



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: April 24, 2014

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Maximum Reimbursement of Unused Savings from Program 45.45 for Court Interpreter Expenditures	Action Required
	Effective Date
	April 24, 2014
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
N/A	April 18, 2014
Recommended by	Contact
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County and Cochair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	Patrick Ballard, 818-558-3115 patrick.ballard@jud.ca.gov
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director and Chief Financial Officer, AOC Fiscal Services Office and Cochair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	

Executive Summary

At its January 23, 2014 meeting, the Judicial Council directed the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to provide recommendations to the council at its April 2014 meeting on the maximum amount each trial court will be eligible to receive in reimbursement from the \$12,924,795 of accumulated unused savings from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Program 45.45 for expenditures on interpreters in civil cases where the parties are indigent and, should there be insufficient funding in Program 45.45, for costs related to court interpreters for all

appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases in which there is a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases.

In response to the council direction, the TCBAC formed an Interpreter Funding Subcommittee (subcommittee) which provided recommendations to the full advisory committee at its March 25, 2014 meeting. At that and a subsequent meeting on April 17, 2014, the TCBAC adopted four recommendations related to the unused savings from the TCTF Program 45.45. The recommendations include setting a maximum reimbursement from the unused savings that each interpreter region (except for those two courts that are not part of a region) would be eligible to receive, tracking the reimbursement of the unused savings, prioritizing reimbursement of interpreter services for mandatory and previously grant-reimbursed cases, and establishing separate tracking of expenditures for interpreter services for indigent parties in civil cases.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the council, effective April 24, 2014, approve the following recommendations related to the unspent savings from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Program 45.45.

1. Each interpreter region shall be eligible to receive in reimbursement from the unused savings a percentage of the unused savings that is equal to the average percentage of Program 45.45 reimbursements it received over the past five years. The Superior Courts of Solano and Ventura Counties which are not in interpreter regions, would be eligible for individual earmarked funds based on the same methodology. For fiscal year 2013–2014, approval of this recommendation would result in the allocation to the regions (and two individual courts) of the amounts contained in the shaded rows on Attachment A.
2. Staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) should track the rate at which the unused savings are being drawn down and report that information each month to the trial courts. The TCBAC should review this information at least once each quarter.
3. If requests for reimbursement for mandated case types and domestic violence matters (including family law matters in which there is a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse) from the TCTF Program 45.45 appropriation in the current fiscal year (FY 2013–2014) exceed the amount of money in that fund, then the unused savings should first be allocated to Program 45.45 in an amount sufficient to cover the shortfall. This same amount of unused savings shall also be held to ensure adequate funds are available in FY 2014–2015 to cover the mandated case types and domestic violence matters. In FY 2014–2015, upon review and approval of the TCBAC, all remaining unused savings shall be allocated to each interpreter region pursuant to the percentages established in Recommendation 1. If (a) requests for reimbursement from the TCTF Program 45.45 appropriation in FY 2014–2015 exceed the amount of money in that fund, and (b) the unused savings have not been exhausted by the end of FY 2014–2015, then the remaining unused savings shall be allocated to the unsatisfied requests for reimbursement. The council should

direct AOC staff to seek the necessary expenditure authority to permit reimbursement from the unused savings in FY 2013–2014 and FY 2014–2015. If there are additional unused savings in FY 2013–2014 from the Program 45.45 appropriation, those amounts shall be added to the total reimbursement each region, and the two unaffiliated courts, are eligible to receive in FY 2014–2015.

4. The expenditures for requests for reimbursement that result from providing interpreters for indigent parties in civil cases are to be tracked separately. Data on those requests for reimbursement should be tracked monthly so it can be determined how quickly the unused savings are being spent. Direct AOC staff to create the necessary procedures that would collect this data from the Phoenix Financial System.

Previous Council Action

The following council actions have had an impact on the recommendations presented in this report.

- In October 2010, the council approved a policy that the \$4.84 million in savings from the TCTF Program 45.45 appropriation for FY 2009–2010, and any future savings, be set aside and made available to address future reimbursable court interpreter costs, including base funding.
- In July 2011, the council redirected \$3.0 million in savings in the FY 2009–2010 Court Interpreters Program to support court operations, with the remaining \$1.84 million in savings to be for the use of the Court Interpreters Program.
- In May 2013, the Executive and Planning Committee, on behalf of the council, approved the formation of a limited-term Ad Hoc Joint Working Group to Address Court Interpreter Issues (ad hoc working group) made up of representatives from each of the council’s civil law subject matter advisory committees as well as the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC), TCBAC, the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee, the Court Interpreters Advisory Panel, and the council’s internal Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee.
- In August 2013, the council approved allocating \$1.73 million for the Domestic Violence—Family Law Interpreter Program (DV-FLIP) from the TCTF using the Program 45.45 expenditure authority, rather than from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, which had been the source of the funding in previous years.
- At its January 23, 2014 meeting, the council directed the TCBAC to provide recommendations to the council at its April 2014 meeting on the maximum amount each court will be eligible to receive in reimbursement from the \$12,924,795 of accumulated unused savings from Program 45.45 for expenditures on interpreters in civil cases where the parties are indigent and, should there be insufficient funding in Program 45.45, for costs

related to court interpreters for all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases in which there is a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases. The council further directed that the advisory committee's recommendations should be developed in a manner that will result in complete exhaustion of the unused savings by the end of FY 2014–2015. These directions were made based on the recommendations of the working group, which was charged with making recommendations to the council about options (a) for using all or a portion of the accumulated Program 45.45 funds and (b) for ensuring coordination of efforts designed to expand the provision of court interpreter services in California.

- At the January meeting, in addition to directing the TCBAC to recommend maximum allocations of the unused savings, the council also approved using Program 45.45 funds (the annual appropriation and unspent savings) to reimburse courts for costs related to court interpreters for all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases in which there is a domestic violence issue, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases, and eliminating the previous \$1.73 million cap for such expenditures. The council also approved that courts can be reimbursed from the Program 45.45 appropriation and unused savings for court interpreters for indigent parties in civil cases. In addition, the council approved a recommendation that courts would be directed to track the usage of interpreters in civil matters and report this information to the AOC in the format and time frame specified by the AOC.

Rationale for Recommendation

Current interpreter reimbursement process

Currently regional budgets are established for each of the four interpreter regions based on each region's percentage of the previous year's total interpreter reimbursement. The Superior Courts of Solano and Ventura Counties do not belong to an interpreter region and so have their own individual budgets, based on the same methodology. The actual reimbursements to courts for interpreter costs are made on a monthly basis. Funds are advanced to the courts for staff interpreter costs based on the salary and benefit information for filled positions reported by the courts in their most current Schedule 7A. Contract interpreter costs are reimbursed based on the actual expenditures reported by courts in the Phoenix Financial System, as are cross-assignment costs. At the end of the fiscal year, a year-end adjustment survey is completed by each court in which they report their eligible reimbursable interpreter costs for the year. This amount is then compared with the amount already reimbursed to the court. Courts either receive additional funds if they were underreimbursed, or have their current reimbursements reduced, if they were overreimbursed. Because the expenditures have not exceeded the Budget Act appropriation for the program—\$92.7 million—for the past several years, all courts have been fully reimbursed for their eligible expenditures.

Interpreter Funding Subcommittee

In response to the council's direction to the TCBAC at its January 23, 2014 meeting, the TCBAC formed an Interpreter Funding Subcommittee (subcommittee) and directed that it provide

recommendations addressing the council's charge to the full advisory committee at its March 25, 2014 meeting. The members of the subcommittee are: Judges Barry Goode (chair), Steven Austin, and Mark Cope, and Court Executive Officers Sherri Carter, Shawn Landry, and Christina Volkens. The subcommittee met on February 26 and March 6, 2014 and considered the following information in developing its recommendations:

1. Filings data, broken down by case type.
2. Each court's past reimbursement from Program 45.45 funding for mandated cases for the past five fiscal years. The subcommittee examined each court's percentage of total reimbursement based on an average of the last five years of reimbursements, an average of the last three years of reimbursements, and just the reimbursements for the 2012–2013 fiscal year. The subcommittee also examined what division of the unused interpreter savings would be if the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) percentages were used. (See Attachment B for the allocations that would result based on the options considered.)
3. Census data on the population by county of individuals who speak English "less than very well."

The subcommittee determined that there was no good data that demonstrated anticipated need and usage by court for interpreters in civil cases where the parties are indigent. While several efforts are beginning that will help in obtaining a better understanding of the need and anticipated use of interpreters in these areas, and the resulting cost, that information is not currently available. The subcommittee decided that case filings data was not a good determinant of the relative need for interpreter funding by court. There was no real correlation between the number of filings and the need for interpreters in these cases. The subcommittee also opted not to consider the census data. They then reviewed the percentage of total reimbursement from Program 45.45 for each court based on the most recent five years, the most recent three years, and the most recent year. The subcommittee felt that basing an allocation on a single year's reimbursement did not allow for appropriate smoothing of possible significant one-year variations in interpreter usage. They observed that there was little difference between the five-year average and the three-year average, but concluded that the five-year average would be the fairest comparison.

The subcommittee also considered using the percentage of the 2013–2014 trial court allocation each court would receive (when applying WAFM to 10% of the base funding and all of the new \$60 million and the historical percentages to the remaining 90% of the base) or the straight WAFM formula. However, the subcommittee quickly concluded this was not a reasonable representation of the relative need for funding among the courts for costs of interpreters. The subcommittee therefore recommended to the TCBAC using each court's five-year average percentage of total Program 45.45 reimbursement to determine the percentage of the unspent savings that each court will be eligible to receive.

The subcommittee and TCBAC recommended that AOC staff track the usage of the unspent funding on a monthly basis and that the TCBAC review this usage quarterly. Tracking these reimbursements will let courts know how much of their maximum allocation is still available to them, with the understanding that adjustments will need to be made if the FY 2013–2014 costs for interpreter services in mandatory and previously DV-FLIP grant-funded cases exceed the Program 45.45 expenditure authority of \$92.794 million.

The recommended methodology will, in effect, prioritize, without a funding cap, reimbursement for interpreter services in mandated cases, and all appearances in domestic violence cases, family law cases in which there are domestic violence issues, and elder or dependent adult abuse cases. At the same time, there will be funds available to each court for some expansion into civil cases where parties are indigent. The subcommittee members felt it was important that the previously approved reimbursable costs continue to be fully reimbursed.

Separately tracking the reimbursements for interpreter services for indigent civil parties will enable the TCBAC to obtain important data, including whether individual courts are expanding interpreter services to include indigent parties in civil cases.

TCBAC meeting

The TCBAC met twice to consider recommendations for allocation of the unspent interpreter funding. At the second meeting, on April 17, 2014, they amended their original proposed allocation methodology, which had been contained in Recommendation 1 and would have allocated funding on an individual court basis, to a methodology that allocates funds on a regional basis, with the exception of the two courts that do not belong to an interpreter region. Using a regional allocation will allow courts more flexibility to expend the funds without requiring further action from the council to reallocate the funding at a later date. Each region would provide services until the region's allocated funds are exhausted. This modified Recommendation 1 was proposed by CEAC. (See the Alternatives discussion in the next section of the report). The chair of the ad hoc working group, who attended the April 17 TCBAC meeting, stated that this amended recommendation was in keeping with the ad hoc working group recommendation and that the court executive officers agreed with this methodology. All but one member of the TCBAC who voted on the motion voted in favor of the amended recommendation. Recommendations 2 through 4 were not changed at the second meeting.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Comments

This item was not circulated for public comment, but review of issues was sought from the CEAC.

Alternatives

At its March 25, 2014 meeting, TCBAC members expressed concern that the proposed implementation of expanded interpreter services into civil cases would trigger meet-and-confer

requirements with California's regional interpreter unions. In light of the TCBAC's specific charge, the cochairs of the TCBAC requested that the CEAC review the issues and determine whether these concerns should be raised before the council.

CEAC met on April 2, 2014 and discussed the policy implications surrounding a statewide and uniform expansion of court interpreting services. As part of this discussion, CEAC considered the need for a reallocation methodology that would allow courts to maintain regional uniformity in the delivery of services without requiring the council to reallocate the funding at a later date. Because the courts bargain regionally, CEAC determined that the allocation of surplus funding would be better allocated regionally, as is done with the existing interpreter funding. Without this regional allocation, as the 58 individual courts draw down the funds made available to them, there would have to be a process in place to request that the council reallocate funds away from courts that are not fully expending their allotments to courts that have used up their projected funding. This would place those courts that draw down all of their funding in the position of ceasing to provide services while other courts continue to provide them. Under this new recommendation, earmarked funds in one region would be available to all courts in that region until all of the funds have been expended. This regional allocation methodology was presented to the TCBAC at its April 17, 2014 meeting and was approved by TCBAC, thereby amending their original Recommendation 1, for consideration by the council.

Policy implications

The ad hoc working group stated in its report to the council at the January 23, 2014 council meeting, that waiting to change the interpreter reimbursement policies until enactment of the statutory amendment authorizing expenditure of court resources for interpreters in civil matters was not consistent with the ad hoc working group's charge and their understanding that immediate action should be taken to expand access to interpreters in ways that the branch believes are legally permissible. The council supported this understanding by approving the ad hoc working group's recommendations.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

As mentioned above, concern was expressed at the TCBAC meeting about how to implement the expansion of interpreter services into civil cases with indigent parties. For example, should implementation be the same for all courts in a region since expansion into civil will trigger meet-and-confer requirements? TCBAC felt that they were not the appropriate body to address these types of issues. TCBAC unanimously agreed to proceed with their allocation recommendations and to have implementation issues addressed by CEAC. This referral to CEAC resulted in the regional allocation methodology being recommended (in Recommendation 1) in this report. In addition, CEAC adopted a phased-in approach to the delivery of expanded services in civil cases with indigent parties that fits within the direction of the council at its January 23, 2014 meeting.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This report relates to strategic plan Goal I: Access, Fairness, and Diversity. One of the objectives to Goal I is to “[i]ncrease qualified interpreter services in mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court venues; increase the availability of language-assistance services to all court users.” Providing and tracking the use of these funds in reimbursing courts for expanded interpreter services in civil cases will allow for the development of more compelling and better justified requests for additional ongoing interpreter funding in the future.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Proposed Regional Allocation of Unspent Savings from Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters)
2. Attachment B: Options for Allocation of Unspent Savings to Individual Courts from Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters)

Proposed Regional Allocation of Unspent Savings from Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters)

Court	Region	Allocation Based on 5-Year Average
Los Angeles	1	4,557,330
San Luis Obispo	1	59,026
Santa Barbara	1	169,997
Region 1 Allocation:		4,786,353
Alameda	2	472,488
Contra Costa	2	200,830
Del Norte	2	7,454
Humboldt	2	15,730
Lake	2	14,722
Marin	2	79,612
Mendocino	2	42,530
Monterey	2	122,424
Napa	2	66,619
San Benito	2	14,379
San Francisco	2	307,050
San Mateo	2	230,265
Santa Clara	2	456,287
Santa Cruz	2	95,566
Sonoma	2	180,748
Region 2 Allocation:		2,306,705
Alpine	3	259
Amador	3	4,873
Butte	3	27,203
Calaveras	3	2,739
Colusa	3	18,448
El Dorado	3	27,856
Fresno	3	347,388
Glenn	3	13,115
Kern	3	331,296
Kings	3	40,315
Lassen	3	6,134
Madera	3	68,327
Mariposa	3	4,922
Merced	3	121,779
Modoc	3	748
Mono	3	5,040
Nevada	3	8,624
Placer	3	60,797
Plumas	3	3,653
Sacramento	3	481,565
San Joaquin	3	194,186
Shasta	3	31,670
Sierra	3	578
Siskiyou	3	11,209
Stanislaus	3	90,304
Sutter	3	42,271
Tehama	3	19,221
Trinity	3	5,500
Tulare	3	191,064
Tuolumne	3	4,052
Yolo	3	77,937
Yuba	3	10,026
Region 3 Allocation:		2,253,098
Imperial	4	81,712
Inyo	4	8,292
Orange	4	1,184,410
Riverside	4	488,528
San Bernardino	4	668,241
San Diego	4	867,493
Region 4 Allocation:		3,298,677
Solano Allocation:		55,649
Ventura Allocation:		224,313
Total Allocation:		12,924,795

Options for Allocation of Unspent Savings to Individual Courts from Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters)

Court	5 Yr Average Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 5 Yr Avg	3 Yr Average Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 3 Yr Avg	2012-2013 Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 2012-2013 Reimb	2013-2014 Allocation %	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 2013-2014 Allocation	WAFM Formula Only	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on WAFM Only
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Alameda	3.66%	472,488	3.83%	494,475	3.99%	515,699	4.67%	603,588	3.95%	510,529
Alpine	0.00%	259	0.00%	369	0.00%	0	0.04%	5,170	0.01%	1,292
Amador	0.04%	4,873	0.03%	4,107	0.03%	3,877	0.14%	18,095	0.10%	12,925
Butte	0.21%	27,203	0.22%	28,703	0.19%	24,557	0.51%	65,916	0.52%	67,209
Calaveras	0.02%	2,739	0.02%	2,214	0.01%	1,292	0.13%	16,802	0.10%	12,925
Colusa	0.14%	18,448	0.14%	17,805	0.11%	14,217	0.09%	11,632	0.07%	9,047
Contra Costa	1.55%	200,830	1.59%	204,910	1.64%	211,967	2.30%	297,270	2.36%	305,025
Del Norte	0.06%	7,454	0.05%	6,697	0.04%	5,170	0.15%	19,387	0.13%	16,802
El Dorado	0.22%	27,856	0.22%	28,249	0.20%	25,850	0.41%	52,992	0.40%	51,699
Fresno	2.69%	347,388	2.50%	322,854	2.36%	305,025	2.42%	312,780	2.56%	330,875
Glenn	0.10%	13,115	0.10%	12,461	0.08%	10,340	0.12%	15,510	0.08%	10,340
Humboldt	0.12%	15,730	0.12%	14,985	0.07%	9,047	0.34%	43,944	0.29%	37,482
Imperial	0.63%	81,712	0.59%	76,412	0.56%	72,379	0.44%	56,869	0.47%	60,747
Inyo	0.06%	8,292	0.06%	7,459	0.04%	5,170	0.12%	15,510	0.08%	10,340
Kern	2.56%	331,296	2.62%	338,599	2.50%	323,120	2.11%	272,713	2.66%	343,800
Kings	0.31%	40,315	0.32%	40,863	0.30%	38,774	0.34%	43,944	0.36%	46,529
Lake	0.11%	14,722	0.11%	14,290	0.08%	10,340	0.19%	24,557	0.15%	19,387
Lassen	0.05%	6,134	0.04%	5,216	0.01%	1,292	0.13%	16,802	0.11%	14,217
Los Angeles	35.26%	4,557,330	35.18%	4,546,474	36.20%	4,678,776	27.56%	3,562,074	29.11%	3,762,408
Madera	0.53%	68,327	0.51%	66,293	0.56%	72,379	0.41%	52,992	0.40%	51,699
Marin	0.62%	79,612	0.60%	78,023	0.54%	69,794	0.86%	111,153	0.57%	73,671
Mariposa	0.04%	4,922	0.04%	4,722	0.02%	2,585	0.06%	7,755	0.05%	6,462
Mendocino	0.33%	42,530	0.26%	33,130	0.23%	29,727	0.30%	38,774	0.28%	36,189
Merced	0.94%	121,779	0.97%	125,028	0.97%	125,371	0.65%	84,011	0.78%	100,813
Modoc	0.01%	748	0.01%	668	0.01%	1,292	0.06%	7,755	0.03%	3,877
Mono	0.04%	5,040	0.04%	5,244	0.04%	5,170	0.09%	11,632	0.08%	10,340
Monterey	0.95%	122,424	0.97%	125,063	0.98%	126,663	0.92%	118,908	1.00%	129,248
Napa	0.52%	66,619	0.51%	66,264	0.51%	65,916	0.41%	52,992	0.35%	45,237
Nevada	0.07%	8,624	0.06%	7,147	0.04%	5,170	0.26%	33,604	0.24%	31,020
Orange	9.16%	1,184,410	9.09%	1,174,439	9.00%	1,163,232	8.31%	1,074,050	7.26%	938,340
Placer	0.47%	60,797	0.39%	50,590	0.34%	43,944	0.79%	102,106	0.89%	115,031
Plumas	0.03%	3,653	0.02%	2,080	0.01%	1,292	0.10%	12,925	0.06%	7,755
Riverside	3.78%	488,528	3.65%	471,755	3.49%	451,075	4.15%	536,379	5.05%	652,702
Sacramento	3.73%	481,565	3.78%	488,162	3.82%	493,727	4.29%	554,474	4.38%	566,106
San Benito	0.11%	14,379	0.12%	14,963	0.11%	14,217	0.17%	21,972	0.14%	18,095
San Bernardino	5.17%	668,241	5.27%	681,477	5.15%	665,627	4.53%	585,493	5.79%	748,346
San Diego	6.71%	867,493	6.70%	865,334	6.76%	873,716	8.28%	1,070,173	7.20%	930,585
San Francisco	2.38%	307,050	2.43%	314,641	2.30%	297,270	3.50%	452,368	2.68%	346,385
San Joaquin	1.50%	194,186	1.45%	187,449	1.41%	182,240	1.69%	218,429	1.94%	250,741
San Luis Obispo	0.46%	59,026	0.46%	59,103	0.38%	49,114	0.73%	94,351	0.72%	93,059

Options for Allocation of Unspent Savings to Individual Courts from Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters)

Court	5 Yr Average Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 5 Yr Avg	3 Yr Average Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 3 Yr Avg	2012-2013 Interpreter Reimbursement	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 2012-2013 Reimb	2013-2014 Allocation %	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on 2013-2014 Allocation	WAFM Formula Only	Share of \$12,924,795 Based on WAFM Only
San Mateo	1.78%	230,265	1.85%	239,097	1.79%	231,354	2.03%	262,373	1.86%	240,401
Santa Barbara	1.32%	169,997	1.43%	184,268	1.47%	189,994	1.24%	160,267	1.06%	137,003
Santa Clara	3.53%	456,287	3.56%	460,427	3.81%	492,435	4.96%	641,070	4.06%	524,747
Santa Cruz	0.74%	95,566	0.72%	93,691	0.79%	102,106	0.67%	86,596	0.61%	78,841
Shasta	0.25%	31,670	0.22%	28,544	0.22%	28,435	0.52%	67,209	0.54%	69,794
Sierra	0.00%	578	0.00%	429	0.00%	0	0.04%	5,170	0.01%	1,292
Siskiyou	0.09%	11,209	0.08%	10,923	0.06%	7,755	0.21%	27,142	0.12%	15,510
Solano	0.43%	55,649	0.44%	56,962	0.38%	49,114	1.12%	144,758	1.26%	162,852
Sonoma	1.40%	180,748	1.48%	191,819	1.39%	179,655	1.33%	171,900	1.41%	182,240
Stanislaus	0.70%	90,304	0.63%	80,999	0.55%	71,086	1.13%	146,050	1.40%	180,947
Sutter	0.33%	42,271	0.32%	41,194	0.31%	40,067	0.24%	31,020	0.28%	36,189
Tehama	0.15%	19,221	0.15%	18,832	0.11%	14,217	0.20%	25,850	0.20%	25,850
Trinity	0.04%	5,500	0.05%	6,444	0.05%	6,462	0.07%	9,047	0.07%	9,047
Tulare	1.48%	191,064	1.58%	204,612	1.60%	206,797	0.87%	112,446	0.93%	120,201
Tuolumne	0.03%	4,052	0.03%	3,600	0.01%	1,292	0.18%	23,265	0.15%	19,387
Ventura	1.74%	224,313	1.79%	230,927	1.85%	239,109	1.73%	223,599	1.94%	250,741
Yolo	0.60%	77,937	0.58%	75,341	0.50%	64,624	0.46%	59,454	0.49%	63,331
Yuba	0.08%	10,026	0.06%	7,970	0.05%	6,462	0.22%	28,435	0.18%	23,265
Total:	100.00%	12,924,795	100.00%	12,924,795	100.00%	12,924,795	100.00%	12,924,795	100.00%	12,924,795