximately 32 percent of all filings statewide.

The court uses interpreters in 640 courtrooms at 63 different court locations throughout the county. According to Schedule 7A data, the court employs 14 FTE staff as interpreter coordinators to manage its court interpreters program.

In the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the court used 566 contract interpreters for a total of \$5,740,309.⁴ Table A1 shows the expenditures for per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 by language and certification status. Because this data was taken directly from a database based on payment sheets submitted by interpreters, some of the categories of languages are unclear. For example, two nonregistered interpreters indicated that they interpret in “Mesoamerican”; another in “sub-Saharan African.” It is likely that these interpreters work in multiple languages.

Table A1 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; 358 certified interpreters and 28 noncertified interpreters of this language work in the courts, and expenditures for Spanish interpreting totaled more than \$4.7 million in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

Korean interpretations accounted for the second largest expenditure by language in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, \$197,700, in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. In that quarter, approximately 98 percent of all expenditures for Korean interpreting were for the services of certified interpreters.

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

³ Fiscal year 2000–2001 is the most recent complete year for which filing data is available.

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

nonregistered interpreters: Assyrian, Hmong, Creole, sub-Saharan African, Cebuano, Mesoamerican languages, Bengali, Burmese, Tamil, Amharic, Samoan, Singhalese, and Tongan. Yet the total expenditure for these 13 languages combined amounted to \$16,341, or less than one-half of 1 percent of total expenditures for contract per diem interpreters in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

(2) *Superior Court of San Diego County.* San Diego County is in the extreme southwestern corner of the state, bordered by Mexico to the south and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The Department of Finance estimates that the population of San Diego County in January 2000 was just under 3 million, at 2,911,500. The Superior Court of San Diego County received 654,671 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, just under 8 percent of total statewide filings.

The court reports 11.4 FTE staff working in its court interpreter program, 6.9 of whom are staff interpreters; the rest are interpreter coordinators.

Table A2 shows expenditures totaling \$788,982 for spoken-language contract interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County. As in Los Angeles County and the rest of the state, Spanish is the dominant language. Approximately \$691 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 \$22,108 (approximately 3 percent of the total) was spent in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

The percentage of total expenditures for contract interpreters paid to certified and registered interpreters in the Superior Court of San Diego County is slightly lower than that in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Approximately 93 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters in San Diego County went to certified and registered interpreters (compared with 97 percent in Los Angeles County).

When expenditures are broken down by language, 100 percent of Spanish interpretations were performed by certified interpreters. Among the designated languages, all expenditures for Tagalog, Cantonese, Japanese, and Arabic were for noncertified interpreters, with Tagalog having the largest expense. Expenditures for the other designated and newly designated languages were split between certified or registered interpreters and noncertified or nonregistered interpreters.

(3) Superior Court of Riverside County. Riverside County is a mix of suburban and rural populations and reaches from Orange County in the west to Nevada in the east. It borders three other counties. Riverside County was home to 1,545,387 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates, making it the sixth largest county in California. The Superior Court of Riverside County received 380,946 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately 5 percent of total filings. On Schedule 7A, the court reported 1 FTE staff interpreter. No other interpreter staff was reported.

As shown in Table A3, the total expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 was \$495,781. Spanish language interpretations accounted for approximately 92 percent of reported expenditures for interpretations, and certified interpreters performed approximately 93 percent of Spanish language interpretations. Of the other designated languages, only 3 percent of expenditures went to certified interpreters. The remaining 97 percent went to noncertified interpreters. All expenditures for nondesignated languages were paid to nonregistered interpreters.

(4) Superior Court of Fresno County. Fresno County lies in the middle of the Central Valley, stretching from the foothills of the Sierra Nevada on the east to Monterey County on the west. The Department of Finance estimates the population of Fresno in 2000 at 805,000, making it the 10th largest county in the state. In fiscal year 2000–2001, the Superior Court of Fresno County received 171,285 filings, a little more than 2 percent of all filings statewide.

On Schedule 7A, the court reports 12.62 FTE staff working in its court interpreters program. Five of these positions are identified as staff interpreters; another 7.62 FTEs are reported as interpreter coordinators.

Table A4 shows expenditures of \$351,526 for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. The data indicates that approximately 69 percent of these expenditures went to certified or registered interpreters. Interpreter needs for Spanish, Mien, Cambodian, Tagalog, Hmong, and Laotian are met by using a combination of certified or registered and noncertified or nonregistered interpreters. In Spanish, for example, 74 percent of expenditures for interpretations go to certified interpreters.

(5) Superior Court of Sacramento County. Sacramento County stretches from the Delta lowlands in the west to the Sierra Nevada foothills on the

east and borders eight other counties. According to Department of Finance estimates, Sacramento is the eighth largest county by population, with 1,209,500 inhabitants in 2000. The Superior Court of Sacramento County received 86,177 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately 1 percent of total statewide filings.⁵

On Schedule 7A, the court reports four authorized, funded FTE staff positions in the interpreter program: two interpreter coordinators and two staff interpreters.

As shown in Table A5, expenditures for contract per diem interpreters totaled \$349,351 in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Approximately 87 of the spoken-language interpreters used in Sacramento were certified or registered; of the Spanish interpreters, approximately 100 percent were certified (99.53). Spanish is the language interpreted most frequently, followed by Vietnamese, Russian, and Hmong. Almost 100 percent of expenditures for Spanish and 100 percent of expenditures for Russian interpreting went to certified or registered interpreters. Six of the next 10 most widely interpreted languages show a majority of expenditures going to certified and registered interpreters.

(6) Superior Court of San Mateo County. San Mateo County is bordered to the north by San Francisco County and to the south by Santa Clara County, and has a population of 707,161 according to 2000 Department of Finance estimates, making it the 13th largest county in the state. The Superior Court of San Mateo County received 147,337 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately 1.7 percent of total filings. As reported in Schedule 7A, San Mateo county had 2 FTE interpreter coordinators.

Expenditures for contract, per diem interpretations in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 totaled \$217,876 as shown in Table A6. Certified or registered interpreters perform approximately 87 percent of all interpretations in the Superior Court of San Mateo County. As shown in Table A6, 75 percent of the expenditures in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 were for Spanish, and of these 86 percent were for certified interpreters. Vietnamese was the second most interpreted language, with more than 98 percent of the interpretations performed by certified interpreters. Of the 14 nondesignated languages, 9 had expenditures on nonregistered interpreters. However, these expenditures accounted for 1.5 percent of the total amount spent on interpretations.

⁵ Filing data for Sacramento for fiscal year 1999–2000 was undercounted because of problems in the court’s case management system. The following discussion of contract, per diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

(7) Superior Court of Sonoma County. Sonoma County is bordered by Marin County to the south and Mendocino County to the north and is a blend of both suburban and rural populations. In 2000, according to the Department of Finance, Sonoma County had a population of 458,614, making it the 16th most populous county. The court received 92,293 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001. The Superior Court of Sonoma County had 2 FTE staff for court interpreters, both interpreter coordinators according to Schedule 7A.

The Superior Court of Sonoma County had expenditures totaling \$186,977 for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. As reported in Table A7, certified or registered interpreters performed more than 75 percent of all interpretations. Approximately 72 percent of the total reported expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, 81 percent of which were for certified interpreters. The next largest expense was Cantonese, of which 68 percent was spent on certified interpreters. The largest expenditure among the nondesignated languages was Cambodian, with all of the interpretation being performed by nonregistered interpreters.

(8) Superior Court of Ventura County. Ventura County was home to 753,197 people, according to Department of Finance estimates, making it the 12th largest county in the state. A verdant county, Ventura is bordered by Los Angeles County to the south and Santa Barbara to the north. In fiscal year 2000–2001, the Superior Court of Ventura County received 160,529 filings, approximately 2 percent of the state’s total. Schedule 7A shows 6 FTE for Ventura County, all staff interpreters. Expenditures for all interpretations, including staff interpreters, are shown in Table A8 and totaled \$172,243.

As with all of the courts in our study, in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, Spanish language interpretations accounted for most of the interpretations at approximately 92 percent. Of these, certified interpreters performed approximately 100 percent of the Spanish language interpretations, and certified or registered interpreters performed over 97 percent of all interpretations. The second highest expense was for Korean, with approximately 97 percent of the interpretations being performed by certified interpreters. Of the nondesignated languages, Mandarin was interpreted the most, with approximately 94 percent of the interpretations being performed by registered interpreters.

(9) *Superior Court of Tulare County.* With a population of 368,021, according to Department of Finance estimates for 2000, Tulare County is one of the medium-sized courts in our study. The Superior Court of Tulare County received 82,964 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately 1 percent of the state’s total. There are no FTE positions listed in Schedule 7A for court interpreter staff for fiscal year 2002–2003.

As shown in Table A9, expenditures on contract, per-diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 totaled \$151,011. Certified or registered interpreters performed approximately 60 percent of all interpretations. All of these were in Spanish, and certified interpreters performed 60 percent of the interpretations. None of the other designated or nondesignated languages use certified or registered interpreters.

(10) *Superior Court of San Joaquin County.* San Joaquin is one of the larger Central Valley counties, with an estimated population of 563,598 according to the Department of Finance. In fiscal year 2000–2001, 126,144 filings were received in the Superior Court of San Joaquin County, accounting for 1.8 percent of total filings. The Superior Court of San Joaquin County listed 0.25 FTE for an interpreter coordinator position in fiscal year 2002–2003. As shown in Table A10, the court also spent approximately \$150,365 on contract, per diem interpretations during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

Certified or registered interpreters in the Superior Court of San Joaquin County performed almost 87 percent of all interpretations during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.⁶ Of these, Spanish was the most interpreted language, accounting for 77 percent of all expenditures, followed by Cambodian and Hmong. Certified interpreters performed 83 percent of Spanish interpretations; no certified interpreters were used for the other designated languages.

(11) *Superior Court of Monterey County.* Monterey County spans the central coastline between the counties of San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz and reaches into the western edge of the Central Valley, bordering San Benito and Fresno Counties. The Department of Finance estimated the population of Monterey County to be 401,762 in 2000. The Superior Court of Monterey County received 95,056 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001,⁷ just over 1 percent of all filings statewide. The court reported 1.25 FTE staff working in the area of court interpreters. One FTE is identified as an

⁶ The following discussion of contract, per diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations.

⁷ FY 2000–2001 is the most recent year for which complete filings data are available.

interpreter coordinator. The other 0.25 FTE is identified as a staff interpreter.

The court uses contract interpreters in three different court locations. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the court used contract, per diem spoken-language interpreters at a cost of \$125,750.⁸ Table A11 shows the expenditures of the Superior Court of Monterey County by language and certification status of the interpreters. Approximately 74 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters went to certified or registered interpreters. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 91 percent of all contract, per diem expenditures. Seventy-three percent of Spanish language interpreters are certified. Vietnamese is the second most frequently interpreted language, and approximately 93 percent of the \$3,736 spent on Vietnamese interpretation went to certified interpreters. All of the remaining expenditures for designated and nondesignated languages are split between certified or registered and non-certified or nonregistered interpreters.

*(12) Superior Court of San Francisco County.*⁹ San Francisco County has a population of 801,400, according to Department of Finance estimates, making it the 11th largest county in the state by population, right behind Fresno. Unlike Fresno, San Francisco is predominantly urban with high population density and an economy based on finance and high technology. In fiscal year 2000–2001, the Superior Court of San Francisco County received 205,378 filings, which amount to 2.3 percent of all filings statewide, a slightly higher percentage of the statewide total than that of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Schedule 7A lists only one FTE (an interpreter coordinator) in the court interpreters program.

Table A12 shows total expenditures of \$90,448 for contract interpreters in July 2002. Slightly under 90 percent of all expenditures for contract interpreters went to certified or registered interpreters. Among the most widely interpreted languages in the San Francisco County courts, the ratios of certified expenditures to noncertified expenditures vary quite dramatically. Approximately 100 percent of Spanish, Vietnamese, Bulgarian, and Croatian expenditures were for certified or registered interpreters. At the same time, 72 percent of expenditures for Arabic, and less than half (40.57 percent) of the expenditures for Korean, went to certified interpreters. Less than a quarter of the expenditures for Portuguese (23.84 percent) went to certified interpreters.

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

⁹ The Superior Court of San Francisco County was only able to provide data for July 2002.

(13) Superior Court of Napa County. The Superior Court of Napa County is in the middle range of interpreter expenditures for courts in this study. The county population is 127,000, or slightly less than one-third of 1 percent of California's population, according to Department of Finance estimates for the year 2000. Situated in a largely rural county between Sonoma County to the west and Yolo and Solano Counties to the east, the Superior Court of Napa County received 25,761 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately one-third of 1 percent of all filings statewide.

According to Schedule 7A data, Napa County has no staff interpreters and 1 FTE interpreter coordinator covering two court locations within the City of Napa. The use of certified or registered interpreters accounted for 68 percent of all contract, per diem interpreter expenditures according to the data for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 provided by the Superior Court of Napa County.

Table A13 shows the expenditures by language and interpreter status for contract, per diem interpreters from the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Total expenditures were \$78,435.¹⁰ The largest expenditure, as in all the courts in the study, was for Spanish language interpretation. Spanish language interpretations accounted for more than 98 percent of all interpretations. Certified interpreters performed approximately 68 percent of all Spanish language interpretations. Noncertified and nonregistered interpreters performed the remaining 35 percent of interpretations.

(14) Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Stanislaus County is on the edge of the greater Bay Area and the northern part of the Central Valley. According to Department of Finance figures for 2000, Stanislaus County has a population of 446,997, making it the 17th largest county in California. The Superior Court of Stanislaus County received 79,558 filings during fiscal year 2000–2001, less than 1 percent of the state's total. There are 2.5 FTE positions listed in Schedule 7A on court interpreters. One FTE is a staff interpreter, and 1.5 FTEs are interpreter coordinators.

Table A14 shows the expenditures totaling \$77,385 for contract, per diem interpretations on languages other than Sign Language for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Of the 13 languages listed, Spanish is the most frequently interpreted, accounting for 88 percent of all expenditures on interpretation. More than 92 percent of the interpretations in Spanish are performed by certified interpreters, while only approximately 40 percent of

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

interpretations in the second most used language, Cambodian, are performed by registered interpreters.

(15) Superior Court of Yolo County. Yolo County lies on the northwest border of Sacramento County and borders five other counties in the northern Central Valley. The Department of Finance estimated that the population of Yolo County was 162,900 in 2000. In fiscal year 2000–2001, the Superior Court of Yolo County received 35,490 filings, slightly less than one-half of 1 percent of the total number of filings statewide. Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003 lists 1 FTE authorized and funded position in the court interpreter program, an interpreter coordinator.

In the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the court required interpretations in 19 different languages. The total expenditures by the Superior Court of Yolo County on interpreters for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 were \$68,196, approximately 63 percent of which is spent on Spanish language interpreters. These figures do not include Sign Language interpretations.

Table A15 shows the breakdown of expenditures for contract interpreters by language and interpreter certification status. Approximately 83.5 percent of all expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the Superior Court of Yolo County went to certified or registered interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003.

(16) Superior Court of Solano County. Lying at the northern edge of the Bay Area, Solano County was home to 394,542 people in 2000 according to the Department of Finance. The Superior Court of Solano County received 92,293 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, just over 1 percent of total filings. The court reports that it has two authorized positions in fiscal year 2002–2003 for court interpreters. One FTE is a staff interpreter and the other FTE is an interpreter coordinator.

Table A16 shows the breakdown by language and certification status for interpretation expenditures for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. It does not include expenditures for Sign Language interpretations. Over \$58,000 was spent on interpretations, placing the Superior Court of Solano County in the middle range of expenditures for interpretations in this study.

Spanish language interpretations accounted for 77 percent of all interpretations, with certified interpreters performing over 63 percent of interpretations, compared to 57 percent performed by certified or registered interpreters in Other-Than-Spanish languages in Solano County.

Interpretations in Tagalog were the second highest expenditure, with none of the interpretations being performed by certified interpreters. However, 100 percent of the Korean interpretations and 100 percent of the Navajo interpretations were performed by certified or registered interpreters.

(17) Superior Court of Kings County. Kings County is located in the heart of the Central Valley, bordered by Kern, Tulare, Fresno, and San Benito Counties. It had a population of 129,461 in 2000 according to the Department of Finance, making it the 32nd largest county in the state. The Superior Court of Kings County received 34,009 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, less than one-half of 1 percent of total filings.¹¹ The court reported no court interpreter staff in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

As shown in Table A17, expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 totaled \$50,632. Over 99 percent of all interpretations were in Spanish during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, and almost 78 percent of the interpretations were performed by certified interpreters. The only other language reported was Japanese, and it accounted for \$184 in expenditures.

(18) Superior Court of Placer County. The Superior Court of Placer County is located in Auburn, the county seat, in the Sierra foothills. The Department of Finance estimated the county's population at 248,399 in 2000. The court received 63,881 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately three-quarters of one percent of the total filings. There were no court interpreter staff positions reported in Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

Table A18 shows total expenditures of \$47,601 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. This table does not include expenditures for Sign Language interpreters. Sixty-six percent of total interpretations were in Spanish, with 100 percent of Spanish language interpretations being performed by certified interpreters. The overwhelming majority, almost 99 percent, of designated language interpretations were performed by certified interpreters. The second highest expenditure was for Russian interpretations, with 92 percent of the interpretations being performed by registered interpreters.

(19) Superior Court of Sutter County. Sutter County is located in the Gold Country of California and is bordered by six counties. According to Department of Finance estimates, the population of Sutter County was 78,930 in 2000, making it the 32nd largest county in the state. The

¹¹ Fiscal year 2000–2001 is the most recent year for which complete filings are available.

Superior Court of Sutter County received 18,076 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately .23 percent of total filings. The court reported 0.25 FTE in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003, an interpreter coordinator.

As shown in Table A19, expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters totaled \$27,307 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. At 95.45 percent, the Superior Court of Sutter County uses a high percentage of certified or registered interpreters.¹² Seventy-one percent of interpretations are in Spanish, and certified interpreters perform more than 95 percent of these interpretations. No other designated languages were reported during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. The second largest expenditure was for Punjabi, with registered interpreters performing more than 96 percent of these interpretations.

(20) Superior Court of Butte County. Bordering Sutter County, Butte County has an estimated population of 203,171, making it the 27th largest county in the state according to Department of Finance estimates. The Superior Court of Butte County received 45,775 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately one-half of 1 percent of total filings. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003, the court reported 0.75 FTE, an interpreter coordinator.

Table A20 shows the breakdown of expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters by language and certification status. Total expenditures were \$23,693 in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. The majority of the interpretations performed in the Superior Court of Butte County as in all the other courts in this study, were in Spanish as shown in Table A20. Sixty-seven percent of interpretations were in Spanish, 85 percent of which were performed by certified interpreters. There were no other reported interpretation expenditures in designated languages. The Superior Court of Butte County, among other courts of similar area and population size, used the highest percentage of registered interpreters in all other languages.

(21) Superior Court of Tehama County. Situated in the north-central part of the state, Tehama County was home to 56,039 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. This makes Tehama County the 41st largest county in California. The court received 23,203 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, less than one-third of 1 percent of total filings. In Schedule

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

7A, the court reported 0.75 FTE, a staff interpreter. No other staff positions in court interpreting were reported.

According to Table A21, the Superior Court of Tehama County spent \$17,870 on interpretations in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Expenditures for Sign Language are not included. Certified and registered interpreters performed almost 60 percent of the interpretations in the Superior Court of Tehama County. The vast majority of expenditures, 98 percent, were spent on Spanish. Certified interpreters performed 59 percent of the Spanish interpretations in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 at a cost of \$10,335. Punjabi was the only other language with reported expenditures of \$360; 100 percent of these interpretations were performed by a registered interpreter.

(22) Superior Court of Siskiyou County. Siskiyou County is located along the northern border of the state, with Modoc County to the east and Del Norte County to the west. According to Department of Finance estimates there were 44,301 people living in Siskiyou County in 2000, making it the 44th largest county in California. The Superior Court of Siskiyou County received 10,887 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately one-tenth of 1 percent of total filings. The court reported 0.25 FTE for an interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

As shown in Table A22, the Superior Court of Siskiyou County spent \$16,087 for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Certified interpreters performed approximately 87 percent of total interpretations. Spanish language interpretations accounted for just over half of the expenditures, \$8,895, with certified interpreters performing 93 percent of the interpretations. There were two other languages interpreted in the Superior Court of Siskiyou County in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, Hmong and Laotian. Nonregistered interpreters performed all of the interpretations in these languages.

(23) Superior Court of Shasta County. Shasta County was home to 163,256 people in 2000, according to Department of Finance estimates. The Superior Court of Shasta County received 42,152 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, approximately one-half of 1 percent of the state’s total filings.¹³ In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003, the court reported 0.75 FTE for an interpreter coordinator position.

As shown in Table A23, the Superior Court of Shasta County spent \$15,151 for contract, per diem interpreter expenditures in the first quarter of fiscal

¹³ Fiscal year 2000–2001 is the most recent year for which complete information is available.

year 2002–2003 as shown.¹⁴ Certified and registered interpreters performed approximately 13 percent of the interpretations in the court. Fifty percent of the expenditures were for Spanish, with the majority of funds being spent on noncertified interpreters, 81 percent. Mien and Laotian were the other two reported languages in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003; more than 92 percent of the expenditures on these languages went to nonregistered interpreters.

(24) Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County. San Luis Obispo County is located on the Pacific Coast between Santa Barbara County to the south and Monterey County to the north. According to Department of Finance estimates, San Luis Obispo County was home to 246,681 people in 2000. The court received 69,257 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, close to 1 percent of all filings in the state. The court reported no staff positions in court interpreting in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

As shown in Table A24, the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County reported total expenditures of \$14,875 for contract, per diem interpreters for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Certified interpreters performed approximately 87 percent of the interpretations in the court. Ninety-seven percent of the interpretations were in Spanish, and certified interpreters performed 100 percent of these interpretations. There were no other reported interpretations in designated languages. Mandarin and Ilocano were the nondesignated languages reported by the court, and nonregistered interpreters performed all of these interpretations.

(25) Superior Court of El Dorado County. El Dorado County is located in the Sierras along the border with Nevada. There were 156,299 people living in El Dorado County in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. The court received 28,203 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, one-third of 1 percent of total filings. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003, the court reported 0.2 FTE, an interpreter coordinator.

Table A25 shows the expenditures by language and certification status for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. The court spent \$14,427 on interpreting by contract, per diem interpreters, and seven different languages required interpretation not including Sign Language during this period. The largest expenditure was for Spanish, accounting for 86 percent of the total expenditures. Certified interpreters performed 71 percent of interpretations in Spanish and 100 percent of interpretations in Tagalog, the

¹⁴ The following discussion of contract, per diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

other designated language requiring interpretation. Of the five nondesignated languages reported, only one, Mien, was interpreted by a registered interpreter. The other languages all had nonregistered interpreters, accounting for 11 percent of the total expenditures.

(26) Superior Court of Lake County. Lake County is located between Napa County to the south, Mendocino and Sonoma Counties to the west, and Yuba and Butte Counties to the east. It was home to 58,309 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. The court received 15,593 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, the latest year for which complete information is available. There were no court interpreting positions reported on the Schedule 7A for this fiscal year.

As shown in Table A26, the court spent \$11,416 for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Certified and registered interpreters performed 100 percent of the interpretations in the Superior Court of Lake County. The largest expenditure was for Spanish, \$11,066. Mandarin and Thai were the other two languages reported during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, each with \$175 in expenditures.

(27) Superior Court of Colusa County. One of the smallest counties in our study, Colusa County was home to 18,804 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. The court received 11,705 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, just over one-tenth of 1 percent of total filings. In Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003, the court reported 0.5 FTE for an interpreter coordinator position.

Table A27 shows total expenditures of \$11,395 for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year of 2002–2003. Sign Language expenditures were not included as part of this report. One hundred percent of the expenditures went to certified interpreters. Ninety-nine percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, while a certified interpreter performed one half-day of interpretation in Tagalog.

(28) Superior Court of Glenn County. Glenn County sits directly north of Colusa County and was home to 26,453 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. There were 11,357 filings reported to the court in fiscal year 2000–2001. The court reported 0.25 FTE, an interpreter coordinator, in Schedule 7A.

As Table A28 shows, only one language, Spanish, was interpreted in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, and total expenditures were \$11,025. Noncertified interpreters performed all interpretations.

(29) *Superior Court of Del Norte County.* Del Norte County is in the northwestern corner of the state. In 2000, 27,507 people lived in Del Norte County according to the Department of Finance. There were 10,531 filings in the Superior Court of Del Norte County in fiscal year 2000–2001, amounting to just over one-tenth of 1 percent of total filings. No staff positions were reported in court interpretation in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

Table A29 shows the expenditures for interpretation broken down by language and certification status. All of the interpretation expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the court for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, \$10,557, were in Spanish, and certified interpreters performed all of the interpretations. The Superior Court of Del Norte County is part of the AOC’s Telephone Interpreting Pilot Project and accesses certified Spanish interpreters from the Superior Courts of Kern and San Diego Counties through a specialized telephone system.

(30) *Superior Court of San Benito County.* San Benito County is in the heart of the Central Valley and is bordered by six counties. San Benito County was home to 53,234 people in 2000 according to Department of Finance estimates. The court received 14,045 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, just under two-tenths of 1 percent of total filings for the year. The court reported 0.1 FTE interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

In the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the Superior Court of San Benito County reported \$7,790 in expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters as shown in Table A30.¹⁵ Spanish was the only language with reported expenditures, and noncertified interpreters performed 100 percent of the interpretations.

(31) *Superior Court of Nevada County.* Nevada County is located along the northern edge of the Sierra and in 2000 was home to 92,033 people according to Department of Finance estimates. The court received 20,900 filings in fiscal year 2002–2003, just over one-quarter of 1 percent. In Schedule 7A, the court reported 0.5 FTE for an interpreter coordinator.

Table A31 shows the expenditures broken down by language and certification status for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003. Spanish was the only language reported by the court and totaled of \$5,521.

¹⁵ The following discussion of contract, per diem interpreter costs does not include information on Sign Language interpretations as they are excluded from this report.

Certified interpreters performed approximately 13 percent of the Spanish interpretations.

(32) Superior Court of Yuba County. Yuba County had an estimated population of 60,219 in 2000 according to the Department of Finance making it the 39th largest county in the state. The court received 13,707 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, the latest year with complete filings data. The court also reported 0.75 FTE for an interpreter coordinator position in Schedule 7A.

One of the smaller courts in the study in terms of expenditures, the Superior Court of Yuba County is more diverse than most of the other small courts. As shown in Table A32, there were five languages interpreted in the court by contract, per diem interpreters during the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 for a total of \$4,981. Certified or registered interpreters performed 85 percent of the interpretations and all of the interpretations in Hmong, Russian, and German. As with all the courts in the study, Spanish was the largest expense, accounting for 80 percent of the total amount. Certified interpreters performed 86 percent of the interpretations in Spanish.

(33) Superior Court of Inyo County. Located along the Nevada border, Inyo County was home to an estimated 17,945 people in 2000, making it the 7th smallest county in the state. The Superior Court of Inyo County received 14,470 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, the most recent year for which complete filings are available. The court did not report any staff for court interpretation on the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

Table A33 shows the breakdown of expenditures by language and certification status for interpreters. Expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003 totaled \$2,245 and were for expenditures on Spanish language interpretation only. Certified interpreters performed 59 percent of Spanish language interpretations in the court.

(34) Superior Court of Sierra County. Sierra County is the second smallest county in the state with an estimated population of 3,555 people in 2000 according to the Department of Finance. The court received 1,274 filings in fiscal year 2000–2001, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of total filings. No staff for court interpretation were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2002–2003.

As shown in Table A34, there was only one half-day of interpretation, Spanish, and it was performed by a noncertified interpreter.

Table A1: Superior Court of Los Angeles County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$4,614,452	\$140,362			\$4,754,814	97.05%
Korean	193,776	3,994			197,770	97.98%
Vietnamese	106,617	2,650			109,267	97.57%
Cantonese/Mandarin	125,613	3,884			129,497	97.00%
Taglog	32,974	-			32,974	100.00%
Arabic	30,319	-			30,319	100.00%
Japanese	21,132	9,275			30,407	69.50%
Portuguese	5,961	-			5,961	100.00%
Japanese Korean	4,917	-			4,917	100.00%
Armenian			\$161,073	\$5,742	166,815	96.56%
Farsi/ Dari/ Pashto			52,040	175	52,215	99.66%
Cambodian			50,763	12,637	63,400	80.07%
Russian			43,799	-	43,799	100.00%
Hindi/ Punjabi/ Urdu/ Gujarati			20,237	543	20,780	97.39%
Armenian/ Farsi/ Russian			17,916	-	17,916	100.00%
Hebrew/ Russian			16,326	-	16,326	100.00%
Romanian/Russian/Lithuanian			13,049	828	13,877	94.03%
Italian			12,652	-	12,652	100.00%
Other European			7,252	1,003	8,255	87.85%
French			3,361	92	3,453	97.34%
Polish			2,947	2,246	5,193	56.75%
Hebrew/Farsi			2,202	-	2,202	100.00%
Bulgarian			1,159	-	1,159	100.00%
Meso-American			-	3,942	3,942	0.00%
Tongan			-	3,866	3,866	0.00%
Hmong			-	2,044	2,044	0.00%
Samoan			-	1,546	1,546	0.00%
Burmese			-	1,445	1,445	0.00%
Amharic			-	1,086	1,086	0.00%
Bengali			-	718	718	0.00%
Singhalese			-	525	525	0.00%
Sub Saharan African			-	451	451	0.00%
Assyrian			-	267	267	0.00%
Creole			-	184	184	0.00%
Tamil			-	175	175	0.00%
Cebuano			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$ 5,135,761	\$160,165	\$ 404,776	\$ 39,607	\$ 5,740,309	96.52%

Table A2: Superior Court of San Diego County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$691,251	-			\$691,251	100.00%
Vietnamese	13,780	8,328			\$22,108	62.33%
Portuguese	706	893			\$1,599	44.15%
Korean	265	8,004			\$8,269	3.20%
Tagalog	-	11,802			\$11,802	0.00%
Arabic	-	4,344			\$4,344	0.00%
Cantonese	-	1,923			\$1,923	0.00%
Japanese	-	1,620			\$1,620	0.00%
Laotian			\$8,733	\$1,095	\$9,828	88.86%
Amharic			4,375	1,380	\$5,755	76.02%
Cambodian			3,234	2,825	\$6,059	53.38%
Farsi			2,853	1,045	\$3,898	73.19%
Mandarin			2,764	460	\$3,224	85.73%
Somali			2,352	2,991	\$5,343	44.02%
Russian			2,058	368	\$2,426	84.83%
Chaldean			1,588	478	\$2,066	76.86%
Thai			882	368	\$1,250	70.56%
Ilocano			441	-	\$441	100.00%
Hmong			294	92	\$386	76.17%
Swahili			294	-	\$294	100.00%
French			147	1,104	\$1,251	11.75%
Urdu			147	184	\$331	44.41%
Albanian			147	92	\$239	61.51%
Punjabi			147	92	\$239	61.51%
Kurdish			147	-	\$147	100.00%
Italian			147	-	\$147	100.00%
Tigrinya			-	920	\$920	0.00%
Armenian			-	184	\$184	0.00%
Samoan			-	184	\$184	0.00%
Serbian			-	92	\$92	0.00%
Polish			-	92	\$92	0.00%
German			-	92	\$92	0.00%
Ibo			-	92	\$92	0.00%
Hebrew			-	810	\$810	0.00%
Mixteco			-	184	\$184	0.00%
Greek			-	92	\$92	0.00%
Total	\$706,002	\$36,914	\$30,750	\$15,316	\$788,982	93.38%

Table A3: Superior Court of Riverside County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$427,252	\$30,940			\$458,192	93.25%
Vietnamese	265	2,379			2,644	10.02%
Korean	-	2,875			2,875	0.00%
Arabic	-	1,605			1,605	0.00%
Cantonese	-	1,500			1,500	0.00%
Tagalog	-	1,120			1,120	0.00%
Japanese	-	450			450	0.00%
Punjabi			-	\$8,225	8,225	0.00%
Cambodian			-	2,999	2,999	0.00%
Laotian			-	2,866	2,866	0.00%
Chinese			-	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Romanian			-	2,180	2,180	0.00%
Q'anjob'al			-	1,850	1,850	0.00%
Mandarin			-	1,265	1,265	0.00%
Russian			-	900	900	0.00%
Hindi			-	775	775	0.00%
San Carlos Apache			-	700	700	0.00%
Bengali			-	700	700	0.00%
Czech			-	650	650	0.00%
Farsi			-	615	615	0.00%
Urdu			-	550	550	0.00%
Mien			-	344	344	0.00%
Thai			-	276	276	0.00%
Total	\$427,517	\$40,869	-	\$27,395	\$495,781	86.23%

Table A4: Superior Court of Fresno County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$209,988	\$72,309			\$282,297	74.39%
Tagalog	147	543			690	21.30%
Vietnamese	-	1,878			1,878	100.00%
Arabic	-	543			543	100.00%
Cantonese	-	368			368	0.00%
Korean	-	718			718	0.00%
Japanese	-	184			184	0.00%
Portuguese	-	184			184	0.00%
Cambodian			\$14,045	\$2,145	16,190	86.75%
Hmong			12,720	16,275	28,995	43.87%
Laotian			4,410	4876	9,286	47.49%
Mien			824	-	824	100.00%
Punjabi			-	4,721	4,721	0.00%
Armenian			-	1,813	1,813	0.00%
Mixteco			-	1,362	1,362	0.00%
Ilocano			-	644	644	0.00%
Russian			-	267	267	0.00%
Farsi			-	184	184	0.00%
Amharic			-	92	92	0.00%
Mandarin			-	92	92	0.00%
Turkish				184	184	0.00%
Total	\$210,135	\$76,727	\$31,999	\$32,655	\$351,516	68.88%

Table A5: Superior Court of Sacramento County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$151,155	\$718			\$151,873	99.53%
Vietnamese	29,014	13,433			42,447	68.35%
Cantonese	6,352	2,291			8,643	73.49%
Arabic	2,826	-			2,826	100.00%
Japanese	147	184			331	44.41%
Korean	-	2,448			2,448	0.00%
Tagalog	-	736			736	0.00%
Russian			\$36,720	-	36,720	100.00%
Mein			21,202	4,593	25,795	82.19%
Hmong			17,267	9,715	26,982	63.99%
Armenian			13,267	-	13,267	100.00%
Laotian			8,267	3,148	11,415	72.42%
Romanian			7,855	810	8,665	90.65%
Punjabi			4,913	-	4,913	100.00%
Farsi			1,412	3,747	5,159	27.37%
Cambodian			1,265	-	1,265	100.00%
Hindi			706	-	706	100.00%
Mandarin			441	-	441	100.00%
Thai			441	-	441	100.00%
Urdu			294	-	294	100.00%
Fijian			147	1,077	1,224	12.01%
Tongan			-	1,196	1,196	0.00%
Samoan			-	552	552	0.00%
Hugar (Chinese Dialect)			-	368	368	0.00%
Serbian/Croatian			-	276	276	0.00%
Indonesian			-	184	184	0.00%
Taiwanese			-	92	92	0.00%
Marshallese			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$189,494	\$19,810	\$114,197	\$25,850	\$349,351	86.93%

Table A6: Superior Court of San Mateo County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$141,639	\$22,504			\$164,143	86.29%
Vietnamese	10,207	184			10,391	98.23%
Tagalog	8,944	1,012			9,956	89.84%
Cantonese	7,147	460			7,607	93.95%
Korean	882	184			1,066	82.74%
Arabic	-	1,160			1,160	0.00%
Portuguese	-	736			736	0.00%
Mandarin			\$6,855	\$460	7,315	93.71%
Tongan			5,178	635	5,813	89.08%
Russian			2,352	-	2,352	100.00%
Shangzhai			1,176	-	1,176	100.00%
Punjabi			1,029	92	1,121	91.79%
Hindi			882	709	1,591	55.44%
Samoan			735	267	1,002	73.35%
Farsi			441	184	625	70.56%
Laotian			294	-	294	100.00%
Burmese			267	-	267	100.00%
French			147	-	147	100.00%
Thai			147	-	147	100.00%
Malayalam			-	700	700	0.00%
Turkish			-	175	175	0.00%
Polish			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$168,819	\$26,240	\$19,503	\$3,314	\$217,876	86.93%

Table A7: Superior Court of Sonoma County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$109,832	\$25,579			\$135,411	81.11%
Cantonese	27,472	12,633			40,105	68.50%
Arabic	795	-			795	100.00%
Vietnamese	-	875			875	0.00%
Japanese	-	175			175	0.00%
Tagalog	-	92			92	0.00%
Portuguese	-	46			46	0.00%
Tigrinya			\$1,855	\$350	2,205	84.13%
Punjabi			795	-	795	100.00%
Samoaan			530	-	530	100.00%
Russian			294	-	294	100.00%
Laotian			147	1,013	1,160	12.67%
Italian			147	-	147	100.00%
Cambodian			-	2,238	2,238	0.00%
Tongan			-	1,225	1,225	0.00%
Mandarin			-	709	709	0.00%
Thai			-	175	175	0.00%
Total	\$138,099	\$39,400	\$3,768	\$5,710	\$186,977	75.87%

Table A8: Superior Court of Ventura County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$158,844	\$184			\$159,028	99.88%
Korean	2,650	92			2,742	96.64%
Vietnamese	795	175			970	81.96%
Arabic	265	-			265	100.00%
Tagalog	-	1,602			1,602	0.00%
Mandarin			\$1,412	\$92	1,504	93.88%
Punjabi			795	-	795	100.00%
Farsi			735	92	827	88.88%
Armenian			735	-	735	100.00%
Russian			530	350	880	60.23%
Thai			530	-	530	100.00%
Romanian			265	-	265	100.00%
Mixteco			-	1,050	1,050	0.00%
Tongan			-	525	525	0.00%
Trique			-	525	525	0.00%
Total	\$162,554	\$2,053	\$5,002	\$2,634	\$172,243	97.28%

Table A9: Superior Court of Tulare County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$89,831	\$59,257			\$149,088	60.25%
Tagalog		267			267	0.00%
Portuguese		184			184	0.00%
Arabic		92			92	0.00%
Laotian			-	\$736	736	0.00%
Ilocano			-	276	276	0.00%
Hmong			-	184	184	0.00%
Mien			-	92	92	0.00%
Punjabi			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$89,831	\$59,800	-	\$1,380	\$151,011	59.49%

Table A10: Superior Court of San Joaquin County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$96,407	\$19,713			\$116,120	83.02%
Vietnamese	-	4,584			4,584	0.00%
Cantonese	-	2,291			2,291	0.00%
Arabic	-	276			276	0.00%
Tagalog	-	368			368	0.00%
Portuguese	-	460			460	0.00%
Cambodian			\$6,590	\$5,062	11,652	56.56%
Punjabi			3,793	276	4,069	93.22%
Hmong			735	4,133	4,868	15.10%
Ilocano			588	368	956	61.51%
Laotian			-	4,353	4,353	0.00%
Farsi			-	184	184	0.00%
Q'anjob'al			-	184	184	0.00%
Total	\$96,407	\$27,692	\$11,706	\$14,560	\$150,365	86.93%

Table A11: Superior Court of Monterey County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 84,403	\$ 30,867			\$ 115,270	73.22%
Vietnamese	3,470	276			3,746	92.63%
Korean	882	--			882	100.00%
Tagalog	294	460			754	38.99%
Japanese	276	--			276	100.00%
Mixteco			\$2,058	-	2,058	100.00%
Trique			-	1,441	1,441	0.00%
Dutch			441	-	441	100.00%
Ilonggo			441	-	441	100.00%
Mandarin			294	-	294	100.00%
Punjabi			147	-	147	100.00%
Total	89,325	31,603	3,381	1,441	\$125,750	73.72%

Table A12: Superior Court of San Francisco County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, July 2002 Only						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$53,953	\$267			\$54,220	99.51%
Cantonese	10,420	175			10,595	98.35%
Vietnamese	4,768	-			4,768	100.00%
Tagalog	3,826	184			4,010	95.41%
Arabic	1,706	635			2,341	72.87%
Portuguese	559	1,786			2,345	23.84%
Korean	559	819			1,378	40.57%
Japanese	-	718			718	0.00%
Mandarin			\$1,824	\$92	1,916	95.20%
Bulgarian			1,060	-	1,060	100.00%
Russian			706	2,302	3,008	23.47%
French			559	276	835	66.95%
Polish			412	92	504	81.75%
Amharic			294	-	294	100.00%
Punjabi			147	368	515	28.54%
Thai			147	184	331	44.41%
Croatian			147	-	147	100.00%
Samoan			-	184	184	0.00%
Urdu			-	184	184	0.00%
Hindi			-	184	184	0.00%
Mongolian			-	184	184	0.00%
Burmese			-	184	184	0.00%
Turkish			-	184	184	0.00%
Greek			-	175	175	0.00%
Laotian			-	92	92	0.00%
Cambodian			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$75,791	\$4,584	\$5,296	\$4,777	\$90,448	89.65%

Table A13: Superior Court of Napa County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$52,628	\$25,012			\$77,640	67.78%
Japanese	530	-			1,693	31.31%
Punjabi			\$265	-	265	100.00%
Total	\$53,158	\$25,012	\$265	-	\$78,435	68.11%

Table A14: Superior Court of Stanislaus County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$62,988	\$5,393			\$68,381	92.11%
Vietnamese	441	184			625	70.56%
Portuguese	-	1,390			1,390	0.00%
Arabic	-	359			359	0.00%
Cambodian			\$927	\$1,399	2,326	39.84%
Punjabi			809	497	1,306	61.93%
Hindi			147	46	193	76.17%
Laotian			74	1,454	1,528	4.81%
Assyrian			-	635	635	0.00%
Farsi			-	230	230	0.00%
Dari			-	184	184	0.00%
Pashto			-	138	138	0.00%
Russian			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$63,429	\$7,326	\$1,956	\$4,675	\$77,385	84.49%

Table A15: Superior Court of Yolo County

Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$43,275	-			\$43,275	100.00%
Arabic	735	-			735	100.00%
Cantonese	294	588			882	33.33%
Vietnamese	-	2,147			2,147	0.00%
Tagalog	-	1,824			1,824	0.00%
Korean	-	294			294	0.00%
Russian			\$8,592	-	8,592	100.00%
Mandarin			1,029	1,243	2,272	45.29%
Cambodian			971	113	1,084	89.60%
Mien			853	552	1,405	60.71%
Amharic			294	-	294	100.00%
Armenian			294	-	294	100.00%
Punjabi			294	2,145	2,439	12.05%
Romanian			147	-	147	100.00%
Hmong			147	543	690	21.30%
Farsi			-	644	644	0.00%
Hindi			-	534	534	0.00%
Fijian			-	368	368	0.00%
Tongan			-	276	276	0.00%
Total	\$44,304	\$4,853	\$12,621	\$6,418	\$68,196	83.47%

Table A16: Superior Court of Solano County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 28,409	\$ 16,419			\$ 44,828	63.37%
Vietnamese	882	184			1,066	82.74%
Cantonese	735	588			1,323	55.56%
Korean	441	-			441	100.00%
Arabic	294	92			386	76.17%
Tagalog	-	2,466			2,466	0.00%
Portuguese	-	276			276	0.00%
Mien			\$ 882	\$ 718	1,600	55.13%
Mandarin			735	1,243	1,978	37.16%
Navajo			718	-	718	100.00%
Punjabi			147	2,080	2,227	6.60%
Hmong			147	543	690	21.30%
Farsi			-	184	184	0.00%
Cambodian			-	113	113	0.00%
Russian			-	92	92	0.00%
Laotian			-	92	92	0.00%
Hindi			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$ 30,761	\$ 20,025	\$ 2,629	\$ 5,157	\$ 58,571	57.01%

Table A17: Superior Court of Kings County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$39,187	11,261			\$ 50,448	77.68%
Japanese	-	184			184	0.00%
Total	\$39,187	\$11,445	-	-	\$ 50,632	77.40%

Table A18: Superior Court of Placer County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 31,498	-			\$31,498	100.00%
Vietnamese	3,621	-			3,621	100.00%
Tagalog	795	-			795	100.00%
Portuguese	-	\$ 92			92	0.00%
Russian			\$5,412	\$460	5,872	92.17%
Romanian			2,385	736	3,121	76.42%
Punjabi			588	184	772	76.17%
Armenian			588	-	588	100.00%
Farsi			147	368	515	28.54%
French			-	368	368	0.00%
Serbo-Croatian			-	175	175	0.00%
German			-	92	92	0.00%
Tongan			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$ 35,914	\$ 92	\$ 9,120	\$2,475	\$47,601	94.61%

Table A19: Superior Court of Sutter County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$18,445	\$ 884			\$19,329	95.43%
Punjabi			\$ 7,325	\$ 267	7,592	96.48%
Hmong			147	92	239	61.51%
Mien			147	-	147	100.00%
Total	\$18,445	\$ 884	\$7,619	\$359	\$27,307	95.45%

Table A20: Superior Court of Butte County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 13,573	\$ 2,329			\$ 15,902	85.35%
Hmong			\$ 5,292	-	5,292	100.00%
Mien			735	-	735	100.00%
Mandarin			735	-	735	100.00%
Punjabi			441	-	441	100.00%
Tigrinya			147	-	147	100.00%
Hungarian			147	-	147	100.00%
Russian			147	-	147	100.00%
Laotian			147	-	147	100.00%
Total	\$ 13,573	\$ 2,329	\$ 7,791	-	\$ 23,693	90.17%

Table A21: Superior Court of Tehama County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$10,335	\$ 7,175			\$17,510	59.02%
Punjabi			360	0	360	100.00%
Total	\$10,335	\$ 7,175	\$ 360	-	\$17,870	59.85%

Table A22: Superior Court of Siskiyou County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 8,309	\$586			\$ 8,895	93.41%
Hmong			-	\$ 5,319	5,319	0.00%
Laotian			-	1,873	1,873	0.00%
Total	\$8,309	\$ 586	-	\$7,192	\$16,087	86.93%

Table A23: Superior Court of Shasta County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$ 1,441	\$6,150			\$7,591	18.98%
Mien			\$ 280	\$ 500	780	35.90%
Laotian			280	6,500	6,780	4.13%
Total	\$ 1,441	\$6,150	\$560	\$7,000	\$15,151	13.21%

Table A24: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$14,424	-			\$14,424	100.00%
Ilocano			-	\$ 359	359	0.00%
Mandarin			-	92	92	0.00%
Total	\$14,424	-	-	\$451	\$14,875	86.93%

Table A25: Superior Court of El Dorado County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$8,826	\$3,552			\$12,378	71.30%
Tagalog	265	-			265	100.00%
Mein			\$ 265	-	265	100.00%
Cambodian			-	\$ 875	875	0.00%
Russian			-	276	276	0.00%
Czech			-	184	184	0.00%
French			-	184	184	0.00%
Total	\$9,091	\$ 3,552	\$265	\$1,519	\$ 14,427	64.85%

Table A26: Superior Court of Lake County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$11,066				\$11,066	100.00%
Mandarin			\$175	-	175	100.00%
Thai			175	-	175	100.00%
Total	\$11,066	-	\$350	-	\$11,416	100.00%

Table A27: Superior Court of Colusa County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$11,395	-			\$ 11,395	100.00%
Tagalog	147	-			147	100.00%
Total	\$11,395	-	-	-	\$11,395	100.00%

Table A28: Superior Court of Glenn County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	-	\$11,025			\$ 11,025	0.00%
Total	-	\$11,025	-	-	\$11,025	0.00%

Table A29: Superior Court of Del Norte County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$10,557	-			\$ 10,557	100.00%
Total	\$10,557	-	-	-	\$10,557	100.00%

Table A30: Superior Court of San Benito County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	-	7,790			7,790	0.00%
Total	-	7,790	-	-	7,790	0.00%

Table A31: Superior Court of Nevada County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$735	\$ 4,786			\$5,521	13.31%
Total	\$735	\$4,786	-	-	\$ 5,521	13.31%

Table A32: Superior Court of Yuba County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language	% Certified,
						Registered

	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered	Total	Registered
Spanish	\$3,445	\$543			\$3,988	86.38%
Punjabi			\$368	-	368	100.00%
Hmong			294	-	294	100.00%
Russian			147	-	147	100.00%
German			-	\$184	184	0.00%
Total	\$3,445	\$543	\$809	\$184	\$4,981	85.40%

Table A33: Superior Court of Inyo County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	\$1,325	\$920			\$2,245	59.02%
Total	\$ 1,325	\$920	-	-	\$2,245	59.02%

Table A34: Superior Court of Sierra County						
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpretation, FY 2002–2003 Q1						
	<i>Designated Languages</i>		<i>Nondesignated Languages</i>		Language Total	% Certified, Registered
	Certified	Noncertified	Registered	Nonregistered		
Spanish	-	\$ 92			\$ 92	0.00%
Total	-	\$92	-	-	\$92	0.00%