



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

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

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

February 28, 2013

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State of California
State Capitol, Suite 3021
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt
Secretary of the Senate
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 400
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*, Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33)

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Wilson:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required under the Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33), Item 0250-101-0932, *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*.

Summary of the report:

- The appropriation for court interpreter services (Program 45.45) in fiscal year (FY) 2011–2012 was \$92,794,000. The appropriation amount has remained unchanged since FY 2009–2010.
- Court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures in FY 2011–2012 totaled \$89,187,485.
- Reimbursable court interpreter expenditures decreased from FY 2010–2011 to FY 2011–2012 by \$764,469, a decrease of 0.85 percent.
- Reimbursable expenditures for staff interpreters have increased every year over the past five years (see Table 1). FY 2011–2012 reimbursable expenditures for staff interpreters represented 81.67 percent of total reimbursements.
- Over the past four years (since FY 2008–2009), reimbursable expenditures for contract court interpreters have continually decreased. FY 2011–2012 reimbursable expenditures for contract interpreters represented 18.33 percent of total reimbursements, as compared to 25.47 percent in FY 2008–2009.
- Reimbursed court interpreter expenditures since FY 2009–2010 have been less than the appropriation (expenditure authority). On October 29, 2010, the Judicial Council approved the savings from FY 2009–2010 and any future expenditure savings to be set aside to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs.
- Reimbursable expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters continue to decrease. Reimbursements for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represent 2.67 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 14.55 percent of total contractor costs for FY 2011–2012.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Chad Finke, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Court Operations Special Services Office, at 415-865-8925 or chad.finke@jud.ca.gov.

Very truly yours,



Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
February 28, 2013
Page 3

SJ/CF/SW

Attachment

cc: Members of the Judicial Council

Mr. Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office

Ms. Jolie Onodera, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee

Mr. Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee

Mr. Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Fiscal Office

Mr. Chuck Nicol, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee

Ms. Anita Lee, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office


Ms. Jody Patel, AOC Chief of Staff

Mr. Curt Soderlund, AOC Chief Administrative Officer

Mr. Curtis L. Child, AOC Chief Operating Officer

Mr. Peter Allen, Senior Manager, AOC Office of Communications

Mr. Cory Jasperson, Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs



Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2011–2012

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
FEBRUARY 2013



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

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

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

Report Summary

Report title: *Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2011–2012*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33)

Date of report: February 1, 2013

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with the Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33).

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

The appropriation for court interpreter services (Program 45.45) in FY 2011–2012 was \$92,794,000. Court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures totaled \$89,187,485. Reimbursable court interpreter expenditures decreased from FY 2010–2011 to FY 2011–2012 by \$764,469, a decrease of 0.85 percent. Reimbursable expenditures for staff interpreters represented 81.67 percent of total reimbursements, and reimbursable expenditures for contract interpreters represented 18.33 percent. Reimbursable expenditures continue to decrease for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters. Reimbursements for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represent 2.67 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 14.55 percent of total contractor costs. In 2011–2012 the Judicial Council approved using \$3.0 million of the remaining expenditure authority from FY 2009–2010 to offset statewide trial court budget reductions

The full report can be accessed here: www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm. For a printed copy, call 415-865-4288.

Judicial Council Members

As of February 20, 2013

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

Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Noreen Evans
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Stephen H. Baker
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Mr. James P. Fox
Attorney at Law (Retired)
California State Bar Association

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Hon. James E. Herman
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Hon. Richard Bloom
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. James R. Brandlin
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Teri L. Jackson
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Ms. Angela J. Davis
Assistant United States Attorney
for the Central District of California

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Plumas

Hon. David De Alba
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Ms. Edith R. Matthai
Attorney at Law
Robie & Matthai

Hon. Emilie H. Elias
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Judicial Council Members

As of February 20, 2013

Hon. Douglas P. Miller

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Morris D. Jacobson

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Hon. Brian L. McCabe

Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Merced

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.

Attorney at Law
Robinson Calcagnie Robinson
Shapiro Davis, Inc.

Hon. Robert James Moss

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. David Rosenberg

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo

Hon. Kenneth K. So

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Sue Alexander

Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Ms. Mary Beth Todd

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Sutter

Mr. Alan Carlson

Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. Charles D. Wachob

Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Placer

Hon. Laurie M. Earl

Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Allan D. Hardcastle

Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sonoma

Judicial Council Members

As of February 20, 2013

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Hon. Steven Jahr

Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

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

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

Curtis L. Child
Chief Operating Officer
**JUDICIAL AND COURT OPERATIONS
SERVICES DIVISION**

**COURT OPERATIONS
SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE**

Chad Finke
Director

Dianne Bolotte
Assistant Director

Sonia Sierra Wolf
Primary Author of Report

I. Summary

- The appropriation for court interpreters (Program 45.45) in fiscal year (FY) 2011–2012 was \$92,794,000. The appropriation amount has remained unchanged since FY 2009–2010.
- Court reimbursements for eligible court interpreter expenditures in FY 2011–2012 totaled \$89,187,485.
- Reimbursable court interpreter expenditures decreased from FY 2010–2011 to FY 2011–2012 by \$764,469, a decrease of 0.85 percent.
- Reimbursable expenditures for staff interpreters have increased every year over the past five years (see Table 1). FY 2011–2012 reimbursable expenditures for staff interpreters represented 81.67 percent of total reimbursements.
- Over the past four years (since FY 2008–2009), reimbursable expenditures for contract court interpreters have continually decreased. FY 2011–2012 reimbursable expenditures for contract interpreters represented 18.33 percent of total reimbursements, as compared to 25.47 percent in FY 2008–2009.
- Reimbursed court interpreter expenditures since FY 2009–2010 have been less than the appropriation (expenditure authority). On October 29, 2010, the Judicial Council approved the savings from FY 2009–2010 and any future expenditure savings to be set aside to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs.
- Reimbursable expenditures for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters continue to decrease (see Table 2). Reimbursements for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters represent 2.67 percent of statewide interpreter costs and 14.55 percent of total contractor costs for FY 2011–2012.

II. Background

Mandates to Provide Court Interpreting Services

Article I, section 14, of the California Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide that “[a] person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings.” This provision establishes a mandate for the courts to provide interpreters to all defendants in criminal matters who have limited ability to understand or speak English. Further state court rulings subsequent to the constitutional amendment have established the right to a court interpreter in delinquency and some family law matters for individuals with limited English proficiency. In addition to the constitutional mandate and state court rulings, under federal law, individuals with hearing disabilities who require sign language interpreters must receive court interpreter services free of charge in all court proceedings.

Statutory Requirement to Report on Expenditures

The Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33), item 0250-101-0932, Schedule 5, provides appropriation from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the services of court interpreters. Provision 3 states that “[t]he Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (5).” In fulfillment of that provision, this report details trial court expenditures for court interpreters.

Program Funding

- For FY 2011–2012, the Budget Act of 2011 appropriated \$92,794,000 for the provision of court interpreter services. The amount appropriated for court interpreter reimbursements has remained unchanged since FY 2009–2010.
- During FY 2011–2012, reimbursable expenditures totaled \$89,187,485.
- Reimbursable expenditures for FY 2010–2011 totaled \$89,951,954.
- On October 29, 2010, the Judicial Council approved the savings from FY 2009–2010 and any future expenditure savings to be set aside to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs.
- In response to the deepening fiscal crisis in the state of California, at its July 22, 2011, meeting, as part of the report on trial court allocations for FY 2011–2012, the Judicial Council approved using \$3 million of the savings from the FY 2009–2010 court interpreter expenditure fund to offset part of the trial court budget reductions.

III. Eligible Expenditures

Expenditures that qualify for reimbursement are limited to the following four items:

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

The Judicial Council does not reimburse trial courts for the cost of supervisors, administrative overhead, or any OE&E except for the contractual services, travel, and standard complementary items noted above in items 1, 2, and 4. Trial courts must absorb all other OE&E costs and, except as noted in item 4 above, all supervisory expenditures associated with staff interpreters and court interpreter coordinators.

Attachment 1 is a summary by court of the major reimbursable categories in items 1–4 above.

IV. Rates of Pay for Court Interpreters

The Judicial Council first established statewide standards for court interpreter compensation in January 1999 at two defined levels, a full-day rate and a half-day rate. Three increases in pay for certified and registered interpreters have been authorized since then, effective on July 1, 1999; July 1, 2000; and September 1, 2007.

¹ Limited by item No. 0250-101-0932, provision 3, of the Budget Act of 2011 to 1.0 personnel year (PY) each for counties in classes 1–15, 0.5 PY each for counties in classes 16–31, and 0.25 PY each for counties in classes 32–58. The Budget Act of 2011 defines county classes based on size of population: counties in classes 1–15 have populations greater than 500,000, classes 16–31 have populations between 130,000 and 500,000, and classes 32–58 have populations less than 130,000.

A significant change to the provision of interpreter services was the enactment of Senate Bill 371 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1047), which required trial courts to establish staff interpreter positions and offer employment to certified and registered court interpreters under prescribed conditions. As a result, trial courts began hiring contract interpreters as staff interpreters. The council's standard interpreter pay rates apply only to contract interpreters, not to staff interpreters.

Statewide Standard Rate for Certified and Registered Contract Court Interpreters

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

Interpreters who pass the English-only written and oral portions of the court interpreter certification examination or the required exam for American Sign Language and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements are referred to as certified court interpreters. Currently, California recognizes 15 designated languages for certification: American Sign Language (ASL), Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. (Effective January 1, 2011, Farsi was recognized as a designated language; however, Farsi interpreters currently enrolled on the Master List of Court Interpreters will remain registered interpreters until a bilingual oral interpreting exam for certified status can be administered.)

An interpreter of a spoken language not designated for certification status is required to pass an English fluency examination and fulfill the corresponding Judicial Council requirements to become a registered interpreter of a nondesignated language.

Statewide Standard for Noncertified and Nonregistered Interpreters

During FY 2011–2012, the statewide standard rate for noncertified and nonregistered interpreters remained \$175 for a full day and \$92 for a half day, the same rate established by the Judicial Council in July 1999. However, the actual rates paid to contract interpreters, whether certified/registered or noncertified/nonregistered, often exceed these standards because each assignment must be individually negotiated by the local court subject to the realities of supply and demand—particularly for contractors who interpret less commonly spoken languages.

Comparison with Federal Rates

State compensation rates for California employee court interpreters are comparable to federal rates. California employee court interpreters receive health and retirement benefits that increase the total value of their compensation by 30 to 35 percent. The current federal rates for contract court interpreters are \$388/full day and \$210/half day for certified interpreters and \$187/full day and \$103/half day for noncertified interpreters. Whereas the federal system relies almost exclusively on contract interpreters, most court interpreter assignments in California are performed by staff interpreters.

V. FY 2011–2012 Reimbursed Expenditures

Shift From Contract Interpreters to Staff Interpreters

Table 1, below, details reimbursed expenditures for the past five years for staff and contract court interpreters. Total staff expenditures represented 73.95 percent of interpreter costs in FY 2007–2008 and increased to 81.67 percent of interpreter costs in FY 2011–2012. Conversely, contract expenditures in the same period decreased from 26.41 percent to 18.33 percent. These figures illustrate that, since FY 2007–2008, the percentage shift toward staff expenditures has continued to increase.

Table 1. Shift of Reimbursed Expenditures From Contract to Staff Costs					
Fiscal Year	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Total Staff Expenditures	\$65,109,655 73.59%	\$69,842,707 74.53%	\$68,042,596 77.36%	\$71,763,311 79.78%	\$72,835,667 81.67%
Total Contract Expenditures	\$23,363,502 26.41%	\$23,862,667 25.47%	\$19,912,471 22.64%	\$18,188,643 20.22%	\$16,351,818 18.33%
Total	\$88,473,157	\$93,705,374	\$87,955,067	\$89,951,954	\$89,187,485

Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters

During FY 2011–2012, statewide per diems for noncertified contract interpreters equaled \$1,642,989, or 1.84 percent of total statewide expenditures. Statewide expenditures on per diems for nonregistered contract interpreters equaled \$735,860, or 0.83 percent of total statewide expenditures. Per diem expenditures for both noncertified and nonregistered contract interpreters equaled 2.67 percent of all statewide interpreter costs. Columns K and L of Attachment 1 detail nonregistered and noncertified contract interpreter per diem expenditures for FY 2011–2012 for each of the 58 county trial courts.


Table 2 shows annual statewide expenditures over the past three years for compensation (excluding travel) of noncertified and nonregistered interpreters and their percentages of total eligible expenditures for court interpreter services. The annual percentages show a decrease from 4.18 percent in FY 2009–2010 to 2.67 percent in FY 2011–2012.

Table 2. Expenditures for Noncertified and Nonregistered Contract Interpreters and Percentage of Total Expenditures			
Fiscal Year	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
Noncertified Expenditures	\$2,816,013 3.20%	\$2,488,385 2.77%	\$1,642,989 1.84%
Nonregistered Expenditures	\$862,814 0.98%	\$797,239 0.88%	\$735,860 0.83%
Combined Expenditures	\$3,678,827 4.18%	\$3,285,624 3.65%	\$2,378,849 2.67%

Table 3 shows the annual percentage changes in statewide reimbursed expenditures from FY 2005–2006 to FY 2010–2011.

Table 3. Percentage Change in Statewide Reimbursed Expenditures				
FY 2006–2007 to FY 2007–2008	FY 2007–2008 to FY 2008–2009	FY 2008–2009 to FY 2009–2010	FY 2009–2010 to FY 2010–2011	FY 2010–2011 to FY 2011–2012
6.38%	5.91%	-6.14%	2.27%	-0.85%

Chart 1 depicts total reimbursed court interpreter expenditures since FY 2006–2007.



VI. Distribution of Reimbursed Expenditures by Largest Court Providers

Table 4 lists the 11 courts that received the largest reimbursements for eligible court interpreter costs in FY 2011–2012. These 11 courts accounted for \$69,771,731 or 78.3 percent of the state’s reimbursed expenditures for court interpreters. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County alone accounted for 34.07 percent of reimbursed expenditures, and Southern California’s five largest superior courts—those of Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties—together accounted for 59.26 percent of the state’s reimbursements.

Superior Court	FY 2011–2012 Reimbursed Expenditures (\$)	Percentage of Statewide Total
Los Angeles	30,385,109	34.07
Orange	8,315,792	9.32
San Diego	6,020,578	6.75
San Bernardino	4,806,295	5.39
Alameda	3,451,817	3.87
Sacramento	3,418,328	3.83
Riverside	3,325,155	3.73
Santa Clara	3,052,257	3.42
Kern	2,395,366	2.69
San Francisco	2,340,119	2.62
Fresno	2,260,915	2.54
Subtotal	\$69,771,731	78.23
Statewide Total	\$89,187,485	100.00

VII. Conclusion

In FY 2011–2012, the state appropriation was sufficient to provide all courts with full reimbursement of their allowable court interpreter costs.

Although California’s economic future continues to remain uncertain, it is essential that all Californians have meaningful access to justice, regardless of their ability to communicate in English. The adequacy of the current funding allocation is not guaranteed to meet the need for court interpreter services in future years. To ensure fair and equal access to justice, it is essential that there continue to be sufficient funding to meet the public’s need for court interpreter services in the California courts. The judicial branch continues to work with the Governor, the Legislature, and stakeholders to ensure that all Californians, including those who are unable to understand court proceedings because of a language barrier, are provided meaningful access to justice.

VIII. Attachments

1. FY 2011–2012 Court Interpreters Program 45.45 Year-End Reimbursed Expenditures

**FY 2011-2012 Court Interpreters
TCTF Program 45.45 Reimbursed Expenditures**

Court	Reimbursed Employee-Related Interpreter Costs								Reimbursed Contractor-Related Interpreter Costs								Total Reimbursed Expenditures
	Staff Interpreter Salaries & Benefits	Staff Interpreter Travel	Staff Cross Assignment Costs	Total Staff Interpreter Salaries, Benefits & Travel	CIP Arbitration Awards	Interpreter Coordinator Reimbursed Amount	Supervisor Salaries, Benefits, & OE&E (\$12,500/FTE)	Total Employee Related Costs	Registered Contractor Per Diems	Certified Contractor Per Diems	Non-Registered Contractor Per Diems	Non-Certified Contractor Per Diems	ASL Contractor Per Diems	Total Contractor Per Diems	Contractor Travel, Mileage, Meals, & Lodging	Total Contractor-Related Costs	
	A	B	C	D (A + B + C)	E	F	G	H (D + E + F + G)	I	J	K	L	M	N (I thru M)	O	P (N + O)	
Alameda	2,757,063	5,157	-	2,762,220	-	91,191	-	2,853,411	40,180	289,120	58,026	51,242	82,997	521,565	76,841	598,406	3,451,817
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	-	-	-	86	-	86	86
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	10,845	-	10,845	-	11,200	466	-	-	11,666	7,767	19,433	30,278
Butte	-	-	-	-	-	32,490	-	32,490	5,733	70,463	1,169	5,052	8,388	90,805	103,816	194,621	227,111
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	12,302	-	12,302	-	519	-	3,893	-	4,412	1,131	5,543	17,845
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	22,798	-	22,798	988	70,388	-	-	470	71,846	38,058	109,904	132,702
Contra Costa	892,671	3,131	-	895,802	-	55,721	-	951,523	41,289	381,487	18,316	15,535	675	457,302	42,544	499,846	1,451,369
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	3,437	-	3,437	-	46,346	-	-	63	46,409	17,759	64,168	67,605
El Dorado	120,445	1,540	-	121,985	-	5,644	-	127,629	704	69,213	-	808	1,008	71,733	9,118	80,851	208,480
Fresno	1,889,983	21,214	68,338	1,979,535	-	91,191	-	2,070,726	16,646	65,090	13,919	42,650	45,405	183,710	6,479	190,189	2,260,915
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	18,676	-	18,676	359	34,636	-	16,350	-	51,345	23,664	75,009	93,685
Humboldt	-	-	-	-	-	22,798	-	22,798	-	56,706	-	480	800	57,986	34,428	92,414	115,212
Imperial	439,465	2,663	-	442,128	-	19,772	-	461,900	-	35,434	-	-	-	35,434	13,631	49,065	510,965
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	22,798	-	22,798	-	26,101	-	1,683	-	27,784	13,380	41,164	63,962
Kern	1,577,869	23,943	-	1,601,812	-	91,191	-	1,693,003	71,258	309,774	9,127	209,017	451	599,627	102,736	702,363	2,395,366
Kings	182,349	2,833	-	185,182	-	22,798	-	207,980	-	46,096	6,244	384	-	52,724	29,726	82,450	290,430
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	8,433	-	8,433	-	65,606	-	-	470	66,076	16,469	82,545	90,978
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	22,798	-	22,798	-	13,991	-	4,777	-	18,768	3,193	21,961	44,759
Los Angeles	26,474,934	25,679	299,226	26,799,839	-	91,191	317,059	27,208,089	135,223	1,668,654	180,859	106,938	735,366	2,827,040	349,980	3,177,020	30,385,109
Madera	312,818	10	-	312,828	-	21,764	-	334,592	-	59,694	-	35,064	-	94,758	18,289	113,047	447,639
Marin	455,356	-	-	455,356	-	45,596	-	500,952	-	28,130	-	3,575	-	31,705	27,456	59,161	560,113
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	22,798	-	22,798	-	4,509	-	276	313	5,098	7,433	12,531	35,329
Mendocino	112,407	-	-	112,407	-	18,378	-	130,785	14,083	19,404	-	282	2,327	36,096	34,411	70,507	201,292
Merced	467,928	3,136	-	471,064	-	45,596	-	516,660	8,847	189,764	2,905	33,957	16,622	252,095	146,377	398,472	915,132
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	450	-	4,200	-	-	4,650	-	4,650	4,650
Mono	27,444	-	1,744	29,188	-	-	-	29,188	-	80	-	727	2,559	3,366	4,423	7,789	36,977
Monterey	542,375	535	-	542,910	-	45,596	-	588,506	10,486	153,779	30,098	45,860	4,500	244,723	49,362	294,085	882,591
Napa	309,198	20	-	309,218	-	18,512	-	327,730	-	121,982	-	282	-	122,264	20,484	142,748	470,478
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	10,685	-	10,685	313	5,581	216	19,902	1,566	27,578	7,671	35,249	45,934
Orange	6,353,427	9,984	17,160	6,380,571	-	74,944	151,950	6,607,465	62,123	1,064,756	86,522	317,556	144,953	1,675,910	32,417	1,708,327	8,315,792
Placer	63,334	364	934	64,632	-	45,596	-	110,228	7,524	105,178	-	20,965	12,879	146,546	71,908	218,454	328,682
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	7,598	-	7,598	1,473	100	-	-	157	1,730	4,388	6,118	13,716
Riverside	2,659,572	4,749	10,029	2,674,350	-	70,118	-	2,744,468	19,136	286,487	11,101	18,966	159,177	494,867	85,820	580,687	3,325,155
Sacramento	2,624,731	10,522	192,926	2,828,179	-	91,191	-	2,919,370	74,711	210,039	38,143	37,574	44,465	404,932	94,026	498,958	3,418,328
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	105,604	-	1,944	-	107,548	-	107,548	107,548
San Bernardino	4,136,230	49	-	4,136,279	-	91,191	-	4,227,470	19,448	472,840	10,554	3,646	-	506,488	72,337	578,825	4,806,295
San Diego	5,274,152	6,737	14,673	5,295,562	-	91,191	47,225	5,433,978	102,759	193,269	65,695	123,882	140	485,745	100,855	586,600	6,020,578
San Francisco	1,603,276	62	7,345	1,610,683	-	91,191	-	1,701,874	54,279	372,005	17,568	78,680	63,868	586,400	51,845	638,245	2,340,119
San Joaquin	745,602	1,098	181,259	927,959	-	91,191	-	1,019,150	23,849	204,247	6,375	11,290	-	245,761	47,307	293,068	1,312,218
San Luis Obispo	269,751	-	-	269,751	-	43,948	-	313,699	19,977	61,677	1,564	-	16,564	99,782	18,676	118,458	432,157
San Mateo	1,239,140	630	-	1,239,770	-	91,191	-	1,330,961	37,644	160,835	14,108	81,708	2,112	296,407	25,788	322,195	1,653,156
Santa Barbara	961,014	1,488	-	962,502	-	45,596	-	1,008,098	462	193,000	57,513	929	17,874	269,778	35,459	305,237	1,313,335
Santa Clara	2,500,771	7,862	63,806	2,572,439	-	91,191	-	2,663,630	13,766	134,156	42,105	98,041	40,714	328,782	59,845	388,627	3,052,257
Santa Cruz	532,270	-	-	532,270	-	45,596	-	577,866	5,237	19,923	520	-	7,591	33,271	11,347	44,618	622,484
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	35,596	-	35,596	17,048	46,925	-	10,183	4,233	78,389	85,290	163,679	199,275
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	4,230	-	4,230	-	674	-	-	-	674	-	674	4,904
Siskiyou	-	36	-	36	-	14,435	-	14,471	4,317	41,366	-	982	-	46,665	25,278	71,943	86,414
Solano	196,924	-	-	196,924	-	32,447	-	229,371	13,693	102,894	8,920	75,983	11,121	212,611	24,284	236,895	466,266
Sonoma	1,074,001	310	34,943	1,109,254	-	45,596	-	1,154,850	12,345	51,965	5,081	12,063	28,309	109,763	22,632	132,395	1,287,245
Stanislaus	431,320	-	-	431,320	-	-	-	431,320	7,573	34,381	13,518	33,529	9,631	98,632	28,195	126,827	558,147
Sutter	243,875	111	-	243,986	-	18,125	-	262,111	4,399	4,809	561	1,017	3,727	14,513	6,553	21,066	283,177
Tehama	86,120	-	-	86,120	-	22,798	-	108,918	2,507	282	1,404	14,488	1,691	20,372	6,774	27,146	136,064
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	21,248	-	21,248	-	17,327	-	-	-	17,327	18,671	35,998	57,246
Tulare	754,348	1,339	-	755,687	-	45,596	-	801,283	32,543	380,128	9,263	72,494	27,437	521,865	111,282	633,147	1,434,430
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	15,345	-	15,345	-	11,851	-	92	564	12,507	3,513	16,020	31,365
Ventura	627,128	2,138	-	629,266	-	89,650	-	718,916	42,929	706,545	16,895	18,702	-	785,071	61,807	846,878	1,565,794
Yolo	106,457	-	-	106,457	-	33,047	-	139,504	39,077	209,034	2,030	9,541	2,288	261,970	116,000	377,970	517,474
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	19,117	-	19,117	7,021	16,850	875	-	1,252	25,998	13,940	39,938	59,055
TOTAL	69,045,748	137,340	892,383	70,075,471	-	2,243,962	516,234	72,835,667	972,399	9,052,980	735,860	1,642,989	1,504,727	13,908,955	2,442,863	16,351,818	89,187,485