

A REPORT TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE  
ON THE USE OF INTERPRETERS IN THE  
CALIFORNIA COURTS

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

December 2004

Judicial Council of California  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
Court Interpreters Program Unit  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

This report has been prepared and submitted to the California Legislature pursuant to provision 4, item 0450-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2003 (Stats. 2003, ch. 157).

Copyright © Judicial Council of California. All rights reserved.

Except as permitted under the Copyright Act of 1976 and as otherwise expressly provided herein, no part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including the use of information and storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the copyright holder. Permission is hereby granted to nonprofit institutions to reproduce and distribute this publication for educational purposes if the copies credit the copyright holder.

This report is also available on the California Courts Web site:  
*[www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/4\\_19interp.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/4_19interp.htm)*.

Printed on 100% recycled and recyclable paper.

## Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	4
A. Legal Mandates	4
B. Court Interpreters Program	5
II. Expenditures on and Use of Interpreters	9
A. Statewide	9
B. By County and Interpreter Category	14
C. Summary of Findings From 40 Courts	15
III. Availability of Certified and Registered Interpreters	18
IV. Recommendations to Increase the Numbers of Certified and Registered Court Interpreters	19
V. Conclusion	20
Appendix	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provision 4, item 0450-101-0932 of the Budget Act of 2003 (Stats. 2003, ch. 157) 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.

### A. Analysis of Expenditures

**Statewide expenditures.** All trial courts in the state report their expenditures for interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements (QFSs) to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Of the \$2.2 billion appropriation for all trial court expenditures in fiscal year 2003–2004, \$65 million was spent on the statewide Court Interpreters Program, accounting for about 3 percent of the total court expenditures (see Table 2). This is approximately the same allocation as for fiscal year 2002–2003.

**Funded Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) staff in Court Interpreters Program.** The trial courts reported 17.5 funded interpreter coordinator positions, 30 staff interpreters, and 641.4 FTE pro tempore interpreters for fiscal year 2004–2005. This represents an increase of 167.3 FTE staff from last fiscal year. This increase was mostly in the category of the pro tempore interpreter. Not all the courts employ pro tempore interpreters in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, about 57 percent of the superior courts—33 of 58—reported authorized funded pro tempore employees in the interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the trial courts' interpreter programs reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state.

### B. Analysis by Language and Interpreter Category

To make a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts' Office of Court Research collected interpreter expenditure data from the trial courts. The principal source of data was the Court Interpreter Data Collection System or

CIDCS.<sup>1</sup> In fiscal year 2003–2004, 40 courts submitted complete information on their interpreter expenditures, using the CIDCS. These courts included larger, urban trial courts and small, rural trial courts in all regions of the state. The 40 courts accounted for 37 percent of the expenditures of the AOC’s Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2002–2003 and for 44 percent of total court expenditures by the courts in the same period (see Table 2).

The data on expenditures by language and certification status that were obtained from the CIDCS are detailed in Table 4 and in the appendix. For the 40 sampled courts, certified court interpreters accounted for about 85 percent of all interpreter expenditures, as reported in the CIDCS. Certified interpreters do nearly all Spanish, Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian interpretations. However, certified interpreter use is much lower for Tagalog, Korean, Portuguese, and Japanese.

About 52 percent of the interpreter expenditures were spent on registered interpreters for non-designated languages for the 40 sampled courts. American Sign Language, Hmong, Lao, Punjabi, Khmer, and Mien were the most often interpreted nondesignated languages. Yet, the proportion of registered interpreters used for those languages is relatively low, particularly for American Sign Language and Khmer, suggesting a need for additional registered interpreters in those languages.

At the individual court level, there is no discernable trend regarding the use of certified and registered interpreters between small, rural courts and larger, urban and suburban courts. The use of certified and registered interpreters for contract per-diem interpretations ranges from 0 percent to 100 percent, depending on the language and location. Specific language needs vary widely, with certain regions showing a growing need for American Sign Language, South Asian, and Southeast Asian language interpreters. Additionally, some courts report anecdotally that proceedings are sometimes delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. In some incidents, noncertified/nonregistered court staff were being called for interpreting tasks if the courts could not locate more-qualified interpreters. Considering that California continues to attract large numbers of new immigrants, the courts will likely experience a steady increase in both the need for interpreter services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed.

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

To address the chronic shortage of qualified spoken language interpreters, AOC staff have focused on key areas, such as recruitment, retention, and employee management efforts.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, AOC staff performed the following recruitment activities:

---

<sup>1</sup> The CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system used by the courts and the AOC to collect and analyze data on the use of and expenditures for spoken language interpreters in the trial courts.

- Conducted the first AOC-sponsored, statewide interpreter conference;
- Continued collaborative efforts with interpreting associations; and
- Maintained the Telephone Interpreting Pilot Project.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Legal Mandates

According to the California Constitution, “a person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings.”<sup>2</sup> In addition, the court must provide a spoken language interpreter for any witness who is unable to understand, or express himself or herself in English well enough to be “understood directly by counsel, court and jury.”<sup>3</sup>

The Judicial Council is charged by statute to administer statewide standards for spoken-language interpreter certification, certification renewal, professional standards, and continuing education as well as interpreter recruitment. Certified and registered spoken language interpreters are required by law to meet certain standards through testing, completion of ethics seminars, and mandated continuing education.<sup>4</sup> Government Code section 68561 and rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court require the trial courts to appoint certified spoken language court interpreters. Courts may use noncertified spoken-language interpreters only after conducting a diligent search for available certified interpreters among state and federally certified court interpreters, administrative hearing-certified interpreters, and interpreter agencies. If the search is unsuccessful, the trial court must specifically qualify the noncertified interpreter and find good cause on the record to use him or her.

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

The AOC and trial courts have been working very hard on the many administrative tasks involved in this transition. For example, the act required the Judicial Council to develop rules for the creation and operation of Regional Court Interpreter Employment Relations Committees (RCIERCs).<sup>5</sup> The RCIERCs, in turn, had to set the terms and conditions of employment for court interpreters and adopt reasonable rules and regulations for the administration of employer-employee relations by April 1, 2003.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cal. Const., art. I, § 14.

<sup>3</sup> Evid. Code, § 752.

<sup>4</sup> Sen. Bill 1304; Stats. 1992, ch. 770.

<sup>5</sup> Gov. Code § 71807(b) provides for the creation of a committee to represent each of the four trial court regions: (1) Region 1—Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties; (2) Region 2—counties of the First and Sixth Appellate Districts, except Solano County; (3) Region 3—counties of the Third and Fifth Appellate Districts; and (4) Region 4—Counties of the Fourth Appellate District.

By May 1, 2003, trial courts had to begin accepting applications, under Government Code section 71804(b), from eligible<sup>6</sup> certified and registered spoken-language<sup>7</sup> court interpreters working in the trial courts as independent contractors. By March 1, 2003, the courts had to identify eligible interpreters who had worked as independent contractors between January 1, 2002, and January 1, 2003, and present to the Judicial Council and the recognized employee organization a list of these interpreters.

AOC and trial court staff took on these and other Senate Bill 371 implementation tasks with minimal increase in personnel.<sup>8</sup> The state's uncertain fiscal climate has posed challenging barriers to the AOC's applications for funding to increase personnel (in both the trial courts and the AOC) to implement and administer the act.

## B. Court Interpreters Program

Under Government Code section 68561(a), the council has "designated" eight spoken languages for which certification examinations are administered—Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. In 2000 the council designated an additional five spoken languages for certification—Armenian, Khmer, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Russian. Due to fiscal constraints, the AOC has not been able to obtain funds to develop examinations for all five of these newly designated languages. However, Armenian (Eastern and Western), Mandarin, and Russian certification examinations were completed and administered in the fall 2004 testing cycle. The results of these examinations will be available in early 2005. AOC staff has completed a budget change request for funds to develop examinations for Khmer and Punjabi. Until all the new certification examinations are completed, the courts are using *registered* interpreters in these two spoken languages whenever possible.

- To become certified in a designated language, a spoken language interpreter must pass a state certification examination (with both written and oral components); register with the Judicial Council; pay the annual \$85 fee; and attend a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop.
- For any of the nondesignated spoken languages (including Khmer and Punjabi at this point), an interpreter can register with the Judicial Council by passing an English proficiency exam (with both written and oral components); registering with the Judicial Council; paying the annual fee of \$50; attending a Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop; and attending a Judicial Council orientation workshop.

---

<sup>6</sup> Gov. Code, § 71804(a) provides that an interpreter is *eligible for employment* if (1) he or she is certified or registered; (2) he or she has provided services to the same trial court as an independent contractor on at least either 30 court days or portions thereof in both calendar years 2001 and 2002, or 60 court days or portions thereof in calendar year 2002; (3) he or she has applied for the position of court interpreter pro tempore prior to July 1, 2003; and (4) the court has not rejected his or her application for cause.

<sup>7</sup> Gov. Code, § 71801(a) stipulates that the act does not apply to sign language interpreters.

<sup>8</sup> The AOC's Court Interpreters Program received funding for four regional coordinators to facilitate cross-assignments intra- and interregionally.

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

The AOC maintains a *Master List of Certified Court Interpreters of Designated Languages and Registered Interpreters of Nondesignated Languages*. Table 1 breaks down, by language, the current total of 1,361 certified interpreters in eight designated languages.<sup>9</sup> An additional 425 interpreters are registered in one or more nondesignated or newly designated languages, for a total of 1,786 certified and registered spoken language interpreters.

Arabic	12
Cantonese	24
Japanese	112
Korean	53
Portuguese	8
Spanish	1,108
Tagalog	5
Vietnamese	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,361</b>

Source: AOC Court Interpreters Program, December 2004

#### Spoken Language Interpreters

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

- **Pro tempore employee:** A certified or registered spoken language interpreter who accepted employment with a superior court on or after July 1, 2003.<sup>10</sup>
  - *Certified interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who has passed the certification examination in one of the thirteen *designated* languages for which there is currently an examination, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics workshop, and meets biennial continuing education and professional requirements.
  - *Registered interpreter:* A spoken language interpreter who has passed an English fluency exam, has attended the Judicial Council Code of Ethics and orientation workshops, and meets biennial continuing education and professional requirements. A registered interpreter may interpret in any of the nondesignated spoken languages, as well as in any newly designated language for which there is no certification examination currently developed.

<sup>9</sup> For purposes of this statistical report, Armenian (Eastern and Western), Mandarin, and Russian interpreters are categorized as “registered” interpreters.

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

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

#### American Sign Language Interpreters

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

Since 1996, the California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CCASDHH) and the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) have been the two programs that certify interpreters for the deaf and hard of hearing on behalf of the Judicial Council. CCASDHH and RID submit a biennial progress report to the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee of the Judicial Council to demonstrate full compliance with the *Guidelines for Approval of Certification Programs for Interpreters for Deaf and Hearing Impaired Persons*.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Any noncertified or nonregistered interpreter interpreting on the record in a criminal or juvenile proceeding must be provisionally qualified under rule 984.2 of the California Rules of Court.

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

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

CCASDHH and RID are responsible for establishing and maintaining their certification processes, including testing, certification, renewals, and continuing education requirements for ASL interpreters. As soon as staffing levels permit, the AOC's CIP Unit will examine recruitment and retention of ASL interpreters and the use of ASL interpreters in California, in addition to overseeing the certification processes of CCASDHH and RID.

## II. EXPENDITURES ON AND USE OF INTERPRETERS

### A. Statewide

All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements (QFSs) to the AOC. The QFSs for the courts in this study for fiscal year 2003–2004 are reported in Table 2. These data are reported in broad categories that include expenditures on personnel (court staff who administer the court interpreter programs as well as court staff employed as interpreters); expenditures on contract, per diem interpreters; and expenditures on travel. Another source of statewide data on interpreters is the Salary and Position Worksheet—compiled by the AOC and reported on Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget—in which all trial courts report the salaries and job titles of authorized, funded staff shown in Table 3.

A third source of statewide data is the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS), an Internet-based data collection system in use by most of the superior courts in California. Beginning in the second quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the AOC launched the CIDCS for tracking expenditures on interpreter services by language, case type, and event type. This system is linked to all 58 trial courts through Serranus, the judicial branch’s internal Web site. As of December 1, 2004, 49 of the 58 courts had input data into the system.

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

The data presented in section C and the appendix are taken from the CIDCS for the fiscal year 2003–2004. Table 4 illustrates data from 40 courts that reported complete data on interpreter usage in the CIDCS from July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004. Data were collected on full- and half-day interpreting sessions by language and certification status as well as by other information such as case type and the number of cases. Only expenditure data by language and certification status are presented here. The certification status is further broken down into court interpreters pro tempore; contract, per diem and opt-out interpreters; and noncertified or nonregistered contract interpreters in both language categories (designated and nondesignated.)

Note that there are differences in the expenditure data reported in the QFSs and the CIDCS (Tables 2 and 4). Since the CIDCS data is not used as the basis for payment to the courts, it should not be used as a definitive source for expenditure data. Rather, the value of the CIDCS is in showing expenditures for contract, per diem court interpretation by language and certification status. This data will, among other things, help courts and the Court Interpreters Program recognize languages that should become certified due to high usage levels or identify courts and languages that would benefit from having more court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters.

The 40 sample courts<sup>13</sup>—which include courts of all sizes, from large, urban courts such as San Diego to smaller, more rural courts such as Tuolumne—reported that they had used more than 73 languages during the fiscal year 2003–2004. As Table 2 illustrates, interpreter expenditures by these sample courts accounted for 37 percent of the \$65 million spent on court interpreting in California in fiscal year 2003–2004, whereas the total court expenditures of the 40 sample courts correspond to 44 percent of the \$2.2 billion statewide court expenditures.

---

<sup>13</sup> Due to heavy usage of interpreters and low numbers of staff, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County was unable to provide information on interpreter usage in the CIDCS in this reporting period.

**Table 2: Total Expenditures on Interpreters by Court, Fiscal Year 2003—2004**

Superior Court of California, County of	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Total Court Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Amador	\$3,023,418	\$26,248	0.87%	0.04%
Butte	\$12,181,239	\$141,550	1.16%	0.22%
Calaveras	\$2,339,720	\$18,732	0.80%	0.03%
Colusa	\$1,323,684	\$110,614	8.36%	0.17%
Contra Costa	\$51,553,355	\$954,967	1.85%	1.47%
Del Norte	\$2,303,884	\$27,624	1.20%	0.04%
El Dorado	\$8,050,626	\$85,565	1.06%	0.13%
Fresno	\$41,510,680	\$1,795,245	4.32%	2.76%
Glenn	\$2,196,216	\$91,727	4.18%	0.14%
Imperial	\$7,968,192	\$279,458	3.51%	0.43%
Inyo	\$2,221,571	\$15,352	0.69%	0.02%
Kern	\$41,228,947	\$1,245,660	3.02%	1.91%
Kings	\$6,595,615	\$196,762	2.98%	0.30%
Lassen	\$2,410,204	\$26,660	1.11%	0.04%
Madera	\$5,482,744	\$325,815	5.94%	0.50%
Marin	\$16,873,117	\$386,409	2.29%	0.59%
Merced	\$10,696,028	\$479,922	4.49%	0.74%
Mono	\$1,299,678	\$30,328	2.33%	0.05%
Nevada	\$6,124,352	\$99,876	1.63%	0.15%
Plumas	\$2,078,237	\$6,688	0.32%	0.01%
Sacramento	\$87,019,887	\$2,030,486	2.33%	3.12%
San Benito (1)	\$2,843,352	\$53,636	2.52%	0.08%
San Bernardino	\$86,779,790	\$2,527,223	2.91%	3.88%
San Diego	\$189,595,975	\$3,725,319	1.96%	5.72%
San Joaquin	\$28,793,926	\$849,097	2.95%	1.30%
San Luis Obispo	\$14,425,280	\$195,836	1.36%	0.30%
San Mateo	\$44,469,457	\$1,203,336	2.71%	1.85%
Santa Barbara	\$24,991,771	\$725,240	2.90%	1.11%
Santa Clara	\$109,490,527	\$2,666,458	2.44%	4.09%
Santa Cruz	\$14,627,155	\$484,320	3.31%	0.74%
Shasta	\$11,812,100	\$93,343	0.79%	0.14%
Siskiyou	\$4,518,375	\$58,356	1.29%	0.09%
Stanislaus	\$18,694,459	\$515,214	2.76%	0.79%
Sutter	\$4,758,052	\$133,482	2.81%	0.20%
Tehama	\$3,700,680	\$100,062	2.70%	0.15%
Tulare	\$18,991,529	\$746,077	3.93%	1.15%
Tuolumne	\$3,486,583	\$23,800	0.68%	0.04%
Ventura	\$43,394,388	\$998,651	2.30%	1.53%
Yolo	\$10,313,981	\$386,317	3.75%	0.59%
Yuba	\$4,545,858	\$85,319	1.88%	0.13%
<b>40 confirmed courts</b>	<b>\$954,714,632</b>	<b>\$23,946,774</b>	<b>2.51%</b>	<b>36.70%</b>
<b>Rest of the state</b>	<b>\$1,226,891,448</b>	<b>\$41,307,991</b>	<b>3.37%</b>	<b>63.30%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>\$2,181,606,080</b>	<b>\$65,254,765</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2003—2004

(1) As of December 15, 2004, Q4 San Benito was not available, so a projection based on the first three quarters was used.

**Table 3: Fiscal Year 2004—2005 Authorized, Funded FTE Staff  
in Court Interpreters Program as of July 1, 2004**

Superior Court of California, County of	Pro Tempore Interpreter	Staff Interpreter	Interpreter Coordinator	Total Interpreter Staff 04—05	Total Interpreter Staff 03—04	Change 03—04 to 04—05
Alameda	18.5	-	-	18.5	-	18.5
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-
Butte	-	-	-	-	-	-
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	0.1	-0.1
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	5.0	-	-	5.0	-	5.0
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	1.0	-	-	1.0	-	1.0
Fresno	14.6	6.0	-	20.6	6.0	14.6
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	-
Humboldt	-	-	-	-	-	-
Imperial	5.0	-	-	5.0	3.0	2.0
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kern	6.0	2.0	1.0	9.0	3.0	6.0
Kings	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	370.0	-	8.0	378.0	359.0	19.0
Madera	5.0	-	-	5.0	5.0	-
Marin	3.0	-	-	3.0	5.0	-2.0
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	1.0	-	-	1.0	-	1.0
Merced	1.0	-	-	1.0	-	1.0
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mono	1.0	-	-	1.0	1.0	-
Monterey	6.0	-	-	6.0	-	6.0
Napa	2.0	-	-	2.0	-	2.0
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orange	50.0	1.0	-	51.0	35.0	16.0
Placer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	15.0	1.0	-	16.0	1.0	15.0
Sacramento	4.0	-	-	4.0	5.0	-1.0
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	42.0	-	-	42.0	42.0	-
San Diego	35.6	7.0	-	42.6	17.5	25.1
San Francisco	10.2	-	1.0	11.2	-	11.2
San Joaquin	6.0	-	-	6.0	-	6.0
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	7.6	-	1.0	8.6	1.0	7.6
Santa Barbara	3.0	5.0	0.5	8.5	6.5	2.0
Santa Clara	14.0	-	-	14.0	6.5	7.5
Santa Cruz	-	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	-
Shasta	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solano	-	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	-
Sonoma	7.0	-	1.0	8.0	6.0	2.0
Stanislaus	2.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
Sutter	1.0	-	-	1.0	1.0	-
Tehama	1.0	1.0	-	2.0	2.0	-
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tulare	4.0	-	-	4.0	4.0	-
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura	-	5.0	1.0	6.0	6.0	-
Yolo	-	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	-
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>641.4</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>688.9</b>	<b>521.6</b>	<b>167.3</b>

**Table 4: Expenditures on Contract Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$5,920,310	\$5,827,113	\$1,720,659	\$13,468,082	87%	76.8%
Vietnamese	\$53,001	\$414,913	\$191,213	\$659,127	71%	3.8%
Russian (1)	\$75,221	\$208,311	\$11,719	\$295,250	96%	1.7%
Tagalog	-	\$41,719	\$132,220	\$173,939	24%	1.0%
Mandarin (1)	\$7,819	\$133,781	\$9,929	\$151,530	93%	0.9%
Armenian (1)	\$9,594	\$90,825	\$14,206	\$114,624	88%	0.7%
Korean	\$7,081	\$44,331	\$47,096	\$98,507	52%	0.6%
Cantonese	\$24,033	\$40,211	\$27,528	\$91,773	70%	0.5%
Arabic	\$735	\$37,615	\$27,548	\$65,898	58%	0.4%
Portuguese	-	\$15,833	\$37,524	\$53,357	30%	0.3%
Japanese	-	\$8,540	\$21,374	\$29,915	29%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$6,097,794</b>	<b>\$6,863,192</b>	<b>\$2,241,016</b>	<b>\$15,202,003</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>87%</b>
Nondesigned Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$176,667	\$422,929	\$599,596	29%	3.4%
Hmong	\$162,979	\$41,117	\$92,870	\$296,965	69%	1.7%
Lao	\$42,916	\$116,897	\$95,223	\$255,036	63%	1.5%
Punjabi	\$66,528	\$111,794	\$52,597	\$230,919	77%	1.3%
Khmer	\$87,039	\$22,277	\$91,972	\$201,289	54%	1.1%
All Other Languages (2)	\$19,813	\$38,451	\$129,383	\$187,647	31%	1.1%
Mien	\$24,377	\$61,289	\$48,050	\$133,716	64%	0.8%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (3)	\$2,147	\$23,432	\$47,963	\$73,543	35%	0.4%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (4)	-	\$52,160	\$13,246	\$65,407	80%	0.4%
Farsi (5)	\$294	\$49,219	\$13,458	\$62,970	79%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (6)	\$7,119	\$33,781	\$15,053	\$55,952	73%	0.3%
African Languages (7)	-	\$8,437	\$42,036	\$50,473	17%	0.3%
Tongan	-	\$30,964	\$17,745	\$48,709	64%	0.3%
Samoan	-	\$10,495	\$13,617	\$24,112	44%	0.1%
Middle Eastern Languages (8)	\$4,399	\$4,331	\$17,144	\$25,873	34%	0.1%
Other Western European Languages (9)	\$530	\$5,848	\$5,419	\$11,797	54%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesigned Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$418,141</b>	<b>\$787,159</b>	<b>\$1,118,706</b>	<b>\$2,324,006</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$6,515,935</b>	<b>\$7,650,351</b>	<b>\$3,359,722</b>	<b>\$17,526,008</b>	<b>81% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

This table includes data for the following counties: Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Contra Costa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Lassen, Madera, Marin, Merced, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, Sacramento, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba.

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003—04.

(2) Includes Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco. Also includes data where a language was not specified.

(3) Includes Burmese, Cebuano, Fijian Hindustani, Ilocano, Iloggono, Indonesian, Thai, and Taiwanese.

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

(5) Includes Dari (Persian of Afghanistan) and Farsi (also known as Persian of Iran).

(6) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Gujranti, Pashto, and Urdu.

(7) Includes Amharic (also known as Ethiopian), Oromo, Somali, Swahili, and Tigrinya.

(8) Includes Assyrian, Chaldean, Hebrew, Kurdish, Persian, and Turkish.

(9) Includes Dutch, Finnish, French, German, and Italian.

## B. By County and Interpreter Category

Each court sends an annual report to the AOC listing the number of authorized, funded positions by position title and program budget area. This report is called Schedule 7A, *Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget*. In July 2004 the trial courts reported about 689 full-time equivalent (FTE) authorized and funded staff positions in the trial courts' interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. The majority of these positions were staff interpreters and pro tempore interpreters (as defined by the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act).

Not all the courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, about 57 percent of the superior courts—33 of 58—reported authorized funded staff in the interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the trial courts' interpreter programs reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state. Most courts still rely primarily on contract interpreters; however, SB 371 has caused an increase in the number of pro tempore interpreters. Many courts also use court personnel, such as courtroom or calendar clerks, to assist with interpreter coordination in addition to their other duties, but these positions are not listed in Schedule 7A.

The Judicial Council established statewide standards for interpreter pay and authorized increases in the amounts paid for full-day and half-day interpreting effective January 1, 1999. Two additional increases were authorized and made effective on July 1, 1999, and July 1, 2000.<sup>14</sup> Table 5 shows the changes in payment over time. Certified and registered interpreters are currently paid 32.5 percent more for a full day of interpreting than they were when the Judicial Council first established statewide standards for interpreter pay in January 1999. At the same time, the Judicial Council lowered the wages paid to noncertified and nonregistered interpreters to provide a financial incentive for new and existing court interpreters to become certified or registered. Despite the increases in pay for certified and registered interpreters, compensation for interpreters in the state trial courts still lags behind the \$305 paid to federally certified interpreters for a full day. The Judicial Council sought but did not receive funding for further rate increases in fiscal year 2001–2002.

	Table 5: Rates Paid for Interpreters							
	Certified (Registered)				Noncertified (Nonregistered)			
	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change
1/1/99	\$200	—	\$105	—	\$200	—	\$105	—
7/1/99	243	+21.5	135	28.57	175	-12.5	92	-12.38
7/1/00	265	+9.05	147	8.89	175	0	92	0

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

### C. Summary of Findings From 40 Courts

**The Spanish language remains the most-interpreted language in the courts.** In fiscal year 2003–2004, over \$17 million in expenditures were reported in the CIDCS for Spanish language interpretations in the 40 courts included in this analysis. This represents approximately 77 percent of all contract, per diem expenditures in fiscal year 2003–2004.

**Usage of certified and registered court interpreters varies widely across courts and across languages.** Statewide, certified court interpreters are used in about 85 percent of all contract, per diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS. Nearly all Spanish (87 percent), Russian (96 percent), Mandarin (93 percent), and Armenian (88 percent) interpretations are done by certified interpreters (both contractors and interpreters pro tempore). However, certified interpreter use is much lower for Tagalog (24 percent), Korean (52 percent), Portuguese (30 percent), and Japanese (29 percent). While this might partially reflect low levels of language use in the courts, particularly for Portuguese and Japanese, Tagalog and Korean interpreter expenditures are significant enough to warrant additional certified interpreters.

Statewide, registered interpreters for nondesignated languages are used in about 52 percent of contract, per diem interpretations. This low rate is to be expected, due to the variety of non-designated languages. However, it would be expected that the nondesignated languages used more frequently in the courts (American Sign Language, Hmong, Lao, Punjabi, Khmer, and Mien<sup>15</sup>) would have more registered interpreters. The proportion of registered interpreters used for those languages is relatively low, particularly for American Sign Language (29 percent) and Khmer (54 percent), suggesting a need for additional registered interpreters in those languages.

At the individual court level, there is no discernable trend regarding the use of certified and registered interpreters between small, rural courts and larger, urban and suburban courts. The use of certified and registered interpreters for contract, per diem interpretations ranges from 0 to 100 percent. While some smaller courts do not seem to be hampered by a lack of available certified and registered interpreters, others do not share that same access. For example, the Superior Court of Del Norte County used certified interpreters for 100 percent of their contract, per diem interpretations (all Spanish language interpretations), whereas the Superior Court of Plumas County did not use any certified interpreters (also all Spanish language interpretations).

**American Sign Language is the third-most interpreted language in the courts, but there are few registered interpreters statewide to meet the demand.** In September 2003, the Court Interpreters Program Unit of the AOC's Human Resources Division assumed administrative authority of the American Sign Language Court Interpreters

---

<sup>15</sup> The language category called "All Other Languages" had reported expenditures of \$187,647, but that category cannot be disaggregated into separate languages. Most are Latin American dialects (Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco) or instances where a language was not specified for the interpretation.

Program, which was previously under the charge of the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee's Interpreters for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Working Group. This report contains the first full fiscal year's worth of data about contract, per diem American Sign Language interpretations. American Sign Language was the third-most interpreted "language" in the courts, with about \$588,000 in expenditures reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004.

However, it appears there are few registered American Sign Language interpreters. As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, only 29 percent of American Sign Language contract, per diem interpretations statewide were done by registered court interpreters and there apparently were no American Sign Language interpretations by court interpreters pro tempore. Use of registered American Sign Language interpreters varied in the courts from 0 to 100 percent. Unlike what might be expected, the problem is not confined to small, rural courts; there was no discernable difference in availability of registered American Sign Language interpreters between larger, urban courts and smaller, rural ones.

**Southeast Asian Language interpretation expenditures are significant in Central Valley courts.** Among the 40 courts included in this analysis, Vietnamese, Hmong, and Lao contract, per diem interpreter expenditures rank second, fourth, and sixth, respectively, among all language expenditures reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004. The expenditure rates for these languages are particularly high for the Superior Courts of Fresno County and Merced County. Outside the Central Valley, the Superior Courts of Sacramento County and Santa Clara County report high levels of interpreter expenditures for Vietnamese and Hmong.

**Punjabi language interpretation expenditures are increasing.** Expenditures for Punjabi interpretations ranked seventh highest of all languages interpreted statewide in the 40-court study, as reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004. Due to the high number of interpretations, data about Punjabi interpretations are presented separately rather than being grouped with other South Asian languages.

Punjabi interpretations were performed in both urban and rural courts statewide. The highest levels of expenditures were found in the Superior Courts of Sacramento County (\$33,506), Santa Clara County (\$30,813), and Fresno County (\$28,492). Unexpectedly, the Superior Court of Sutter County reported the highest *proportion* of contract, per diem interpreter expenditures for Punjabi. As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, Punjabi interpretations in the Superior Court of Sutter County represented 23 percent of all interpreter expenditures. Even smaller, rural courts such as the Superior Courts of Butte County and Nevada County reported expenditures for Punjabi interpretations.

Information from the 40 courts that entered complete data into the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004 gives us a snapshot of language usage and the use of certified and registered court interpreters for contract, per diem interpretations in California courts. However, it

should be noted that without data from Los Angeles County, the largest user of contract, per diem court interpreters, the picture is not complete. The AOC's Office of Court Research staff will work to find ways to lessen the reporting burden for Los Angeles so that its data can more easily be added to the CIDCS and included in subsequent annual reports.

### III. AVAILABILITY OF CERTIFIED AND REGISTERED INTERPRETERS

The proportion of California's population that is foreign born—26 percent—is higher than that of any other state.<sup>16</sup> California is also the most linguistically diverse state, with 224 languages and innumerable dialects spoken here.<sup>17</sup> According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 39.5 percent of Californians (12,401,756) speak a language other than English in their homes, which represents an increase of more than 4 million from 1990. The 2000 U.S. Census also revealed that 20 percent of the state's population (6,277,779) reported not being able to speak English well and that 3.5 percent, or 1.11 million, of California's 31.4 million residents over age 5 were linguistically isolated or spoke no English at all.

California's statistics on legal immigration show an increasing rate of growth in ethnic groups unlikely to speak English as a first language. According to statistics released by the California Department of Finance,<sup>18</sup> yearly legal immigration to the state averages more than 200,000. In the period 1990–2000, legal immigration to California was 2,186,774. Population increases during this period were particularly significant among ethnic groups unlikely to have English as their first language.<sup>19</sup>

Although there are more than 1,700 certified and registered spoken language interpreters in California, the state's trial courts are facing a critical shortage of qualified interpreters. As already discussed, the availability of certified and registered interpreters varies widely among courts. The needs for specific languages also vary widely among courts, with certain regions showing a growing need for South Asian and Southeast Asian languages.

It is clear that California will experience a steady increase in both the need for court interpreting services and the diversity of languages in which those services are needed, while not having enough interpreters to meet these demands.

---

<sup>16</sup> Public Policy Institute of California, *Just the Facts: Immigration in California* (July 2002).

<sup>17</sup> United States Census, *Language Use and English Ability, Persons Five Years of Age and Older, by State* (2000).

<sup>18</sup> California Department of Finance, *Legal Immigration to California by County, 1990–2000*.

<sup>19</sup> California 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 Judicial Council became responsible for setting payment rates and other compensation policies for court interpreters. In addition to the recruitment activities described on page 2, a multipronged strategy is in place to overcome the critical shortage of certified and registered court interpreters. The components of this strategy include:

- Increased rates and an improved incentive-based rate structure to attract and retain certified and registered court interpreters;
- Collaboration with schools and universities (the nation's first bachelor's degree program in interpreting and translating has now been developed at California State University at Long Beach);
- Development of a plan highlighting specific steps to incorporate American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter issues into the AOC's Court Interpreters Program;
- Development of standards and/or rules related to the use of team interpreting for spoken language interpretations in trials of long duration;
- Development and implementation of a refresher course for interpreters who wish to return to the interpreting profession after being on inactive status;
- Creation of a policy or rule of court to establish standards for authorizing translation of documents for criminal proceedings in a format and manner approved by the Judicial Council;
- Expansion and implementation of a mentoring program in which experienced court interpreters serve as counselors and guide new interpreters in languages other than Spanish;
- Creation of a plan to work with spoken language and ASL interpreter associations to address language access issues;
- Development of a resource manual for court interpreters, including relevant rules of court, statutes, protocols, practices, standards, and service-related statistics; and
- Development of a plan to seek funds to assist prospective interpreters of languages other than Spanish in attending courses and workshops in legal interpreting.

## V. CONCLUSION

While Spanish was the language most frequently interpreted in the 40 courts whose data are part of this annual report, the CIDCS data also revealed high usage levels of American Sign Language, Southeastern Asian languages (Vietnamese, Hmong, Lao), and Punjabi.

Table 4 shows that certified and registered interpreters performed the majority of trial court interpreting. Certified interpreters or court interpreters pro tempore conducted 85 percent of all interpretations of designated languages, and registered interpreters or court interpreters pro tempore did 52 percent of all interpretations of nondesignated languages.

However, this statewide data may mask local shortages of certified or registered interpreters in certain languages. These shortages seem to occur both in small, rural courts and large, urban and suburban courts. The expenditure tables for individual courts, in the appendix of this report, may help courts and Court Interpreters Program staff identify areas of need and, therefore, improve access to the justice system for non-English speakers.

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

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

Appendix  
Expenditures for Interpreter Services in 40 Courts  
Fiscal Year 2003—2004 (July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004)

To make a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts' Office of Court Research collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the superior courts. The principal source of data was the Court Interpreter Data Collection System or CIDCS. The CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system housed on Serranus, the password protected Web site for court personnel, and came online in October 2002. The data in this appendix are the first full fiscal year's data collected through CIDCS. All of the courts represented in this appendix have verified that they entered complete information in the CIDCS as of November 15, 2004.

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

Each of the following court studies includes data reported to the AOC to provide some points of comparison, including county population, number of staff in the interpreter program according to the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, and data collected via the CIDCS specifically for this report (expenditures by language and by certification status of interpreter). Data for the following 40 courts are included in this appendix and appear in alphabetical order:

- Amador
- Butte
- Calaveras
- Colusa
- Contra Costa
- Del Norte
- El Dorado
- Fresno
- Glenn
- Imperial
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kings
- Lassen
- Madera
- Marin
- Merced
- Mono
- Nevada
- Plumas
- Sacramento
- San Benito
- San Bernardino
- San Diego
- San Joaquin
- San Luis Obispo
- San Mateo
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Shasta
- Siskiyou
- Stanislaus
- Sutter
- Tehama
- Tulare
- Tuolumne
- Ventura
- Yolo
- Yuba

Note that there are differences in the expenditure data collected in the Quarterly Financial Statements (QFSs) and the data collected by the CIDCS. Since the CIDCS data is not used as the basis for payment to the courts, it should not be used as a definitive source for expenditure data. Rather, the value of the CIDCS is in showing expenditures for contract, per diem court interpretation by language and certification status. This data will help courts and the Court Interpreters Program recognize languages that should become certified due to high usage levels or identify courts and languages that would benefit from having more court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters.

#### A1. Superior Court of Amador County

There are approximately 36,500 residents of Amador County, which is located in the Sierra foothills.<sup>1</sup> The Superior Court of Amador County reported no full-time equivalent (FTE) staff as interpreters, interpreter coordinators, or court interpreters pro tem in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004—2005.

Table A1 shows that the Superior Court of Amador County reported a total of \$26,663 for contract, per diem interpreter expenditures to the Court Interpreters Data Collection System (CIDCS). The Spanish language represents two-thirds of that total, and nearly all Spanish language interpreters were certified contractors. Only two other languages were interpreted during this time period in the superior court: American Sign Language and Other Languages (most likely Latin American dialects). Registered interpreters performed 10 percent of interpretations.

#### A2. Superior Court of Butte County

Butte County, in the north-central region of the state, has a population of about 210,400. There were no court interpreter FTEs reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, a total of \$106,325 was expended on contract, per diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and shown in Table A2. As with most of the courts, Spanish language interpretations made up the majority of total expenditures (44 percent), with about 10 percent of those interpretations performed by a certified interpreter. Hmong language interpretations represented 31 percent of total contract, per diem expenditures, and registered interpreters conducted 89 percent of Hmong interpretations.

---

<sup>1</sup> All population figures are 2003 California State Department of Finance estimates.

### A3. Superior Court of Calaveras County

There are about 42,450 residents in Calaveras County, located in the Central Valley. In fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of Calaveras County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for their court interpreter program.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of Calaveras County spent \$9,764 on contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A3). Spanish language accounted for 69 percent of the interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with only 3 percent translated by certified court interpreters. Arabic, Punjabi, American Sign Language, and Other Languages accounted for the rest of the expenditures during the reporting period.

### A4. Superior Court of Colusa County

Located in the Central Valley, Colusa County is one of the smaller counties with 19,700 residents. The Superior Court of Colusa County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

In Table A4, the Superior Court of Colusa County reported \$74,368 in contract, per diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations were conducted most frequently, representing 98 percent of all interpretations. Almost all of the Spanish language interpretations (99.7 percent) were performed by certified court interpreters. Russian and Punjabi accounted for another 3 percent of the expenditures during the reporting period, and these interpretations were all done by registered court interpreters.

### A5. Superior Court of Contra Costa County

Contra Costa County is one of the Bay Area counties and has a population of 994,900. The court reported five court interpreters pro tem in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003–2004, they did not report any FTEs for the court interpreter program.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County spent \$791,495 on contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A5). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 75 percent of all expenditures during this period (\$593,695), and certified interpreters performed 81 percent of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for American Sign Language interpreting accounting for 5 percent of the total expenditures (\$40,456), and registered interpreters performed 65 percent of American Sign Language interpreting. Vietnamese, Mandarin, Punjabi, Lao, Mien, and Tongan ranked among the next highest expenditures and each represented about 2 to 3 percent of the total expenditures. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 78 percent of court interpretations.

#### A6. Superior Court of Del Norte County

Del Norte County is the northernmost coastal county in the state, with an estimated population of 27,850. The superior court did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A6 shows that in fiscal year 2003–2004, \$23,415 was reported to the CIDCS as spent on contract, per diem interpretations. Consistent with last year’s annual report, Spanish was the only language interpreted, and certified interpreters performed all interpretations.

#### A7. Superior Court of El Dorado County

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra foothills and has a population of about 166,000. For fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of El Dorado County reported one court interpreter pro tempore FTE in the Schedule 7A.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of El Dorado County reported \$103,764 in contract, per diem court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS, with the majority (94 percent) for Spanish language interpretations. About 90 percent of those interpretations were performed by certified and pro tempore court interpreters. These data are shown in Table A7.

#### A8. Superior Court of Fresno County

Fresno County is located in the Central Valley. With 841,400 people, as reported in 2003, it is the state’s ninth-most populous county. In the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Fresno County reported 6 FTE staff interpreters and 14.6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore, for a total of 20.6 interpreter FTEs.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of Fresno County spent \$1,146,868 on contract, per diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS (see Table A8). Nearly 70 percent of all interpretations were in Spanish, with certified court interpreters and court interpreters pro tempore performing 79 percent of those interpretations. There were also a high number of interpretations conducted in Lao, Hmong, American Sign Language, Khmer, All Other Languages (mostly Latin American dialects), and Punjabi. Registered interpreters and court interpreters pro tempore were used for most of the interpretations. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 71 percent of court interpretations.

#### A9. Superior Court of Glenn County

Located in the northern part of the Central Valley, Glenn County is one of the smaller counties in our study, with 27,050 residents. The Superior Court of Glenn County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

As Table A9 points out, the Superior Court of Glenn County reported \$87,532 in contract, per diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 89 percent of the total expenditures. Only 3 percent of the Spanish language interpretations were performed by certified interpreters. Hmong and American Sign Language were among the second-highest expenditures during the reporting period representing 6 percent and 4 percent of the expenditures respectively. For all languages, certified and registered interpreters performed only 5 percent of the interpreting.

#### A10. Superior Court of Imperial County

There are about 150,900 residents of Imperial County, located in the southeastern-most corner of the state and bordered by Mexico to the south and Arizona to the east. In the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Imperial County reported 5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore. This is a slight increase from fiscal year 2003–2004 when the court reported 3 FTE staff interpreters and no FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

The total expenditure for court interpretation in fiscal year 2003–2004, as reported in the CIDCS, was \$272,920. Table A10 shows that Spanish accounted for 96 percent of contract, per diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with nearly all interpretations conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Vietnamese, American Sign Language, and Korean were the only other languages with expenditures greater than \$1,000 during the reporting period.

#### A11. Superior Court of Inyo County

Located on the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada mountains, Inyo County is one of the smallest counties in this analysis, with an estimated population of 18,500. The Superior Court of Inyo County did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, \$15,837 was reported to the CIDCS as expended on contract, per diem interpretations, exclusively for Spanish language interpretations (see Table A11). Ninety-three percent of these interpretations were done by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. While Inyo County does not have any court interpreters pro tempore, they occasionally will use a court interpreter pro tempore on a

cross-assignment from a neighboring court. That interpreter is paid as a court interpreter pro tempore by his or her home court, which is reimbursed by Inyo County.

#### A12. Superior Court of Kern County

Kern County, with an estimated population of 702,900, is located in the southern part of the Central Valley. For the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Kern County reported 2 FTE staff interpreters, 1 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore, for a total of 9 FTE court interpreter staff.

Table A12 shows that \$794,986 was spent on contract, per diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, as reported in the CIDCS. The majority of expenditures (94.7 percent) were for Spanish language interpretations. Seventy-nine percent of Spanish interpretations were conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Interpretations in Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island languages (which include Cebuano, Ilocano (both languages of the Philippines), and Indonesian) accounted for the second-highest total interpreter expenditures, with 92 percent of those interpretations performed by registered contract interpreters.

#### A13. Superior Court of Kings County

Kings County, with an estimated population of 136,100, is located at the southern part of the Central Valley. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A13 shows expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$185,703. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 99 percent (\$183,044) of the total interpretations with 59 percent of the interpretations done by certified interpreters. Portuguese and Southeast Asian languages (which include Vietnamese, Hmong, Ilocano, Mien, and Lao) comprised the rest of the expenditures. Certified and registered interpreters did 59 percent of all interpreting.

#### A14. Superior Court of Lassen County

The Superior Court of Lassen County is one of the smallest counties in our study, with an estimated population of 34,950. The Superior Court of Lassen County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A14 shows expenditures on contract, per diem interpreters for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$9,005, and 100 percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified interpreters performed only 4 percent of the interpreting.

#### A15. Superior Court of Madera County

Located in the Central Valley, Madera County has about 131,200 residents. The Superior Court of Madera County reported 5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore for fiscal year 2004–2005, which is the same number that was reported in fiscal year 2003–2004.

In Table A15, the Superior Court of Madera County reported \$275,286 in contract, per diem interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS. As with all the courts in this study, Spanish language interpretations were conducted most frequently, representing 95 percent of all interpretations. Eighty-five percent of all Spanish language interpretations were performed by court interpreters pro tempore and contract interpreters. For all languages, 81 percent of all interpretations were done by certified, registered, or pro tempore court interpreters.

#### A16. Superior Court of Marin County

Located just north of San Francisco, Marin County has a population of about 250,400. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of Marin County listed 3 court interpreters pro tempore.

Table A16 shows the Superior Court of Marin County's total expenditures, \$213,570, for contract, per diem interpretations for fiscal year 2003–2004, as reported to the CIDCS. Eighty-six percent of those interpretations were conducted in Spanish. Of the Spanish language interpretations, 98 percent were performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. The only other language with significant expenditures was Vietnamese, with \$14,805 in expenditures representing 7 percent of all interpreter expenditures. Certified court interpreters performed all of the Vietnamese interpretations.

#### A17. Superior Court of Merced County

Merced County is one of the Central Valley counties, with about 225,100 residents. The Superior Court of Merced County reported one FTE court interpreters pro tempore for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003–2004, they did not report any FTEs for the court interpreters program.

In Table A17, the Superior Court of Merced County reported \$440,957 in contract, per diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations represented 77 percent of all interpretations. Thirty-five percent of all Spanish language interpretations were performed by court interpreters pro tempore and certified contract interpreters. Hmong, Mien, Punjabi, and American Sign Language, and Lao were other languages where expenditures exceeded \$10,000.

#### A18. Superior Court of Mono County

Mono County, located on the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada mountains, is the smallest county in this study, with a population of 13,500. The Superior Court of Mono County reported one court interpreter pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–05.

Table A18 summarizes the contract, per diem expenditures as reported to the CIDCS for Mono County in fiscal year 2003–2004. All of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, totaling \$18,598. Court interpreters pro tempore conducted all of the interpretations.

#### A19. Superior Court of Nevada County

Nevada County is located in the Sierra Nevada, bordering the State of Nevada. The population in 2003 was estimated at 95,700. The Superior Court of Nevada County did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

The Superior Court of Nevada County reported \$45,042 in contract, per diem court interpreter expenses to the CIDCS (see Table A19). Of this amount, \$35,413 was spent on Spanish language interpretations, representing 79 percent of all interpretations, with just over 50 percent being performed by certified interpreters. Vietnamese was the second-most translated language in the Superior Court of Nevada County, representing 12 percent of all interpretations. All of the Vietnamese language interpretations were done by certified contract interpreters.

#### A20. Superior Court of Plumas County

The Superior Court of Plumas County is located in the northern part of the Central Valley, with an estimated population of 20,900. The Superior Court of Plumas County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A20 shows the court's expenditures on contract, per diem interpretations for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$6,688, and 100 percent of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Only non-certified interpreters performed the interpreting.

## A21. Superior Court of Sacramento County

Sacramento County had an estimated population of 1.3 million in 2003. The Superior Court of Sacramento County reported four FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003–2004, they reported two FTE staff interpreters and three FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of Sacramento County spent \$1,694,292 on contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A21). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 39 percent of all expenditures during this period (\$654,329), and certified interpreters performed 99 percent of the Spanish interpreting. The second-highest expenditures were for Russian, accounting for 12 percent of the total expenditures, followed by American Sign Language and Hmong, which accounted for 10 percent and 8 percent of the total expenditures, respectively. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 85 percent of court interpretations.

## A22. Superior Court of San Benito County

Located near the central coastal region to the east of the Monterey County, San Benito County has a population of 56,300. The Superior Court of San Benito County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A22 shows expenditures on contract, per diem interpretations for fiscal year 2003–2004. Spanish was the only language interpreted during the reporting period, totaling \$58,363 in expenditures. Certified interpreters performed 98 percent of the interpreting.

## A23. Superior Court of San Bernardino County

San Bernardino is physically the largest county in the state and, with approximately 1,833,000 residents, ranks fourth in population. The court reported 42 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A.

Table A23 shows that the Superior Court of San Bernardino County's expenditure on contract per diem interpretations was \$2,044,947 in fiscal year 2003–2004, as reported in the CIDCS. Spanish language interpretations accounted for nearly 90 percent of total interpreter expenditures, with 98 percent of those interpretations performed by court interpreters pro tempore and certified interpreters. American Sign Language, Vietnamese, Korean, Arabic, and Mandarin are other frequently translated languages in this court, though they represent a small fraction of total interpretations. Overall, certified or registered interpreters perform 94 percent of all contract, per diem interpretations, which is one of the highest ratios among the larger courts included in this study.

#### A24. Superior Court of San Diego County

Located in the extreme southwest corner of the state, bordered on the south by Mexico and by the Pacific Ocean on the west, San Diego County is the largest county included in this study. Its 2003 population was estimated at 2.9 million. On the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of San Diego County reported 7 FTE staff interpreters and 35.56 FTE court interpreters pro tempore. This is a marked increase from the previous fiscal year, where only 7 FTE staff interpreters were reported and reflects the recent addition of the court interpreter pro tempore job classification.

The Superior Court of San Diego County reported \$2.95 million in contract, per diem court interpreter expenditures for fiscal year 2003–2004, as reported in the CIDCS and as seen in Table A24. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 84 percent of all interpretations. Nearly all of Spanish language interpretations were conducted by either court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. After Spanish, the next most frequently translated languages were American Sign Language, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Khmer, and African languages (Amharic, Somali, Swahili, and Tingrinya). Overall, certified and registered court interpreters performed nearly 90 percent of all interpretations.

#### A25. Superior Court of San Joaquin County

One of the larger Central Valley counties, San Joaquin County has a population of about 613,500. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of San Joaquin County reported 6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

Table A25 shows a total of \$720,245 in expenditures reported to the CIDCS for contract, per diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 71 percent of all interpreter expenditures, with 72 percent performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters. Other languages with significant expenditures include Khmer, Vietnamese, and the category All Other Languages, which includes Latin American dialects.

#### A26. Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County

San Luis Obispo County is located on the southern coast with about 256,300 residents. No FTEs were reported in the Schedule 7A for the court interpreters program in San Luis Obispo County in fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A26 shows expenditures by language and certification status for contract, per diem interpreters in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo in fiscal year 2003–2004. Expenditures during this period totaled \$188,832, 95 percent of which were for Spanish language interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for American Sign

Language interpreting, accounting for 3 percent of the total expenditures (\$6,266), and registered interpreters performed 95 percent of American Sign Language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed almost all (99 percent) of the interpreting.

#### A27. Superior Court of San Mateo County

San Mateo County is located in the Bay Area, south of San Francisco. Its population is approximately 717,000. In the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of San Mateo County reported one FTE court interpreter coordinator and 7.6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

The Superior Court of San Mateo County expended \$778,420 for contract, per diem court interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and as shown in Table A27. Sixty-eight percent of all interpretations were for Spanish language interpretations, and 88 percent of those were handled by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Tagalog, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Vietnamese were also translated frequently in this court, with the majority of interpretations made by certified or registered interpreters.

#### A28. Superior Court of Santa Barbara County

Santa Barbara County is a coastal county with a population of about 410,300. The Superior Court of Santa Barbara County reported 5 FTE staff interpreters, 0.5 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 3 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, the superior court expended approximately \$541,553 for contract, per diem interpretations. As with the rest of the state, the majority of interpretations were in the Spanish language (92 percent). Nearly all (99.8 percent) Spanish language interpretations were handled by court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters. There were several other languages translated in the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County during the time period of this report, but the expenditures for those interpretations were relatively small compared to Spanish language interpretations. However, 96 percent of contract, per diem interpretations (for all languages) in the court were done by certified or registered interpreters.

#### A29. Superior Court of Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County is one of the Bay Area counties and has a population of 1.7 million. The court reported 14 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003–2004, only 6.5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore were reported.

In fiscal year 2003–2004, the Superior Court of Santa Clara County spent \$1,270,204 on contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A29). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 59 percent of all expenditures during this period (\$743,291), and certified interpreters performed 67 percent of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for Vietnamese interpreting, accounting for 23 percent of the total expenditures (\$297,541), and certified interpreters performed 81 percent of Vietnamese interpretations. Mandarin, Tagalog, Punjabi, and Khmer ranked among the next highest expenditures, and each represented about 2 to 4 percent of total expenditures. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 67 percent of court interpretations.

### A30. Superior Court of Santa Cruz County

Located at the coast just south of the Bay Area, Santa Cruz County is one of the medium-sized counties in our study, with a population of 259,800. The Schedule 7A lists one interpreter coordinator FTE position in the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters in fiscal year 2003–2004 totaled \$443,599 and are shown in Table A30. Certified and registered interpreters performed 91 percent of interpreting, and Spanish language interpreting accounted for 91 percent of expenditures (\$405,041). The second-highest expenditures were for American Sign Language interpreting, accounting for 5 percent of the total expenditures (\$22,224), and registered interpreters performed 78 percent of American Sign Language interpreting. Ninety-three percent of expenditures were for interpreting in designated languages, while 7 percent were for interpreting in nondesignated languages.

### A31. Superior Court of Shasta County

Shasta County, with an estimated population of 172,000, is located in the northern part of the state. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A31 shows expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$81,323. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 36 percent (\$29,679) of the total interpretations, followed by Lao and Mien (23 percent and 24 percent respectively). Certified and registered interpreters did 56 percent of all interpreting.

### A32. Superior Court of Siskiyou County

Located in the northernmost portion of the state, Siskiyou County has approximately 44,400 residents. The superior court of Siskiyou County reported no court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

The Superior Court reported \$45,593 in court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, as shown in Table A32. The majority of those expenditures were for Spanish language translations (86 percent) with 90 percent of those interpretations done by certified interpreters. Lao and All Other Languages (generally Latin American dialects) were the second- and third-most translated languages, and registered interpreters were used for 100 percent and 34 percent of the translations, respectively.

### A33. Superior Court of Stanislaus County

Stanislaus County, with a population of about 481,600, is located in the Central Valley. The Superior Court of Stanislaus County reported 1 FTE staff interpreter, 1 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 2 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, the superior court expended approximately \$339,338 for contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A33). Spanish language interpretations accounted for 79 percent of contract interpreter expenditures, with 90 percent performed by certified court interpreters and court interpreters pro tempore. American Sign Language and Khmer were the second- and third-most translated languages, with expenditures of \$11,870 and \$10,994, respectively, for fiscal year 2003–2004.

### A34. Superior Court of Sutter County

Sutter County is one of the smaller counties in this study, located in the northern part of the Central Valley. There were about 83,200 residents in 2003. One pro tempore interpreter FTE was listed for the Superior Court of Sutter County in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Expenditures for contract, per diem interpreters during fiscal year 2003–2004 are shown in Table A34 and totaled \$119,883. Sixty-one percent of the expenditures (\$73,433) were for Spanish language interpreting. Punjabi accounted for the second-highest total interpreter expenditures (24 percent) with 72 percent of those interpretations performed by registered contract interpreters. Certified and registered interpreters performed 89 percent of interpreting overall, and 100 percent of the Hindi, Mandarin, Khmer, Mien, Romanian, Russian, and Vietnamese interpreting.

### A35. Superior Court of Tehama County

Tehama County has a population of about 57,700. In the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Tehama County reported one FTE staff interpreter and one FTE court interpreter pro tempore.

The Superior Court of Tehama County expended \$14,130 for contract, per diem court interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and as shown in Table A35. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 81 percent of expenditures, with 50 percent of interpretations performed by certified court interpreters. Mandarin was the second-most frequently translated language, representing 15 percent of expenditures, with 100 percent of interpretations done by certified interpreters.

### A36. Superior Court of Tulare County

Tulare County, located in the Central Valley, has approximately 386,200 residents. In the fiscal year 2004–2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Tulare County reported 4 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, the superior court expended approximately \$689,719 for contract, per diem interpretations (see Table A36). Ninety-five percent of those expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, with 69 percent performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. American Sign Language and Lao were the second- and third-most translated languages, though the expenditures for those languages were relatively small compared to Spanish language interpretations.

### A37. Superior Court of Tuolumne County

Tuolumne County is located in the central Sierra Nevada and encompasses Yosemite National Park. The population is estimated at 56,500. The Superior Court of Tuolumne County reported no court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

The superior court reported \$12,833 in court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003–2004, as shown in Table A37. The majority of those expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations (83 percent) with 91 percent of those interpretations done by certified court interpreters.

### A38. Superior Court of Ventura County

Ventura County is located on the southern coast adjacent to Los Angeles County, with an estimated population of 791,300 in 2003. The Superior Court of Ventura County reported

five FTE staff interpreters and one FTE interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A38 shows that \$500,541 was spent on contract, per diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with the majority of expenditures (97 percent) on Spanish language interpretations. Almost all of Spanish interpretations (99 percent) were conducted by certified court interpreters. Interpretations in Armenian, Vietnamese, Korean, and All Other Languages were the other languages with expenditures exceeding \$5,000. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 98 percent of court interpretations.

#### A39. Superior Court of Yolo County

There are about 181,300 residents in Yolo County. In fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of Yolo County reported one FTE interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A39 shows \$324,801 in interpreter expenditures, as reported in the CIDCS. Spanish accounted for 65 percent of contract, per diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with nearly all translations done by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Russian, American Sign Language, Punjabi, and Lao were the other languages with expenditures greater than \$10,000 during the reporting period.

#### A40. Superior Court of Yuba County

Located in the Central Valley to the north of Sacramento County, Yuba County had an estimated population of 62,800 in 2003. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program for this court were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A40 shows that \$30,856 was spent on contract, per diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with 52 percent of expenditures on Spanish language interpretations. Almost all of Spanish interpretations (99 percent) were conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Another 43 percent of expenditures were spent on interpretations in non-designated languages, totaling \$13,277. Hmong interpretations represented the second-highest expenditure (18 percent) with 41 percent of those interpretations conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or registered court interpreters.

**Table A1: Superior Court of Amador County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$17,710	\$174	\$17,885	99.0%	67.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$17,710</b>	<b>\$174</b>	<b>\$17,885</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>67.1%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
All Other Languages (1)	-	\$180	\$7,421	\$7,600	2.4%	28.5%
American Sign Language	-	\$694	\$484	\$1,178	58.9%	4.4%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$873</b>	<b>\$7,905</b>	<b>\$8,779</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>32.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$18,584</b>	<b>\$8,079</b>	<b>\$26,663</b>	<b>69.7% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A2: Superior Court of Butte County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$4,614	\$41,932	\$46,547	9.9%	43.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$2,205	\$0	\$2,205	100.0%	2.1%
Vietnamese	-	\$1,610	\$0	\$1,610	100.0%	1.5%
Korean	-	\$0	\$1,200	\$1,200	0.0%	1.1%
Russian (1)	-	\$0	\$536	\$536	0.0%	0.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$8,430</b>	<b>\$43,668</b>	<b>\$52,098</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>49.0%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	-	\$29,507	\$3,533	\$33,040	89.3%	31.1%
American Sign Language	-	\$1,256	\$10,750	\$12,006	10.5%	11.3%
Mien	-	\$633	\$4,853	\$5,486	11.5%	5.2%
Punjabi	-	\$1,957	\$157	\$2,114	92.6%	2.0%
Lao	-	\$957	\$0	\$957	100.0%	0.9%
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$317	\$306	\$623	50.8%	0.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$34,627</b>	<b>\$19,600</b>	<b>\$54,227</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$43,057</b>	<b>\$63,268</b>	<b>\$106,325</b>	<b>40.5% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Mandarin and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A3: Superior Court of Calaveras County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/O pt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$192	\$6,528	\$6,720	2.9%	68.8%
Arabic	-	-	\$628	\$628	0.0%	6.4%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$192</b>	<b>\$7,156</b>	<b>\$7,348</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>75.3%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/O pt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Punjabi	\$639	\$299	\$0	\$938	100.0%	9.6%
All Other Languages (1)	-	-	\$841	\$841	0.0%	8.6%
American Sign Language	-	\$638	\$0	\$638	100.0%	6.5%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$639</b>	<b>\$937</b>	<b>\$841</b>	<b>\$2,416</b>	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$639</b>	<b>\$1,129</b>	<b>\$7,996</b>	<b>\$9,764</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A4: Superior Court of Colusa County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/O pt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$72,255	\$221	\$72,476	99.7%	97.5%
Russian (1)	-	\$625	-	\$625	100.0%	0.8%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$72,880</b>	<b>\$221</b>	<b>\$73,101</b>	<b>99.7%</b>	<b>98.3%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/O pt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Punjabi	-	\$1,267	-	\$1,267	100.0%	1.7%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$1,267</b>	-	<b>\$1,267</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$74,147</b>	<b>\$221</b>	<b>\$74,368</b>	<b>99.7% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004.

**Table A5: Superior Court of Contra Costa County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$478,133	\$115,562	\$593,695	80.5%	75.0%
Vietnamese	-	\$16,672	\$3,898	\$20,570	81.1%	2.6%
Mandarin (1)	\$2,732	\$9,794	\$176	\$12,702	98.6%	1.6%
Tagalog	-	\$168	\$10,905	\$11,072	1.5%	1.4%
Portuguese	-	\$9,135	\$521	\$9,656	94.6%	1.2%
Cantonese	\$4,207	\$2,747	\$331	\$7,285	95.5%	0.9%
Korean	\$147	\$588	\$4,591	\$5,326	13.8%	0.7%
Russian (1)	-	\$3,345	-	\$3,345	100.0%	0.4%
Arabic	\$735	\$2,201	\$326	\$3,262	90.0%	0.4%
Japanese	-	-	\$1,279	\$1,279	0.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$7,821</b>	<b>\$522,784</b>	<b>\$137,587</b>	<b>\$668,192</b>	<b>79.4%</b>	<b>84.4%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$26,147	\$14,308	\$40,456	64.6%	5.1%
Punjabi	\$158	\$17,162	-	\$17,320	100.0%	2.2%
Lao	-	\$15,415	\$1,527	\$16,942	91.0%	2.1%
Mien	-	\$2,087	\$9,964	\$12,052	17.3%	1.5%
Tongan	-	\$9,366	\$2,659	\$12,025	77.9%	1.5%
Farsi (2)	-	\$4,949	\$1,104	\$6,053	81.8%	0.8%
Khmer	\$192	\$170	\$3,588	\$3,950	9.2%	0.5%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (3)	-	\$1,542	\$2,125	\$3,667	42.1%	0.5%
Tigrinya	-	\$2,149	\$709	\$2,858	75.2%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	-	\$2,347	\$392	\$2,739	85.7%	0.3%
All Other Languages (5)	-	\$1,158	\$1,058	\$2,216	52.2%	0.3%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (6)	-	\$147	\$1,169	\$1,316	11.2%	0.2%
Samoan	-	\$851	-	\$851	100.0%	0.1%
Middle Eastern Languages (7)	-	-	\$393	\$393	0.0%	0.0%
Hmong	-	\$319	-	\$319	100.0%	0.0%
German	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$350</b>	<b>\$83,956</b>	<b>\$38,996</b>	<b>\$123,303</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$8,172</b>	<b>\$606,740</b>	<b>\$176,584</b>	<b>\$791,495</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Dari (Persian of Afghanistan) and Farsi (also known as Persian of Iran).

(3) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian and Polish.

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(5) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(6) Includes Ilocano and Thai.

(7) Includes Persian and Turkish.

**Table A6: Superior Court of Del Norte County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	\$23,415	-	\$23,415	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL <sup>c</sup></b>	-	<b>\$23,415</b>	-	<b>\$23,415</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A7: Superior Court of El Dorado County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$32,229	\$55,490	\$9,830	\$97,549	89.9%	94.0%
Tagalog	-	-	\$1,684	\$1,684	0.0%	1.6%
Russian (1)	-	\$330	\$726	\$1,056	31.2%	1.0%
Japanese	-	\$696	-	\$696	100.0%	0.7%
Armenian (1)	-	\$187	-	\$187	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$32,229</b>	<b>\$56,702</b>	<b>\$12,240</b>	<b>\$101,171</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$347	\$1,851	\$2,197	15.8%	2.1%
Tongan	-	-	\$213	\$213	0.0%	0.2%
Hmong	\$183	-	-	\$183	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$183</b>	<b>\$347</b>	<b>\$2,063</b>	<b>\$2,593</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$32,412</b>	<b>\$57,049</b>	<b>\$14,303</b>	<b>\$103,764</b>	<b>86.2% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003—04.

**Table A8: Superior Court of Fresno County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$573,935	\$57,133	\$163,565	\$794,632	79.4%	69.3%
Armenian (1)	-	\$8,285	\$2,676	\$10,961	75.6%	1.0%
Russian (1)	-	\$5,685	\$1,712	\$7,397	76.9%	0.6%
Arabic	-	\$3,626	\$2,004	\$5,630	64.4%	0.5%
Vietnamese	-	-	\$7,687	\$7,687	0.0%	0.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	\$1,577	\$1,577	0.0%	0.1%
Korean	-	-	\$1,259	\$1,259	0.0%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	\$692	\$692	0.0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	-	\$470	\$470	0.0%	0.0%
Japanese	-	-	\$92	\$92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$573,935</b>	<b>\$74,729</b>	<b>\$181,734</b>	<b>\$830,398</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>72.4%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Lao	\$28,649	\$14,014	\$36,941	\$79,604	53.6%	6.9%
Hmong	\$45,667	\$942	\$15,245	\$61,854	75.4%	5.4%
American Sign Language	-	\$1,607	\$54,802	\$56,410	2.8%	4.9%
Khmer	\$39,715	\$2,541	\$6,445	\$48,701	86.8%	4.2%
All Other Languages (2)	\$14,714	\$853	\$20,038	\$35,605	43.7%	3.1%
Punjabi	\$379	\$15,621	\$12,492	\$28,492	56.2%	2.5%
Mien	-	\$2,713	-	\$2,713	100.0%	0.2%
Middle Eastern Languages (3)	-	-	\$686	\$686	0.0%	0.1%
African Languages (4)	-	-	\$552	\$552	0.0%	0.05%
Other Asian Indian Languages (5)	-	-	\$534	\$534	0.0%	0.05%
Farsi	-	-	\$478	\$478	0.0%	0.04%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (6)	-	-	\$382	\$382	0.0%	0.03%
Italian	-	-	\$276	\$276	0.0%	0.02%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (7)	-	-	\$184	\$184	0.0%	0.02%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$129,124</b>	<b>\$38,291</b>	<b>\$149,055</b>	<b>\$316,470</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>27.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$703,058</b>	<b>\$113,020</b>	<b>\$330,789</b>	<b>\$1,146,868</b>	<b>71.2% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian, Russian, and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Persian and Turkish.

(4) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya.

(5) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(6) Includes Ilocano and Indonesian.

(7) Includes Czech and Ukrainian.

**Table A9: Superior Court of Glenn County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/O pt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$2,246	\$75,316	\$77,563	2.9%	88.6%
Russian (1)	-	\$670	-	\$670	100.0%	0.8%
Arabic	-	\$461	-	\$461	100.0%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	\$322	-	\$322	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$3,699</b>	<b>\$75,316</b>	<b>\$79,015</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>90.3%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/O pt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	-	\$341	\$4,935	\$5,276	6.5%	6.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$3,241	\$3,241	0.0%	3.7%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$341</b>	<b>\$8,176</b>	<b>\$8,517</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$4,039</b>	<b>\$83,492</b>	<b>\$87,532</b>	<b>4.6% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004.

**Table A10: Superior Court of Imperial County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$134,394	\$128,637	\$175	\$263,206	99.9%	96.4%
Vietnamese	-	\$1,835	\$1,998	\$3,833	47.9%	1.4%
Korean	-	-	\$1,051	\$1,051	0.0%	0.4%
Cantonese	-	-	\$770	\$770	0.0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$347	\$265	\$611	56.7%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$134,394</b>	<b>\$130,819</b>	<b>\$4,259</b>	<b>\$269,471</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>98.7%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	\$693	\$2,103	\$2,796	24.8%	1.0%
Ukrainian	-	\$388	-	\$388	100.0%	0.1%
Punjabi	-	-	\$265	\$265	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$1,081</b>	<b>\$2,368</b>	<b>\$3,449</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$134,394</b>	<b>\$131,900</b>	<b>\$6,627</b>	<b>\$272,920</b>	<b>97.6% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Mandarin became a certified language in FY 2003—2004.

**Table A11: Superior Court of Inyo County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$9,424	\$5,236	\$1,176	\$15,837	92.6%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$9,424</b>	<b>\$5,236</b>	<b>\$1,176</b>	<b>\$15,837</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: Inyo County does not have pro tempore interpreters. However, occasionally, court interpreters pro tempore from other counties will be cross-assigned to the Superior Court of Inyo County. They are listed in the CIDCS as court interpreters pro tempore and paid by their home courts as such. The home courts then arrange for reimbursement from Inyo County.

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A12: Superior Court of Kern County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$99,113	\$498,091	\$155,630	\$752,833	79.3%	94.7%
Korean	-	\$5,041	-	\$5,041	100.0%	0.6%
Arabic	-	\$1,026	\$2,973	\$3,999	25.7%	0.5%
Armenian (1)	-	-	\$1,882	\$1,882	0.0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	\$1,762	-	\$1,762	100.0%	0.2%
Portuguese	-	\$879	-	\$879	100.0%	0.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$441	-	\$441	100.0%	0.1%
Japanese	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$99,113</b>	<b>\$507,387</b>	<b>\$160,484</b>	<b>\$766,984</b>	<b>79.1%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (2)	-	\$9,237	\$798	\$10,035	92.0%	1.3%
Punjabi	-	\$3,793	\$4,548	\$8,341	45.5%	1.0%
All Other Languages (3)	-	\$4,611	\$751	\$5,362	86.0%	0.7%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$2,535	\$2,535	0.0%	0.3%
Khmer	-	\$1,095	-	\$1,095	100.0%	0.1%
Bengali	-	\$340	-	\$340	100.0%	0.0%
French	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
Hungarian	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$19,370</b>	<b>\$8,632</b>	<b>\$28,002</b>	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$99,113</b>	<b>\$526,757</b>	<b>\$169,116</b>	<b>\$794,986</b>	<b>78.7%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian, Russian, and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Cebuano, Ilocano, and Indonesian

(3) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A13: Superior Court of Kings County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/O pt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$16,300	\$91,587	\$75,157	\$183,044	58.9%	98.6%
Portuguese	-	\$1,250	-	\$1,250	100.0%	0.7%
Vietnamese	-	\$560	-	\$560	100.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$16,300</b>	<b>\$93,397</b>	<b>\$75,157</b>	<b>\$184,853</b>	<b>59.3%</b>	<b>99.5%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/O pt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	-	-	\$516	\$516	0.0%	0.3%
Ilocano	-	-	\$133	\$133	0.0%	0.1%
Mien	-	-	\$109	\$109	0.0%	0.1%
Lao	-	-	\$92	\$92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$850</b>	<b>\$850</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$16,300</b>	<b>\$93,397</b>	<b>\$76,007</b>	<b>\$185,703</b>	<b>59.1% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

**Table A14: Superior Court of Lassen County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$381	\$8,624	\$9,005	4.2%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>\$381</b>	<b>\$8,624</b>	<b>\$9,005</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A15: Superior Court of Madera County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$220,860	\$824	\$39,574	\$261,258	84.9%	94.9%
Arabic	-	-	\$925	\$925	0.0%	0.3%
Cantonese	-	-	\$644	\$644	0.0%	0.2%
Korean	-	-	\$306	\$306	0.0%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	\$150	\$150	0.0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	-	\$129	\$129	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$220,860</b>	<b>\$824</b>	<b>\$41,728</b>	<b>\$263,412</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>95.7%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$4,668	\$4,668	0.0%	1.7%
American Sign Language	-	\$346	\$2,213	\$2,560	13.5%	0.9%
Hmong	-	-	\$2,323	\$2,323	0.0%	0.8%
Punjabi	-	-	\$1,462	\$1,462	0.0%	0.5%
German	-	-	\$572	\$572	0.0%	0.2%
Indonesian	-	-	\$146	\$146	0.0%	0.1%
Tigrinya	-	-	\$143	\$143	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$346</b>	<b>\$11,528</b>	<b>\$11,874</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$220,860</b>	<b>\$1,170</b>	<b>\$53,256</b>	<b>\$275,286</b>	<b>80.7% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A16: Superior Court of Marin County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$10,798	\$169,421	\$3,515	\$183,734	98.1%	86.0%
Vietnamese	-	\$14,805	-	\$14,805	100.0%	6.9%
Cantonese	\$1,984	\$926	-	\$2,910	100.0%	1.4%
Korean	\$294	\$1,617	-	\$1,911	100.0%	0.9%
Russian (1)	\$265	\$946	-	\$1,211	100.0%	0.6%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$988	-	\$988	100.0%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	\$722	-	\$722	100.0%	0.3%
Arabic	-	\$161	-	\$161	100.0%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	\$97	\$97	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$13,341</b>	<b>\$189,587</b>	<b>\$3,612</b>	<b>\$206,540</b>	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Lao	-	\$1,617	\$256	\$1,873	86.3%	0.9%
Punjabi	-	\$1,248	-	\$1,248	100.0%	0.6%
Thai	-	\$559	\$407	\$966	57.9%	0.5%
Mien	\$147	-	\$585	\$732	20.1%	0.3%
American Sign Language	-	\$556	-	\$556	100.0%	0.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$147	\$256	\$403	36.5%	0.2%
French	-	-	\$358	\$358	0.0%	0.2%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (3)	-	\$294	-	\$294	100.0%	0.1%
Amharic	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.1%
Turkish	-	-	\$189	\$189	0.0%	0.1%
Persian of Iran (Farsi)	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$147</b>	<b>\$4,833</b>	<b>\$2,051</b>	<b>\$7,030</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$13,488</b>	<b>\$194,419</b>	<b>\$5,662</b>	<b>\$213,570</b>	<b>97.3% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Bulgarian and Polish.

**Table A17: Superior Court of Merced County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$9,215	\$109,750	\$220,950	\$339,914	35.0%	77.1%
Portuguese	-	\$40	\$8,346	\$8,386	0.5%	1.9%
Japanese	-	-	\$1,094	\$1,094	0.0%	0.2%
Armenian (1)	-	-	\$1,067	\$1,067	0.0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	\$350	\$428	\$778	45.0%	0.2%
Vietnamese	-	\$333	\$291	\$624	53.3%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	\$424	\$424	0.0%	0.1%
Korean	-	-	\$187	\$187	0.0%	0.0%
Arabic	-	-	\$121	\$121	0.0%	0.0%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	\$80	\$80	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$9,215</b>	<b>\$110,473</b>	<b>\$232,988</b>	<b>\$352,676</b>	<b>33.9%</b>	<b>80.0%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	\$2,218	-	\$21,429	\$23,647	9.4%	5.4%
Mien	-	\$11,495	\$6,188	\$17,683	65.0%	4.0%
Punjabi	\$11,954	-	\$5,300	\$17,254	69.3%	3.9%
American Sign Language	-	\$2,853	\$10,299	\$13,152	21.7%	3.0%
Lao	-	\$6,182	\$4,180	\$10,362	59.7%	2.3%
All Other Languages (2)	\$576	\$695	\$3,538	\$4,810	26.4%	1.1%
Khmer	\$878	-	\$201	\$1,079	81.4%	0.2%
Assyrian	-	-	\$294	\$294	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$15,626</b>	<b>\$21,225</b>	<b>\$51,430</b>	<b>\$88,281</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$24,841</b>	<b>\$131,698</b>	<b>\$284,418</b>	<b>\$440,957</b>	<b>35.5% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A18: Superior Court of Mono County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$18,598	-	-	\$18,598	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$18,598</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$18,598</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A19: Superior Court of Nevada County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	\$18,686	\$16,727	\$35,413	52.8%	78.6%
Vietnamese	-	\$5,159	-	\$5,159	100.0%	11.5%
Russian (1)	-	\$1,607	-	\$1,607	100.0%	3.6%
Portuguese	-	\$861	\$133	\$994	86.6%	2.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$26,313</b>	<b>\$16,860</b>	<b>\$43,173</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>95.9%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	-	\$768	\$768	0.0%	1.7%
French	-	-	\$497	\$497	0.0%	1.1%
Punjabi	-	\$338	-	\$338	100.0%	0.8%
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$603</b>	<b>\$1,265</b>	<b>\$1,869</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$26,916</b>	<b>\$18,125</b>	<b>\$45,042</b>	<b>59.8% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A20: Superior Court of Plumas County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	-	\$6,688	\$6,688	-	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	-	<b>\$6,688</b>	<b>\$6,688</b>	-	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A21: Superior Court of Sacramento County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$42,369	\$604,519	\$7,440	\$654,329	98.9%	38.6%
Russian (1)	\$74,056	\$121,540	\$92	\$195,688	100.0%	11.5%
Vietnamese	-	\$45,856	\$61,540	\$107,396	42.7%	6.3%
Armenian (1)	\$9,064	\$69,258	-	\$78,322	100.0%	4.6%
Cantonese	-	\$24,901	\$9,655	\$34,556	72.1%	2.0%
Korean	-	\$721	\$12,778	\$13,499	5.3%	0.8%
Tagalog	-	-	\$7,014	\$7,014	0.0%	0.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$2,911	\$1,748	\$4,659	62.5%	0.3%
Arabic	-	\$3,499	-	\$3,499	100.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	\$1,323	-	\$1,323	100.0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	\$456	-	\$456	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$125,490</b>	<b>\$874,984</b>	<b>\$100,268</b>	<b>\$1,100,741</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$85,080	\$88,137	\$173,217	49.1%	10.2%
Hmong	\$113,201	\$6,472	\$11,290	\$130,963	91.4%	7.7%
Mien	\$24,230	\$33,309	\$7,988	\$65,527	87.8%	3.9%
Lao	-	\$41,057	\$4,086	\$45,143	90.9%	2.7%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (2)	-	\$28,800	\$5,244	\$34,045	84.6%	2.0%
Punjabi	\$3,504	\$29,910	\$92	\$33,506	99.7%	2.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (3)	\$2,181	\$24,808	\$267	\$27,256	99.0%	1.6%
All Other Languages (4)	\$147	\$13,067	\$8,262	\$21,476	61.5%	1.3%
Farsi (5)	-	\$18,786	-	\$18,786	100.0%	1.1%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (6)	-	\$2,787	\$13,961	\$16,748	16.6%	1.0%
Tongan	-	\$2,620	\$10,105	\$12,725	20.6%	0.8%
Khmer	\$7,215	\$2,818	\$198	\$10,231	98.1%	0.6%
African Languages (7)	-	\$3,100	-	\$3,100	100.0%	0.2%
Samoan	-	-	\$828	\$828	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$150,478</b>	<b>\$292,615</b>	<b>\$150,457</b>	<b>\$593,550</b>	<b>74.7%</b>	<b>35.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$275,968</b>	<b>\$1,167,598</b>	<b>\$250,725</b>	<b>\$1,694,292</b>	<b>85.2% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003—04.

(2) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, Romanian, Serbian, and Ukrainian.

(3) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(4) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(5) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(6) Includes Fijian Hindustan, Ilocano, Taiwanese and Thai

(7) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya

**Table A22: Superior Court of San Benito County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	2,713	54,590	1,060	58,363	98.2%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,713</b>	<b>54,590</b>	<b>1,060</b>	<b>58,363</b>	<b>98.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

**Table A23: Superior Court of San Bernardino County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$1,510,972	\$281,335	\$29,804	\$1,822,111	98.4%	89.1%
Vietnamese	-	\$29,604	\$1,566	\$31,169	95.0%	1.5%
Korean	-	\$21,875	-	\$21,875	100.0%	1.1%
Arabic	-	\$18,600	\$1,735	\$20,335	91.5%	1.0%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$16,730	-	\$16,730	100.0%	0.8%
Armenian (1)	-	\$346	\$5,409	\$5,756	6.0%	0.3%
Russian (1)	-	\$4,432	\$265	\$4,697	94.4%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	\$4,444	\$4,444	0.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	\$2,353	\$398	\$2,751	85.5%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	\$976	\$530	\$1,506	64.8%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	\$921	\$299	\$1,220	75.5%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$1,510,972</b>	<b>\$377,172</b>	<b>\$44,450</b>	<b>\$1,932,594</b>	<b>97.7%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$6,134	\$41,776	\$47,909	12.8%	2.3%
Khmer	-	-	\$11,452	\$11,452	0.0%	0.6%
Samoan	-	-	\$10,020	\$10,020	0.0%	0.5%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (2)	-	\$6,841	\$2,144	\$8,985	76.1%	0.4%
All Other Languages (3)	-	\$5,404	\$2,934	\$8,338	64.8%	0.4%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (4)	-	\$743	\$6,110	\$6,853	10.8%	0.3%
Punjabi	-	\$586	\$5,177	\$5,763	10.2%	0.3%
African Languages (5)	-	\$2,233	\$1,206	\$3,439	64.9%	0.2%
Other Asian Indian Languages (6)	-	\$336	\$2,892	\$3,228	10.4%	0.2%
Tongan	-	-	\$2,054	\$2,054	0.0%	0.1%
Farsi (7)	-	\$581	\$1,139	\$1,720	33.8%	0.1%
Other Western European Languages (8)	-	\$709	\$306	\$1,015	69.9%	0.0%
Middle Eastern Languages (9)	-	-	\$917	\$917	0.0%	0.0%
Lao	-	\$570	\$92	\$662	86.1%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$24,136</b>	<b>\$88,217</b>	<b>\$112,353</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$1,510,972</b>	<b>\$401,308</b>	<b>\$132,667</b>	<b>\$2,044,947</b>	<b>93.5% <sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian, Mandarin, and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Greek, Hungarian, and Romanian.

(3) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Indonesian and Thai.

(5) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya.

(6) Includes Bengali, Gujranti, Hindi and Urdu.

(7) Includes Farsi (also known as Persian of Iran).

(8) Includes Dutch and German.

(9) Includes Assyrian and Turkish.

**Table A24: Superior Court of the County of San Diego  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$1,953,069	\$517,631	\$635	\$2,471,335	99.97%	83.8%
Vietnamese	\$3,180	\$60,030	\$32,916	\$96,126	65.8%	3.3%
Tagalog	-	-	\$33,297	\$33,297	0.0%	1.1%
Arabic	-	\$4,591	\$16,576	\$21,167	21.7%	0.7%
Russian (1)	-	\$15,823	\$184	\$16,007	98.9%	0.5%
Mandarin (1)	\$5,087	\$7,560	\$184	\$12,831	98.6%	0.4%
Korean	-	\$3,742	\$8,496	\$12,238	30.6%	0.4%
Japanese	-	-	\$9,730	\$9,730	0.0%	0.3%
Portuguese	-	\$2,029	\$1,740	\$3,769	53.8%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	\$3,130	\$3,130	0.0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	\$1,470	\$736	\$2,206	66.6%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$1,961,336</b>	<b>\$612,876</b>	<b>\$107,623</b>	<b>\$2,681,835</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	-	\$103,139	\$103,139	0.0%	3.5%
Khmer	\$12,939	-	\$19,053	\$31,992	40.4%	1.1%
African Languages (2)	-	-	\$30,042	\$30,042	0.0%	1.0%
Lao	\$14,267	\$4,069	\$8,238	\$26,574	69.0%	0.9%
All Other Languages (3)	\$2,942	\$3,577	\$16,671	\$23,190	28.1%	0.8%
Farsi (4)	-	\$12,762	\$5,076	\$17,838	71.5%	0.6%
Middle Eastern Languages (5)	\$4,399	\$1,735	\$3,330	\$9,464	64.8%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (6)	-	\$3,739	\$4,353	\$8,092	46.2%	0.3%
Hmong	-	-	\$5,149	\$5,149	0.0%	0.2%
Other Western European Languages (7)	\$530	\$2,058	\$2,258	\$4,846	53.4%	0.2%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (8)	\$2,147	\$147	\$460	\$2,754	83.3%	0.1%
Punjabi	-	-	\$2,132	\$2,132	0.0%	0.1%
Samoan	-	-	\$828	\$828	0.0%	0.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (9)	-	-	\$368	\$368	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$37,224</b>	<b>\$28,087</b>	<b>\$201,096</b>	<b>\$266,407</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$1,998,560</b>	<b>\$640,963</b>	<b>\$308,719</b>	<b>\$2,948,242</b>	<b>89.5%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian, Mandarin, and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Amharic, Somali, Swahili, and Tingrianya.

(3) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Farsi, Persian of Afghanistan (Dari), and Farsi (Persian of Iran).

(5) Includes Chaldean, Hebrew, and Turkish.

(6) Includes Albanian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Georgian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak, Ukrainian.

(7) Includes French, German, and Italian.

(8) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai.

(9) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

**Table A25: Superior Court of San Joaquin County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$114,570	\$254,313	\$141,482	\$510,365	72.3%	70.9%
Vietnamese	-	\$12,443	\$18,481	\$30,924	40.2%	4.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$541	\$3,096	\$3,637	14.9%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	-	\$1,971	\$1,971	0.0%	0.3%
Tagalog	-	-	\$1,371	\$1,371	0.0%	0.2%
Korean	-	-	\$1,205	\$1,205	0.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	\$700	\$112	\$812	86.2%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	\$761	-	\$761	100.0%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	\$644	\$644	0.0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	\$285	-	\$285	100.0%	0.0%
Russian (1)	-	-	\$276	\$276	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$114,570</b>	<b>\$269,042</b>	<b>\$168,639</b>	<b>\$552,252</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	<b>76.7%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Khmer	\$23,839	\$2,354	\$27,436	\$53,629	48.8%	7.4%
All Other Languages (2)	\$412	-	\$33,631	\$34,043	1.2%	4.7%
Lao	-	-	\$16,397	\$16,397	0.0%	2.3%
American Sign Language	-	\$198	\$16,078	\$16,276	1.2%	2.3%
Hmong	-	-	\$16,152	\$16,152	0.0%	2.2%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (3)	-	-	\$11,951	\$11,951	0.0%	1.7%
Punjabi	\$8,200	\$812	\$2,751	\$11,763	76.6%	1.6%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	\$559	-	\$4,434	\$4,993	11.2%	0.7%
Farsi (5)	-	\$925	\$1,282	\$2,208	41.9%	0.3%
Samoan	-	-	\$460	\$460	0.0%	0.1%
Romanian	-	-	\$122	\$122	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$33,009</b>	<b>\$4,290</b>	<b>\$130,695</b>	<b>\$167,994</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$147,579</b>	<b>\$273,332</b>	<b>\$299,334</b>	<b>\$720,245</b>	<b>58.4%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Fijian Hindustani and Ilocano.

(4) Includes Hindi, Pashto, and Urdu.

(5) Includes Persian of Afghanistan (Dari) and Persian of Iran (Farsi).

**Table A26: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$178,761	\$359	\$179,120	99.8%	94.9%
Armenian (1)	-	\$1,000	-	\$1,000	100.0%	0.5%
Cantonese	\$579	-	-	\$579	100.0%	0.3%
Japanese	-	\$430	-	\$430	100.0%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	\$368	\$368	0.0%	0.2%
Arabic	-	-	\$184	\$184	0.0%	0.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	\$92	\$92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$579</b>	<b>\$180,191</b>	<b>\$1,003</b>	<b>\$181,772</b>	<b>99.4%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$5,935	\$331	\$6,266	94.7%	3.3%
Ilocano	-	-	\$552	\$552	0.0%	0.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$242	\$242	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$5,935</b>	<b>\$1,125</b>	<b>\$7,060</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$579</b>	<b>\$186,125</b>	<b>\$2,128</b>	<b>\$188,832</b>	<b>98.9%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A27: Superior Court of San Mateo County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$214,454	\$251,371	\$64,986	\$530,810	87.8%	68.2%
Tagalog	-	\$39,916	\$23,922	\$63,838	62.5%	8.2%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$38,179	-	\$38,179	100.0%	4.9%
Cantonese	\$16,924	\$6,719	-	\$23,643	100.0%	3.0%
Vietnamese	-	\$23,181	-	\$23,181	100.0%	3.0%
Russian (1)	-	\$16,605	-	\$16,605	100.0%	2.1%
Portuguese	-	-	\$12,585	\$12,585	0.0%	1.6%
Japanese	-	-	\$5,255	\$5,255	0.0%	0.7%
Korean	\$932	\$1,982	-	\$2,913	100.0%	0.4%
Arabic	-	\$853	-	\$853	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$232,309</b>	<b>\$378,805</b>	<b>\$106,748</b>	<b>\$717,863</b>	<b>85.1%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Tongan	-	\$16,427	\$2,605	\$19,032	86.3%	2.4%
Samoan	-	\$9,645	\$752	\$10,397	92.8%	1.3%
Punjabi	-	\$8,474	-	\$8,474	100.0%	1.1%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (2)	-	\$6,991	\$184	\$7,175	97.4%	0.9%
American Sign Language	-	\$1,911	\$4,445	\$6,356	30.1%	0.8%
Other Asian Indian Languages (3)	\$167	\$1,981	-	\$2,148	100.0%	0.3%
Lao	-	\$2,082	-	\$2,082	100.0%	0.3%
Farsi (4)	-	-	\$2,075	\$2,075	0.0%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (5)	-	\$1,075	-	\$1,075	100.0%	0.1%
Turkish	-	-	\$664	\$664	0.0%	0.1%
Italian	-	\$480	-	\$480	100.0%	0.1%
Tigrinya	-	\$335	-	\$335	100.0%	0.0%
All Other Languages	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$167</b>	<b>\$49,665</b>	<b>\$10,725</b>	<b>\$60,558</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$232,477</b>	<b>\$428,470</b>	<b>\$117,473</b>	<b>\$778,420</b>	<b>84.9%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Mandarin and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, and Thai.

(3) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(4) Includes Farsi and Persian of Afghanistan (Dari).

(5) Includes Croatian and Polish.

**Table A28: Superior Court of Santa Barbara County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$89,518	\$407,425	\$1,072	\$498,016	99.8%	92.0%
Armenian (1)	-	\$2,016	\$1,597	\$3,613	55.8%	0.7%
Korean	-	\$2,356	\$368	\$2,724	86.5%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	\$1,245	-	\$1,245	100.0%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	\$980	\$980	0.0%	0.2%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$641	\$278	\$920	69.7%	0.2%
Vietnamese	-	\$842	-	\$842	100.0%	0.2%
Arabic	-	\$776	-	\$776	100.0%	0.1%
Japanese	-	\$773	-	\$773	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$89,518</b>	<b>\$416,075</b>	<b>\$4,296</b>	<b>\$509,889</b>	<b>99.2%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$12,118	\$2,660	\$14,778	82.0%	2.7%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$12,850	\$12,850	0.0%	2.4%
Hmong	-	-	\$1,723	\$1,723	0.0%	0.3%
Ilocano	-	-	\$1,238	\$1,238	0.0%	0.2%
Hebrew	-	\$810	-	\$810	100.0%	0.1%
Italian	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$13,193</b>	<b>\$18,471</b>	<b>\$31,664</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$89,518</b>	<b>\$429,268</b>	<b>\$22,767</b>	<b>\$541,553</b>	<b>95.8%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A29: Superior Court of Santa Clara County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$394,051	\$105,499	\$243,741	\$743,291	67.2%	58.5%
Vietnamese	\$49,821	\$191,084	\$56,636	\$297,541	81.0%	23.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$46,220	\$359	\$46,579	99.2%	3.7%
Tagalog	-	\$174	\$34,080	\$34,254	0.5%	2.7%
Korean	\$5,708	\$2,665	\$10,409	\$18,781	44.6%	1.5%
Cantonese	-	\$724	\$9,029	\$9,753	7.4%	0.8%
Russian (1)	-	\$3,323	\$5,838	\$9,161	36.3%	0.7%
Japanese	-	-	\$2,796	\$2,796	0.0%	0.2%
Arabic	-	-	\$243	\$243	0.0%	0.0%
Portuguese	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$449,580</b>	<b>\$349,836</b>	<b>\$363,130</b>	<b>\$1,162,546</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>91.5%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Punjabi	\$25,865	\$4,948	-	\$30,813	100.0%	2.4%
Khmer	-	\$8,662	\$16,211	\$24,873	34.8%	2.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$18,510	\$18,510	0.0%	1.5%
African Languages (2)	-	\$355	\$9,385	\$9,741	3.6%	0.8%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (3)	-	\$5,661	-	\$5,661	100.0%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	\$930	\$1,174	\$3,249	\$5,353	39.3%	0.4%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (5)	-	-	\$5,297	\$5,297	0.0%	0.4%
Farsi (6)	\$294	\$1,702	\$1,914	\$3,910	51.1%	0.3%
Tongan	-	\$2,552	-	\$2,552	100.0%	0.2%
Middle Eastern Languages (7)	-	-	\$591	\$591	0.0%	0.0%
All Other Languages (8)	-	-	\$267	\$267	0.0%	0.0%
Dutch	-	-	\$92	\$92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$27,089</b>	<b>\$25,055</b>	<b>\$55,515</b>	<b>\$107,659</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$476,669</b>	<b>\$374,891</b>	<b>\$418,645</b>	<b>\$1,270,204</b>	<b>67.0%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Amharic, Amharic (Ethiopian), Oromo, Somali, and Tigrinya.

(3) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Polish, Romanian, and Serbian.

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(5) Includes Ilocano, Ilogono, and Thai.

(6) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran).

(7) Includes Hebrew and Turkish.

(8) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A30: Superior Court of Santa Cruz County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$99,341	\$278,142	\$27,559	\$405,041	93.2%	91.3%
Tagalog	-	\$1,461	\$734	\$2,195	66.6%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	\$1,694	-	\$1,694	100.0%	0.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$1,210	-	\$1,210	100.0%	0.3%
Korean	-	\$325	\$113	\$438	74.2%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	\$371	\$371	0.0%	0.1%
Cantonese	\$340	-	-	\$340	100.0%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	\$184	\$184	0.0%	0.0%
Vietnamese	-	\$173	-	\$173	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$99,681</b>	<b>\$283,005</b>	<b>\$28,961</b>	<b>\$411,646</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>92.8%</b>
Nondesigned Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$17,430	\$4,794	\$22,224	78.4%	5.0%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$6,021	\$6,021	0.0%	1.4%
Punjabi	-	\$2,061	-	\$2,061	100.0%	0.5%
Thai	-	\$809	-	\$809	100.0%	0.2%
Croatian	-	\$517	-	\$517	100.0%	0.1%
Khmer	-	\$206	-	\$206	100.0%	0.0%
Italian	-	-	\$114	\$114	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesigned Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$21,023</b>	<b>\$10,929</b>	<b>\$31,952</b>	<b>65.8%</b>	<b>7.2%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$99,681</b>	<b>\$304,028</b>	<b>\$39,890</b>	<b>\$443,599</b>	<b>91%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A31: Superior Court of Shasta County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$20,434	\$9,245	\$29,679	68.9%	36.5%
Vietnamese	-	\$1,146	-	\$1,146	100.0%	1.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	\$426	\$426	0.0%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	-	\$210	\$210	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$21,580</b>	<b>\$9,881</b>	<b>\$31,461</b>	<b>68.6%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Mien	-	\$5,283	\$14,578	\$19,862	26.6%	24.4%
Lao	-	\$15,501	\$3,463	\$18,964	81.7%	23.3%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$7,318	\$7,318	0.0%	9.0%
Punjabi	\$526	\$1,736	-	\$2,262	100.0%	2.8%
Thai	-	\$1,070	-	\$1,070	100.0%	1.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$387	\$387	0.0%	0.5%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$526</b>	<b>\$23,589</b>	<b>\$25,747</b>	<b>\$49,862</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>61.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$526</b>	<b>\$45,169</b>	<b>\$35,628</b>	<b>\$81,323</b>	<b>56.2%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003—2004.

21) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A32: Superior Court of Siskiyou County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$9,482	\$26,087	\$3,761	\$39,329	90.4%	86.3%
Russian (1)	-	\$733	\$205	\$938	78.1%	2.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$704	-	\$704	100.0%	1.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$9,482</b>	<b>\$27,523</b>	<b>\$3,966</b>	<b>\$40,971</b>	<b>90.3%</b>	<b>89.9%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$811	\$1,525	\$2,336	34.7%	5.1%
Lao	-	\$2,286	-	\$2,286	100.0%	5.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$3,097</b>	<b>\$1,525</b>	<b>\$4,622</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$9,482</b>	<b>\$30,621</b>	<b>\$5,491</b>	<b>\$45,593</b>	<b>88.0%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A33: Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$101,485	\$136,803	\$28,003	\$266,291	89.5%	78.5%
Portuguese	-	-	\$7,697	\$7,697	0.0%	2.3%
Vietnamese	-	\$1,716	\$441	\$2,157	79.6%	0.6%
Cantonese	-	\$787	\$587	\$1,374	57.3%	0.4%
Arabic	-	-	\$882	\$882	0.0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$645	\$240	\$885	72.9%	0.3%
Armenian (1)	-	-	\$250	\$250	0.0%	0.1%
Russian (1)	-	-	\$930	\$930	0.0%	0.3%
Tagalog	-	-	\$456	\$456	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$101,485</b>	<b>\$139,951</b>	<b>\$39,486</b>	<b>\$280,922</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$11,870	-	\$11,870	100.0%	3.5%
Khmer	-	\$3,780	\$7,214	\$10,994	34.4%	3.2%
Lao	-	\$3,367	\$5,505	\$8,872	38.0%	2.6%
Punjabi	\$5,863	\$460	\$2,370	\$8,693	72.7%	2.6%
Assyrian	-	-	\$6,853	\$6,853	0.0%	2.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (2)	\$2,672	-	\$1,649	\$4,321	61.8%	1.3%
Romanian	-	\$2,626	-	\$2,626	100.0%	0.8%
Farsi (3)	-	\$1,322	\$715	\$2,037	64.9%	0.6%
Finnish	-	-	\$947	\$947	0.0%	0.3%
Samoan	-	-	\$508	\$508	0.0%	0.1%
Hmong	-	-	\$456	\$456	0.0%	0.1%
Mien	-	-	\$147	\$147	0.0%	0.0%
Hebrew	-	-	\$92	\$92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$8,535</b>	<b>\$23,425</b>	<b>\$26,456</b>	<b>\$58,416</b>	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>17.2%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$110,020</b>	<b>\$163,376</b>	<b>\$65,942</b>	<b>\$339,338</b>	<b>80.6%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04

(2) Includes Hindi and Pashto

(3) Includes Farsi and Dari (Persian of Afghanistan)

**Table A34: Superior Court of Sutter County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/O pt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$54,648	\$16,506	\$2,279	\$73,433	96.9%	61.3%
Russian (1)	\$380	\$885	-	\$1,265	100.0%	1.1%
Vietnamese	-	\$912	-	\$912	100.0%	0.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$491	-	\$491	100.0%	0.4%
Korean	-	-	\$307	\$307	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$55,028</b>	<b>\$18,794</b>	<b>\$2,586</b>	<b>\$76,408</b>	<b>96.6%</b>	<b>63.7%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/O pt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Punjabi	\$9,441	\$10,745	\$7,950	\$28,136	71.7%	23.5%
All Other Languages (2)	\$875	\$4,269	\$138	\$5,283	97.4%	4.4%
Hmong	\$632	\$1,619	\$418	\$2,669	84.3%	2.2%
American Sign Language	-	\$354	\$1,481	\$1,835	19.3%	1.5%
Hindi	\$610	\$1,188	-	\$1,798	100.0%	1.5%
Lao	-	\$953	\$355	\$1,308	72.9%	1.1%
Romanian	-	\$1,021	-	\$1,021	100.0%	0.9%
Mien	-	\$892	-	\$892	100.0%	0.7%
Khmer	-	\$341	-	\$341	100.0%	0.3%
Persian of Iran (Farsi)	-	\$193	-	\$193	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$11,558</b>	<b>\$21,574</b>	<b>\$10,343</b>	<b>\$43,475</b>	<b>76.2%</b>	<b>36.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$66,586</b>	<b>\$40,369</b>	<b>\$12,928</b>	<b>\$119,883</b>	<b>89.2%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table 35: Superior Court of Tehama County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$5,724	\$5,673	\$11,397	50.2%	80.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$2,098	-	\$2,098	100%	14.8%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$7,822</b>	<b>\$5,673</b>	<b>\$13,495</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>95.5%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	-	\$339	\$339	0%	2.4%
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$296	-	\$296	100%	2.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$296</b>	<b>\$339</b>	<b>\$635</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$8,118</b>	<b>\$6,012</b>	<b>\$14,130</b>	<b>57.5%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Mandarin became a certified language in FY 2003—2004

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table 36: Superior Court of Tulare County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$226,434	\$222,911	\$203,321	\$652,666	68.8%	94.6%
Portuguese	-	-	\$2,282	\$2,282	0.0%	0.3%
Vietnamese	-	-	\$626	\$626	0.0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	-	\$460	\$460	0.0%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	\$184	\$184	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$226,434</b>	<b>\$222,911</b>	<b>\$206,873</b>	<b>\$656,218</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>95%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	-	\$14,178	\$14,178	0.0%	2.1%
Lao	-	-	\$9,576	\$9,576	0.0%	1.4%
Ilocano	-	\$265	\$3,745	\$4,010	6.6%	0.6%
Hmong	-	-	\$1,932	\$1,932	0.0%	0.3%
Punjabi	-	-	\$1,657	\$1,657	0.0%	0.2%
Mien	-	-	\$1,652	\$1,652	0.0%	0.2%
Khmer	\$322	-	\$175	\$497	64.8%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$322</b>	<b>\$265</b>	<b>\$32,914</b>	<b>\$33,501</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$226,756</b>	<b>\$223,176</b>	<b>\$239,786</b>	<b>\$689,719</b>	<b>62.5%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Armenian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004

**Table A37: Superior Court of Tuolumne County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	\$9,598	\$1,004	\$10,603	90.5%	82.6%
Russian (1)	\$344	-	-	\$344	100.0%	2.7%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$344</b>	<b>\$9,598</b>	<b>\$1,004</b>	<b>\$10,947</b>	<b>90.8%</b>	<b>85.3%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/Opt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	\$900	\$900	0%	7.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$784	\$784	0%	6.1%
Farsi	-	-	\$202	\$202	0%	1.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$1,886</b>	<b>\$1,886</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$344</b>	<b>\$9,598</b>	<b>\$2,890</b>	<b>\$12,833</b>	<b>77.5%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003—2004

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A38: Superior Court of Ventura County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	\$479,117	\$7,030	\$486,147	98.6%	97.1%
Armenian (1)	-	\$7,665	-	\$7,665	100.0%	1.5%
Vietnamese	-	\$7,513	\$139	\$7,652	98.2%	1.5%
Korean	-	\$3,420	\$2,279	\$5,699	60.0%	1.1%
Tagalog	-	-	\$3,292	\$3,292	0.0%	0.7%
Japanese	-	\$1,502	-	\$1,502	100.0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$1,093	\$147	\$1,240	88.1%	0.2%
Arabic	-	\$1,142	-	\$1,142	100.0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	\$504	-	\$504	100.0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	\$147	\$92	\$239	61.5%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$479,117</b>	<b>\$7,030</b>	<b>\$486,147</b>	<b>98.6%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
All Other Languages (2)	-	\$1,301	\$4,250	\$5,551	23.4%	1.1%
Farsi (3)	-	\$2,141	-	\$2,141	100.0%	0.4%
Punjabi	-	\$1,693	\$216	\$1,909	88.7%	0.4%
Lao	-	\$913	\$671	\$1,585	57.6%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (4)	-	\$1,555	-	\$1,555	100.0%	0.3%
Thai	-	\$677	-	\$677	100.0%	0.1%
Hebrew	-	\$463	-	\$463	100.0%	0.1%
Italian	-	\$369	-	\$369	100.0%	0.1%
Hindi	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$9,258</b>	<b>\$5,137</b>	<b>\$14,395</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	-	<b>\$488,374</b>	<b>\$12,167</b>	<b>\$500,541</b>	<b>97.6%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003--2004.

(2) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Farsi, and Farsi (Persian of Iran).

(4) Includes Greek and Polish.

**Table A39: Superior Court of Yolo County**  
**Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Certified Contractor/Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified <sup>b</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	\$791	\$208,244	\$687	\$209,722	99.7%	64.6%
Russian (1)	\$176	\$26,059	\$317	\$26,552	98.8%	8.2%
Tagalog	-	-	\$9,674	\$9,674	0.0%	3.0%
Vietnamese	-	-	\$4,434	\$4,434	0.0%	1.4%
Cantonese	-	\$1,313	\$1,874	\$3,188	41.2%	1.0%
Korean	-	-	\$2,547	\$2,547	0.0%	0.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$683	\$1,261	\$1,944	35.1%	0.6%
Arabic	-	\$680	-	\$680	100.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	\$617	-	\$617	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$966</b>	<b>\$237,597</b>	<b>\$20,794</b>	<b>\$259,358</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>79.9%</b>
Nondesignated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup>	Registered Contractor/Opt Out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered <sup>c</sup>	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	\$500	\$13,214	\$13,714	3.6%	4.2%
Punjabi	-	\$6,119	\$6,029	\$12,147	50.4%	3.7%
Lao	-	\$6,874	\$3,626	\$10,501	65.5%	3.2%
Mien	-	\$4,730	\$2,132	\$6,862	68.9%	2.1%
Farsi(2)	-	\$6,857	-	\$6,857	100.0%	2.1%
Hmong	\$784	-	\$4,590	\$5,373	14.6%	1.7%
All Other Languages (3)	\$147	\$677	\$2,428	\$3,252	25.3%	1.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages(4)	-	\$1,460	\$1,268	\$2,728	53.5%	0.8%
Khmer	\$1,937	\$310	-	\$2,248	100.0%	0.7%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (5)	-	-	\$1,431	\$1,431	0.0%	0.4%
Samoan	-	-	\$220	\$220	0.0%	0.1%
Tongan	-	-	\$110	\$110	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$2,868</b>	<b>\$27,528</b>	<b>\$35,047</b>	<b>\$65,443</b>	<b>46.4%</b>	<b>20.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$3,835</b>	<b>\$265,125</b>	<b>\$55,841</b>	<b>\$324,801</b>	<b>82.8%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

(2) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran).

(3) May include Latin American languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, and Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu.

(5) Includes Fijian Hindustani and Thai.

**Table A40: Superior Court of Yuba County  
Expenditures on Contract, Per Diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Certified Contractor/O pt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified <sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	\$147	\$15,703	\$175	\$16,025	98.9%	51.9%
Armenian	\$530	\$313	-	\$843	100.0%	2.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	\$299	-	\$299	100.0%	1.0%
Cantonese	-	\$265	-	\$265	100.0%	0.9%
Russian (1)	-	\$147	-	\$147	100.0%	0.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$677</b>	<b>\$16,727</b>	<b>\$175</b>	<b>\$17,579</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>57.0%</b>
<b>Nondesignated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Registered Contractor/O pt Out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered <sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Hmong	\$294	\$1,916	\$3,179	\$5,389	41.0%	17.5%
Punjabi	-	\$2,566	-	\$2,566	100.0%	8.3%
American Sign Language	-	-	\$2,392	\$2,392	0.0%	7.8%
Italian	-	\$1,673	-	\$1,673	100.0%	5.4%
Lao	-	\$1,039	\$218	\$1,257	82.7%	4.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$294</b>	<b>\$7,194</b>	<b>\$5,789</b>	<b>\$13,277</b>	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>43.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL <sup>e</sup></b>	<b>\$971</b>	<b>\$23,921</b>	<b>\$5,964</b>	<b>\$30,856</b>	<b>80.7%<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Court Interpreters Pro Tempore are court employees who are paid on a per diem basis.

<sup>b</sup> The proportion of expenditures for designated language interpretations performed by certified court interpreters.

<sup>c</sup> The proportion of expenditures for nondesignated language interpretations performed by registered court interpreters.

<sup>d</sup> The proportion of total expenditures for interpretations performed by certified or registered court interpreters.

<sup>e</sup> Some totals may not add up due to rounding.

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003—2004.

## Executive Summary (OCR part)

### A. Analysis of Expenditures

**Statewide Expenditures.** All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements (QFS) to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Of the \$2.2 billion appropriation for all trial court expenditures in fiscal year 2003-2004, \$65 million was spent on the Court Interpreters Program accounting for about 3% of the total court expenditures (see Table 2). This is approximately the same allocation as for fiscal year 2002-2003.

**Funded FTE Staff in Court Interpreters Program.** The trial courts reported 17.5 funded interpreter coordinator positions, 30 staff interpreters, and 641.4 FTE pro tempore interpreters for fiscal year 2004-2005. This represents an increase of 167.3 FTE staff from last fiscal year. The increase was mostly in the category of the pro tempore interpreter. Not all the courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, about 57 percent of the superior courts—33 of 58—reported authorized funded staff in the interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the court interpreters reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state.

### B. Analysis by Language and Interpreter Category

To make a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Administrative Office of the Court's Office of Court Research collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the trial courts. The principal source of data was the Court Interpreter Data Collection System or CIDCS.<sup>1</sup> In fiscal year 2003-2004, 40 courts submitted complete information on their interpreter expenditures using CIDCS. These courts included larger, urban trial courts and small, rural trial courts in all regions of the state. The 40 courts accounted for 37 percent of the expenditures of the AOC's Court Interpreters Program in fiscal year 2002–2003 and for 44 percent of total court expenditures by the courts in the same period (see Table 2).

The data on expenditures by language and certification status that were obtained from CIDCS are detailed in Table 4 and in Appendix A. For the 40 sampled courts, certified court interpreters accounted for about 85% of all interpreter expenditures, as reported in the CIDCS. Nearly all Spanish, Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian interpretations are done by certified interpreters. However, certified interpreter use is much lower for Tagalog, Korean, Portuguese, and Japanese.

About 52% of the interpreter expenditures were spent on registered interpreters for non-designated languages for the 40 sampled courts. American Sign Language, Hmong, Lao, Punjabi, Khmer, and Mien were the most interpreted non-designated languages. Yet, the proportion of registered interpreters used for those languages is relatively low, particularly for American Sign Language and Khmer, suggesting a need for additional registered interpreters in those languages.

---

<sup>1</sup> CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system used by the courts and the AOC to collect and analyze data on the use of and expenditures on spoken language interpreters in the trial courts.

At the individual court level, there is no discernable trend regarding the use of certified and registered interpreters between small, rural courts and larger, urban and suburban courts. The use of certified and registered interpreters for contract per-diem interpretations ranges from 0% to 100% depending on the language and location. Specific language needs vary widely with certain regions showing a growing need for American Sign Language, South Asian, and Southeast Asian language interpreters. Additionally, some courts report anecdotally that proceedings are sometimes delayed in order to ensure the availability of a certified or registered interpreter. In some incidents, non-certified/non-registered court staff was being called for interpreting tasks if the courts could not locate more qualified interpreters. 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.

## II. EXPENDITURES ON AND USE OF INTERPRETERS

### A. Statewide

All trial courts in the state report their expenditures on interpreting in Quarterly Financial Statements (QFS) to the AOC. The QFS for the courts in this study for fiscal year 2003–2004 are reported in Table 2. These data are reported in broad categories that include expenditures on personnel (court staff who administer the court interpreter programs as well as court staff employed as interpreters); expenditures on contract, per-diem interpreters; and expenditures on travel. Another source of statewide data on interpreters is the Salary and Position Worksheet—compiled by the AOC and reported on Schedule 7A, Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget—in which all trial courts report the salaries and job titles of authorized, funded staff as shown in Table 3.

A third source of statewide data is the biannual report on each trial court’s use of registered, noncertified, and nonregistered interpreters. A fourth source of statewide data is the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS), an internet-based data collection system in use by most of the superior courts in California. Beginning in the second quarter of fiscal year 2002–2003, the AOC launched the CIDCS for tracking expenditures on interpreter services by language, case type, and event type. This system is linked to all 58 trial courts through Serranus, the judicial branch’s internal Web site. As of December 1, 2004, 49 of the 58 courts had input data into the system.

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

The data presented in Section C and Appendix A are taken from CIDCS for the fiscal year of 2003–2004. Table 4 illustrates data from 40 courts that reported complete data on interpreter usage in CIDCS from July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004. Data were collected on full- and half-day interpreting sessions by language and certification status as well as by other information such as case type and the number of cases. Only expenditure data by language and certification status will be presented here. The certification status is further broken down into court interpreters pro tempore; contract, per-diem and opt-out interpreters; and noncertified or nonregistered interpreters in both language categories (designated and nondesignated.)

Note that there are differences in the expenditure data reported in the QFS and the CIDCS (Tables 2 and 4). Since the CIDCS data is not used as the basis for payment to the courts, it should not be used as a definitive source for expenditure data. Rather, the value of the CIDCS is in showing expenditures for contract, per-diem court interpretation by language and certification status. This data will, among other things, help courts and the Court Interpreters’ Program to recognize

languages that should become certified due to high usage levels or to identify courts and languages that would benefit from having more court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters.

The 40 sample courts<sup>2</sup>—which include courts of all sizes, from large urban courts such as San Diego to smaller, more rural courts such as Tuolumne—reported that they had used more than 73 languages during the fiscal year 2003-2004. As Table 2 illustrates, interpreter expenditures of these sample courts accounted for 37 percent of the \$65 million spent on court interpreting in California in fiscal year 2003–2004, whereas the total court expenditures of the 40 sample courts correspond to 44 percent of the \$2.2 billion statewide court expenditures.

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to heavy usage of interpreters and low numbers of staff, the Superior Court of Los Angeles was unable to provide information on interpreter usage in CIDCS in this reporting period.

**Table 2: Total Expenditures on Interpreters by Court, Fiscal Year 2003-2004**

Superior Court of	Total Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Total Court Expenditures	Interpreter Expenditures as % of Statewide Interpreter Expenditures
Amador	3,023,418	26,248	0.87%	0.04%
Butte	12,181,239	141,550	1.16%	0.22%
Calaveras	2,339,720	18,732	0.80%	0.03%
Colusa	1,323,684	110,614	8.36%	0.17%
Contra Costa	51,553,355	954,967	1.85%	1.47%
Del Norte	2,303,884	27,624	1.20%	0.04%
El Dorado	8,050,626	85,565	1.06%	0.13%
Fresno	41,510,680	1,795,245	4.32%	2.76%
Glenn	2,196,216	91,727	4.18%	0.14%
Imperial	7,968,192	279,458	3.51%	0.43%
Inyo	2,221,571	15,352	0.69%	0.02%
Kern	41,228,947	1,245,660	3.02%	1.91%
Kings	6,595,615	196,762	2.98%	0.30%
Lassen	2,410,204	26,660	1.11%	0.04%
Madera	5,482,744	325,815	5.94%	0.50%
Marin	16,873,117	386,409	2.29%	0.59%
Merced	10,696,028	479,922	4.49%	0.74%
Mono	1,299,678	30,328	2.33%	0.05%
Nevada	6,124,352	99,876	1.63%	0.15%
Plumas	2,078,237	6,688	0.32%	0.01%
Sacramento	87,019,887	2,030,486	2.33%	3.12%
San Benito (1)	2,843,352	53,636	2.52%	0.08%
San Bernardino	86,779,790	2,527,223	2.91%	3.88%
San Diego	189,595,975	3,725,319	1.96%	5.72%
San Joaquin	28,793,926	849,097	2.95%	1.30%
San Luis Obispo	14,425,280	195,836	1.36%	0.30%
San Mateo	44,469,457	1,203,336	2.71%	1.85%
Santa Barbara	24,991,771	725,240	2.90%	1.11%
Santa Clara	109,490,527	2,666,458	2.44%	4.09%
Santa Cruz	14,627,155	484,320	3.31%	0.74%
Shasta	11,812,100	93,343	0.79%	0.14%
Siskiyou	4,518,375	58,356	1.29%	0.09%
Stanislaus	18,694,459	515,214	2.76%	0.79%
Sutter	4,758,052	133,482	2.81%	0.20%
Tehama	3,700,680	100,062	2.70%	0.15%
Tulare	18,991,529	746,077	3.93%	1.15%
Tuolumne	3,486,583	23,800	0.68%	0.04%
Ventura	43,394,388	998,651	2.30%	1.53%
Yolo	10,313,981	386,317	3.75%	0.59%
Yuba	4,545,858	85,319	1.88%	0.13%
<b>40 confirmed courts</b>	<b>954,714,632</b>	<b>23,946,774</b>	<b>2.51%</b>	<b>36.70%</b>
<b>Rest of the state</b>	<b>1,226,891,448</b>	<b>41,307,991</b>	<b>3.37%</b>	<b>63.30%</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>2,181,606,080</b>	<b>65,254,765</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Quarterly Financial Statements, fiscal year 2003-2004

(1) As of December 15, 2004, Q4 San Benito was not available, so a projection based on the first three quarters was used.

**Table 3: Fiscal Year 2004-2005 Authorized, Funded FTE Staff  
in Court Interpreters Program as of July 1, 2004**

	Pro Tempore Interpreter	Staff Interpreter	Interpreter Coordinator	Total Interpreter Staff 04-05	Total Interpreter Staff 03-04	Change 03-04 to 04-05
Alameda	18.5	0.0	0.0	18.5	0.0	18.5
Alpine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Amador	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Butte	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Calaveras	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.1
Colusa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contra Costa	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Del Norte	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
El Dorado	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Fresno	14.6	6.0	0.0	20.6	6.0	14.6
Glenn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Humboldt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Imperial	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	2.0
Inyo	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kern	6.0	2.0	1.0	9.0	3.0	6.0
Kings	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lassen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Los Angeles	370.0	0.0	8.0	378.0	359.0	19.0
Madera	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0
Marin	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	-2.0
Mariposa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mendocino	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Merced	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Modoc	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mono	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Monterey	6.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	6.0
Napa	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Orange	50.0	1.0	0.0	51.0	35.0	16.0
Placer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Plumas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Riverside	15.0	1.0	0.0	16.0	1.0	15.0
Sacramento	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	-1.0
San Benito	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Bernardino	42.0	0.0	0.0	42.0	42.0	0.0
San Diego	35.6	7.0	0.0	42.6	17.5	25.1
San Francisco	10.2	0.0	1.0	11.2	0.0	11.2
San Joaquin	6.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	6.0
San Luis Obispo	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
San Mateo	7.6	0.0	1.0	8.6	1.0	7.6
Santa Barbara	3.0	5.0	0.5	8.5	6.5	2.0
Santa Clara	14.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	6.5	7.5
Santa Cruz	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Shasta	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sierra	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Siskiyou	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Solano	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Sonoma	7.0	0.0	1.0	8.0	6.0	2.0
Stanislaus	2.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
Sutter	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Tehama	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0
Trinity	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tulare	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0
Tuolumne	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ventura	0.0	5.0	1.0	6.0	6.0	0.0
Yolo	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Yuba	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>641.4</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>688.9</b>	<b>521.6</b>	<b>167.3</b>

**Table 4: Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	5,920,310	5,827,113	1,720,659	13,468,082	87%	76.8%
Vietnamese	53,001	414,913	191,213	659,127	71%	3.8%
Russian (1)	75,221	208,311	11,719	295,250	96%	1.7%
Tagalog	-	41,719	132,220	173,939	24%	1.0%
Mandarin (1)	7,819	133,781	9,929	151,530	93%	0.9%
Armenian (1)	9,594	90,825	14,206	114,624	88%	0.7%
Korean	7,081	44,331	47,096	98,507	52%	0.6%
Cantonese	24,033	40,211	27,528	91,773	70%	0.5%
Arabic	735	37,615	27,548	65,898	58%	0.4%
Portuguese	-	15,833	37,524	53,357	30%	0.3%
Japanese	-	8,540	21,374	29,915	29%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>6,097,794</b>	<b>6,863,192</b>	<b>2,241,016</b>	<b>15,202,003</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>87%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	176,667	422,929	599,596	29%	3.4%
Hmong	162,979	41,117	92,870	296,965	69%	1.7%
Lao	42,916	116,897	95,223	255,036	63%	1.5%
Punjabi	66,528	111,794	52,597	230,919	77%	1.3%
Khmer	87,039	22,277	91,972	201,289	54%	1.1%
All Other Languages (2)	19,813	38,451	129,383	187,647	31%	1.1%
Mien	24,377	61,289	48,050	133,716	64%	0.8%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (3)	2,147	23,432	47,963	73,543	35%	0.4%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (4)	-	52,160	13,246	65,407	80%	0.4%
Farsi (5)	294	49,219	13,458	62,970	79%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (6)	7,119	33,781	15,053	55,952	73%	0.3%
African Languages (7)	-	8,437	42,036	50,473	17%	0.3%
Tongan	-	30,964	17,745	48,709	64%	0.3%
Samoan	-	10,495	13,617	24,112	44%	0.1%
Middle Eastern Languages (8)	4,399	4,331	17,144	25,873	34%	0.1%
Other Western European Languages (9)	530	5,848	5,419	11,797	54%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesigned Languages</b>	<b>418,141</b>	<b>787,159</b>	<b>1,118,706</b>	<b>2,324,006</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,515,935</b>	<b>7,650,351</b>	<b>3,359,722</b>	<b>17,526,008</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Footnotes:

Includes data for the following counties: Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Contra Costa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Lassen, Madera, Marin, Merced, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, Sacramento, San Benito, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Tuolumne, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba

- (1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.
- (2) Includes Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco. Also includes data where a language was not specified.
- (3) Includes Burmese, Cebuano, Fijian Hindustani, Ilocano, Iloggono, Indonesian, Thai, and Taiwanese
- (4) Includes Albanian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Georgian, Greek, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak, and Ukrainian
- (5) Includes Dari (Persian of Afghanistan), Farsi, and Farsi (Persian of Iran)
- (6) Includes Bengali, Hindi, Gujranti, Pashto, and Urdu
- (7) Includes Amharic, Amharic (Ethiopian), Oromo, Somali, Swahili, and Tigrinya
- (8) Includes Assyrian, Chaldean, Hebrew, Kurdish, Persian, and Turkish
- (9) Includes Dutch, Finnish, French, German, and Italian

## B. By County and Interpreter Category

Each court sends an annual report to the AOC listing the number of authorized, funded positions by position title and program budget area. This report is called Schedule 7A, *Salary and Wages Supplement to the Annual Budget*. In July 2004 the trial courts reported about 689 full-time equivalent (FTE) authorized and funded staff positions in the trial courts' interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. The overwhelming majority of these positions were staff interpreters and pro tempore interpreters (as defined by SB 371).

Not all the courts employ staff in their interpreter programs. As Table 3 shows, about 57 percent of the superior courts—33 of 58—reported authorized funded staff in the interpreter programs for fiscal year 2004–2005. Differing staffing levels and patterns in the court interpreters reflect the range of current interpreter usage throughout the state. Most courts still rely primarily on contract interpreters; however, SB 371 has caused an increase in the number of pro tempore interpreters. Many courts also use court personnel, such as courtroom or calendar clerks, to assist with interpreter coordination in addition to their other duties, but these positions are not listed in Schedule 7A.

The Judicial Council established statewide standards for interpreter pay and authorized increases in the amounts paid for full-day and half-day interpreting effective January 1, 1999. Two additional increases were authorized and made effective on July 1, 1999, and July 1, 2000.<sup>3</sup> Table 5 shows the changes in payment over time. Certified and registered interpreters are currently paid 32.5 percent more for a full day of interpreting than they were when the Judicial Council first established statewide standards for interpreter pay in January 1999. At the same time, the Judicial Council lowered the wages paid to noncertified and nonregistered interpreters to provide a financial incentive for new and existing court interpreters to become certified or registered. Despite the increases in pay for certified and registered interpreters, compensation for interpreters in the state trial courts still lags behind the \$305 paid to federally certified interpreters for a full day. The Judicial Council sought but did not receive funding for further rate increases in fiscal year 2001–2002, and it will continue to strive to ensure that California rates are made competitive with the federal rates.

	<b>Certified (Registered)</b>				<b>Noncertified (Nonregistered)</b>			
	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change	Full Day	% Change	Half Day	% Change
1/1/99	\$200	—	\$105	—	\$200	—	\$105	—
7/1/99	243	+21.5	135	28.57	175	-12.5	92	-12.38
7/1/00	265	+9.05	147	8.89	175	0	92	0

<sup>3</sup> Prior to 1999 pay rates for interpreting varied among different courts.

### C. Summary of Findings from 40 Courts

- **The Spanish language remains the most-interpreted language in the courts.** In fiscal year 2003-2004, over \$17 million in expenditures were reported in the CIDCS for Spanish language interpretations in the 40 courts included in this analysis. This represents approximately 77% of all contract per-diem expenditures in fiscal year 2003-2004.
- **Usage of certified and registered court interpreters varies widely across courts and across languages.** Statewide, certified court interpreters are used in about 85% of all contract per-diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS. Nearly all Spanish (87%), Russian (96%), Mandarin (93%), and Armenian (88%) interpretations are done by certified interpreters (both contractors and interpreters pro tempore). However, certified interpreter use is much lower for Tagalog (24%), Korean (52%), Portuguese (30%), and Japanese (29%). While this might partially reflect low levels of language use in the courts, particularly for Portuguese and Japanese, Tagalog and Korean interpreter expenditures are significant enough to warrant additional certified interpreters.

Statewide, registered interpreters for non-designated languages are used in about 52% of contract per-diem interpretations. This low rate is to be expected, due to the variety of non-designated languages. However, it would be expected that the non-designated languages used more frequently in the courts (American Sign Language, Hmong, Lao, Punjabi, Khmer, and Mien<sup>4</sup>) would have more registered interpreters. The proportion of registered interpreters used for those languages is relatively low, particularly for American Sign Language (29%) and Khmer (54%), suggesting a need for additional registered interpreters in those languages.

At the individual court level, there is no discernable trend regarding the use of certified and registered interpreters between small, rural courts and larger, urban and suburban courts. The use of certified and registered interpreters for contract per-diem interpretations ranges from 0% to 100%. While some smaller courts do not seem to be hampered by a lack of available certified and registered interpreters, others do not share that same access. For example, the Superior Court of Del Norte County used certified interpreters for 100% of their contract per-diem interpretations (all Spanish language interpretations), whereas the Superior Court of Plumas County did not use any certified interpreters (also all Spanish language interpretations).

- **American Sign Language is the third-most interpreted language in the courts, but there are few registered interpreters statewide to meet the demand.** In September 2003, the Court Interpreters Program Unit of the AOC's Human Resources Department assumed administrative control of the American Sign Language Court Interpreters' Program, which was previously under the charge of the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee's Interpreters for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Working Group. This report contains the first full fiscal year's worth of data about contract per-diem American Sign Language interpretations. American Sign Language was the third-most interpreted "language" in the

---

<sup>4</sup> The language category called "All Other Languages" had reported expenditures of \$187,647, but that category cannot be disaggregated into separate languages. Most are Latin American dialects (Mixteco, Trique, Qanjolal (Kanjolal), Tzotzil, Zapateco) and instances where a language was not specified for the interpretation.

courts, with about \$588,000 in expenditures reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004.

However, it appears there are few registered American Sign Language interpreters. As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, only 29% of American Sign Language contract per-diem interpretations statewide were done by a registered court interpreter and there apparently were no American Sign Language interpretations by court interpreters pro tempore. Use of registered American Sign Language interpreters varied in the courts from 0% to 100%. Unlike what might be expected, the problem is not confined to small, rural courts; there was no discernable difference in availability of registered American Sign Language interpreters between larger, urban courts and smaller, rural ones.

- **Southeast Asian Language interpretation expenditures are significant in Central Valley courts.** Among the 40 courts included in this analysis, Vietnamese, Hmong, and Lao contract per-diem interpreter expenditures rank second, fourth, and sixth, respectively, among all language expenditures reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004. The expenditure rates for these languages is particularly high for the Superior Courts of Fresno County and Merced County. Outside of the Central Valley, the Superior Courts of Sacramento County and Santa Clara County report high levels of interpreter expenditures for Vietnamese and Hmong.
- **Punjabi language interpretation expenditures are increasing.** Expenditures for Punjabi translations ranked seventh-highest of all languages interpreted statewide in the 40-court study, as reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004. Due to the high number of interpretations, data about Punjabi interpretations are presented separately rather than being grouped with other South Asian languages.

Punjabi interpretations were performed in both urban and rural courts statewide. The highest levels of expenditures were found in the Superior Courts of Sacramento County (\$33,506), Santa Clara County (\$30,813), and Fresno County (\$28,492). Unexpectedly, the Superior Court of Sutter County reported the highest *proportion* of contract per-diem interpreter expenditures for Punjabi. As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, Punjabi interpretations in the Superior Court of Sutter County represented 23% of all interpreter expenditures. Even smaller, rural courts such as the Superior Courts of Butte County and Nevada County reported expenditures for Punjabi interpretations.

Information from the 40 courts that entered complete data into the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004 give us a snapshot of language usage and the use of certified and registered court interpreters contract per-diem interpretations in California courts. However, it should be noted that without data from Los Angeles County, the largest user of contract per-diem court interpreters, the picture is not complete. Research staff will work to find ways to lessen the reporting burden for Los Angeles County so that its data can more easily be inputted into CIDCS and be included in subsequent annual reports.

## V. Conclusion

While Spanish was the language most frequently interpreted in the 40 courts whose data are part of this annual report, the CIDCS data also revealed high usage levels of American Sign Language, Southeastern Asian languages (Vietnamese, Hmong, Lao), and Punjabi.

Table 4 shows that certified and registered interpreters performed the majority of trial court interpreting. Certified interpreters or court interpreters pro tempore conducted 85% of all interpretations of designated languages, and registered interpreters or court interpreters pro tempore did 52% of all interpretations of non-designated languages.

However, this statewide data may mask local shortages of certified or registered interpreters in certain languages. These shortages seem to occur both in small rural courts and large urban and suburban courts. The expenditure tables for individual courts, in the Appendix of this report, may help courts and Court Interpreter Program staff to identify areas of need and, therefore, improve access to the justice system for non-English speakers.

Appendix A  
Expenditures for Interpreter Services in 20 Courts  
Fiscal Year 2003-2004 (July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004)

To make a detailed analysis of interpreter use, staff from the Administrative Office of the Court's Office of Court Research collected detailed interpreter expenditure data from the superior courts. The principal source of data was the Court Interpreter Data Collection System or CIDCS. CIDCS is an Internet-based data collection system housed on Serranus, the court personnel Web site, and came online in October 2002. The data in this appendix are the first full fiscal year's data collected through CIDCS. All of the courts represented in this appendix have verified that they entered complete information in the CIDCS as of November 15, 2004.

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

Each of the following court studies begins with data reported to the AOC to provide some points of comparison: County population and number of staff in the interpreter program according to the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005. Then come data collected via CIDCS specifically for this report: expenditures by language and by certification status of interpreter. Data for the following forty courts are included in this appendix and appear in alphabetical order:

- Amador
- Butte
- Calaveras
- Colusa
- Contra Costa
- Del Norte
- El Dorado
- Fresno
- Glenn
- Imperial
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kings
- Lassen
- Madera
- Marin
- Merced
- Mono
- Nevada
- Plumas
- Sacramento
- San Benito
- San Bernardino
- San Diego
- San Joaquin
- San Luis Obispo
- San Mateo
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Shasta
- Siskiyou
- Stanislaus
- Sutter
- Tehama
- Tulare
- Tuolumne
- Ventura
- Yolo
- Yuba

Note that there are differences in the expenditure data collected in the quarterly financial statements (QFS) and the data collected by the CIDCS. Since the CIDCS data is not used as the basis for payment to the courts, it should not be used as a definitive source for expenditure data. Rather, the value of the CIDCS is in showing expenditures for contract, per-diem court interpretation by language and certification status. This data will help courts and the Court Interpreters' Program to recognize languages that should become certified due to high usage

levels or to identify courts and languages that would benefit from having more court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters.

### A1. Superior Court of Amador County

There are approximately 36,500 residents of Amador County, which is located in the Sierra foothills.<sup>5</sup> The Superior Court of Amador County reported no full time equivalent (FTE) staff as interpreters, interpreter coordinators, or court interpreters pro tem in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

Table A1 shows that the Superior Court of Amador County reported a total of \$26,663 for contract per-diem interpreter expenditures to the Court Interpreters' Data Collection System (CIDCS). The Spanish language represents two-thirds of that total, and nearly all Spanish language interpreters were certified contractors. Only two other languages were interpreted during this time period in the Superior Court: American Sign Language and Other languages (most likely Latin American dialects). Registered interpreters performed 10% of interpretations.

### A2. Superior Court of Butte County

Butte County, in the north central region of the state, has a population of about 210,400. There were no court interpreter FTEs reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, a total of \$106,325 was expended on contract per-diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and shown in Table A2. As with most of the courts, Spanish language interpretations made up the majority of total expenditures (44%), with about 10% of those interpretations performed by a certified interpreter. Hmong language interpretations represented 31% of total contract per-diem expenditures, and registered interpreters conducted 89% of Hmong interpretations.

### A3. Superior Court of Calaveras County

There are about 42,450 residents in Calaveras County, located in the Central Valley. In fiscal year 2004-2005, the Superior Court of Calaveras County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for their court interpreter program.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County spent \$9,572 on contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A3). Spanish language accounted for 70% of the interpretations in fiscal year 2003-2004, with only 3% translated by certified court interpreters. Arabic, Punjabi, American Sign Language, and Other Languages accounted for the rest of the expenditures during the reporting period.

---

<sup>5</sup> All population figures are 2003 California State Department of Finance estimates.

#### A4. Superior Court of Colusa County

Located in the Central Valley, Colusa County is one of the smaller counties with 19,700 residents. The Superior Court of Colusa County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

In Table A4, the Superior Court of Colusa County reported \$74,368 in contract per-diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations were conducted most frequently, representing 97% of all interpretations. Almost all of the Spanish language interpretations (99.7%) were performed by certified court interpreters. Russian and Punjabi accounted for another 3% of the expenditures during the reporting period and their interpretations were all done by registered court interpreters.

#### A5. Superior Court of Contra Costa County

Contra Costa County is one of the Bay Area counties and has a population of 994,900. The court reported 5 court interpreters pro tem in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003-2004, they did not report any FTEs for the court interpreter program.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County spent \$791,495 on contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A5). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 75% of all expenditures during this period (\$593,695), and certified interpreters performed 81% of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for American Sign Language interpreting accounting for 5% of the total expenditures (\$40,456), and registered interpreters performed 65% of American Sign Language interpreting. Vietnamese, Mandarin, Punjabi, Lao, Mien, and Tongan ranked among the next highest expenditures and each represented about 2-3 % of the total expenditures. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 78% of court interpretations.

#### A6. Superior Court of Del Norte County

Del Norte County is the northernmost, coastal county in the state, with an estimated population of 27,850. The Superior Court did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

Table A6 shows that in fiscal year 2003-2004, \$23,415 was reported to the CIDCS as spent on contract per-diem interpretations. Consistent with the previous year's annual report, Spanish was the only language interpreted, and certified interpreters performed all interpretations.

#### A7. Superior Court of El Dorado County

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra foothills and has a population of about 166,000. For fiscal year 2004-2005, the Superior Court of El Dorado County reported one court interpreter pro tempore FTE in the Schedule 7A.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of El Dorado County reported \$103,764 in contract per-diem court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS, with the majority (94%) for Spanish language interpretations. About 90% of those interpretations were performed by certified and court interpreters pro tempore. These data are shown in Table A7.

#### A8. Superior Court of Fresno County

Fresno County is located in the Central Valley. With 841,400 people, as reported in 2003, it is the state's ninth-most populous county. In the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Fresno County reported 6 FTE staff interpreters and 14.60 FTE court interpreters pro tempore, for a total of 20.60 interpreter FTEs.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of Fresno County spent \$1,146,868 on contract per-diem interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS (see Table A8). Nearly 70% of all interpretations were in Spanish, with certified court interpreters and court interpreters pro tempore performing 79% of those interpretations. There were also a high number of interpretations conducted in Lao, Hmong, American Sign Language, Khmer, All Other Languages (mostly Latin American dialects), and Punjabi. Registered and court interpreters pro tempore were used for most of the interpretations. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 71% of court interpretations.

#### A9. Superior Court of Glenn County

Located in the northern part of the Central Valley, Glenn County is one of the smaller counties with 27,050 residents. The Superior Court of Glenn County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

As Table A9 points out, the Superior Court of Glenn County reported \$87,532 in contract per-diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 89% of the total expenditures. Only 3% of the Spanish language interpretations were performed by certified interpreters. Hmong and American Sign Language were among the second-highest expenditures during the reporting period representing 6% and 4% of the expenditures respectively. For all languages, certified and registered interpreters performed only 5% of the interpreting.

#### A10. Superior Court of Imperial County

There are about 150,900 residents of Imperial County, located in the southeastern-most corner of the state and bordered by Mexico to the south and Arizona to the east. In the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Imperial County reported 5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore. This is a slight increase from fiscal year 2003-2004 when the Court reported 3 FTE staff interpreters and no FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

The total expenditure for court interpretation in fiscal year 2003-2004, as reported in the CIDCS, was \$272,920. Table A10 shows that Spanish accounted for 96% of contract per-diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003-2004, with nearly all interpretations conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Vietnamese, American Sign Language,

and Korean were the only other languages with expenditures greater than \$1,000 during the reporting period.

#### A11. Superior Court of Inyo County

Located on the east side of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, Inyo County is one of the smallest counties in this analysis, with an estimated population of 18,500. The Superior Court of Inyo County did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, \$15,837 was reported to the CIDCS as expended on contract per-diem interpretations, exclusively for Spanish language interpretations (see Table A11). Ninety-three percent of these interpretations were done by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. While Inyo County does not have any court interpreters pro tempore, they occasionally will use a court interpreter pro tempore on a cross-assignment from a neighboring court. That interpreter is paid as a court interpreter pro tempore by their home court, which is reimbursed by Inyo County.

#### A12. Superior Court of Kern County

Kern County, with an estimated population of 702,900, is located in the southern part of the Central Valley. For the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Kern County reported 2 FTE staff interpreters, 1 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore, for a total of 9 FTE court interpreter staff.

Table A12 shows that \$794,986 was spent on contract per-diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003-2004, as reported in the CIDCS. The majority of expenditures (94.7%) were on Spanish language interpretations. Seventy-nine percent of Spanish interpretations were conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Interpretations in Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island languages (which include Cebuano, Ilocano (both languages of the Philippines), and Indonesian) accounted for the second-highest total interpreter expenditures, with 92% of those interpretations performed by registered contract interpreters.

#### A13. Superior Court of Kings County

Kings County, with an estimated population of 136,100, is located at the southern part of the Central Valley. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

Table A13 shows expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters for fiscal year 2003-2004. These expenditures totaled \$185,703. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 99 % (\$183,044) of the total interpretations with 59% of the interpretations done by certified interpreters. Portuguese and Southeast Asian languages (which include Vietnamese, Hmong, Ilocano, Mien, and Lao) represented the rest of the expenditures. Certified and registered interpreters did 59 % of all interpreting.

#### A14. Superior Court of Lassen County

The Superior Court of Lassen County is one of the smallest counties in our study with an estimated population of 34,950. The Superior Court of Lassen County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A14 shows expenditures on contract per-diem for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$9,005, and 100% of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Certified interpreters performed only 4% of the interpreting.

#### A15. Superior Court of Madera County

Located in the Central Valley, Madera County has about 131,200 residents. The Superior Court of Madera County reported 5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore for fiscal year 2004-2005, which is the same number that was reported in fiscal year 2003-2004.

In Table A15, the Superior Court of Madera County reported \$275,286 in contract per-diem interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS. As with all of the courts in this study, Spanish language interpretations were conducted most frequently, representing 95% of all interpretations. Eighty-five percent of all Spanish language interpretations were performed by court interpreters pro tempore and contract interpreters. For all languages, 81% of all interpretations were done by certified, registered, or pro tempore court interpreters.

#### A16. Superior Court of Marin County

Located just north of San Francisco, Marin County has a population of about 250,400. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005, the Superior Court of Marin County listed 3 court interpreters pro tempore.

Table A16 shows the Superior Court of Marin County's total expenditures, \$213,570, for contract per-diem interpretations for fiscal year 2003-2004, as reported to the CIDCS. Eighty-six percent of those interpretations were conducted in Spanish. Of the Spanish language interpretations, 98% were performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. The only other language with significant expenditures was Vietnamese, with \$14,805 in expenditures representing 7 % of all interpreter expenditures. Certified court interpreters performed all of the Vietnamese interpretations.

#### A17. Superior Court of Merced County

Merced County is one of the Central Valley counties with about 225,100 residents. The Superior Court of Merced County reported one FTE court interpreters pro tempore for fiscal year 2004-2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003-2004, they did not report any FTEs for the court interpreters program.

In Table A17, the Superior Court of Merced County reported \$440,957 in contract per-diem interpreter expenditures. Spanish language interpretations represented 77% of all interpretations. Thirty-five percent of all Spanish language interpretations were performed by court interpreters pro tempore and certified contract interpreters. Hmong, Mien, Punjabi, and American Sign Language were other languages with expenditures exceeded \$10,000 respectively.

#### A18. Superior Court of Mono County

Mono County, located on the east side of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, is the smallest county in this study, with a population of 13,500. The Superior Court of Mono County reported one court interpreter pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-05.

Table A18 summarizes the contract per-diem expenditures as reported to the CIDCS for Mono County in fiscal year 2003-2004. All of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, totaling \$18,598. Court interpreters pro tempore conducted all of the interpretations.

#### A19. Superior Court of Nevada County

Nevada County is located in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, bordering the state of Nevada. The population in 2003 was estimated at 95,700. The Superior Court of Nevada did not report any court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

The Superior Court of Nevada County reported \$45,042 in contract per-diem court interpreter expenses to the CIDCS (see Table A19). \$35,413 was spent on Spanish language interpretations, representing 77% of all interpretations, with just over 50% being interpreted by certified interpreters. Vietnamese was the second-most translated language in Nevada County Superior Court, representing 12% of all interpretations. All of the Vietnamese language interpretations were done by certified contract interpreters.

#### A20. Superior Court of Plumas County

The Superior Court of Plumas County is located in the northern part of the Central Valley with an estimated population of 20,900. The Superior Court of Plumas County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A20 shows expenditures on contract per-diem for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$6,688, and 100% of the expenditures were for Spanish language interpreting. Only non-certified interpreters performed the interpreting.

#### A21. Superior Court of Sacramento County

Sacramento County has an estimated population of 1,309,600 in 2003. The Superior Court of Sacramento County reported four FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003-2004, they reported two FTE staff interpreters and three FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of Sacramento County spent \$1,694,292 on contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A21). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 39% of all expenditures during this period (\$654,329), and certified interpreters performed 99% of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for Russian accounting for 12% of the total expenditures followed by American Sign Language and Hmong accounting for 10% and 8% of the total expenditures respectively. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 85% of court interpretations.

#### A22. Superior Court of San Benito County

Located near the central coastal region to the east of the Monterey County, San Benito County has a population of 56,300. The Superior Court of San Benito County reported no FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A22 shows expenditures on contract per-diem for fiscal year 2003–2004. Spanish was the only language interpreted during the reporting period totaling \$58,363. Certified interpreters performed 98% of the interpreting.

#### A23. Superior Court of San Bernardino County

San Bernardino is physically the largest county in the state, and, with approximately 1,833,000 residents, ranks fourth in population. The court reported 42 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A.

Table A23 shows that the Superior Court of San Bernardino County's expenditure on contacted per-diem interpretations was \$2,044,947 in fiscal year 2003-2004, as reported in the CIDCS. Spanish language interpretations accounted for nearly 90% of total interpreter expenditures, with 98% of those interpretations performed by court interpreters pro tempore and certified contract interpreters. American Sign Language, Vietnamese, Korean, Arabic, and Mandarin are other frequently-translated languages in this court, though they represent a small fraction of total interpretations. Overall, certified or registered interpreters perform 94% of all contract per-diem interpretations, which is one of the highest ratios among the larger courts included in this study.

#### A24. Superior Court of San Diego County

Located in the extreme southwest corner of the state, bordered on the south by Mexico and the Pacific Ocean on the west, San Diego County is the largest county included in this study. Its 2003 population is estimated at 2,961,600. On the Schedule 7A in fiscal year 2004-2005, the Superior Court of San Diego County reported 7 FTE staff interpreters and 35.56 FTE court interpreters pro tempore. This is a marked increase from the previous fiscal year, where only 7 FTE staff interpreters were reported and reflects the recent addition of the court interpreter pro tempore job classification.

The Superior Court of San Diego County reported \$2,948,242 in contract per-diem court interpreter expenditures for fiscal year 2003-2004, as reported in the CIDCS and as seen in Table

A24. Spanish language interpretations account for 84% of all interpretations. Nearly all of Spanish language interpretations were conducted by either court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. After Spanish, the next most-frequently translated languages were American Sign Language, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Khmer, and African languages (Amharic, Somali, Swahili, and Tingrinya). Overall, certified and registered court interpreters performed nearly 90% of all interpretations.

#### A25. Superior Court of San Joaquin County

One of the larger Central Valley counties, San Joaquin County has a population of about 613,500. In the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005, the Superior Court of San Joaquin County reported 6 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

Table A25 shows a total of \$720,245 in expenditures reported to the CIDCS for contract per-diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003-2004. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 71% of all contract interpreter expenditures, with 72% performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters. Other languages with significant expenditures include Khmer, Vietnamese, and the category All Other Languages, which includes Latin American dialects.

#### A26. Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County

San Luis Obispo County is located on the southern coast with about 256,300 residents. No FTEs were reported in the Schedule 7A in the court interpreters program in San Luis Obispo County in fiscal year 2004-2005.

Table A26 shows expenditures by language and certification status for contract per-diem interpreters in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo in fiscal year 2003-2004. Expenditures during this period totaled \$188,832, 95% of which were for Spanish language interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for American Sign Language interpreting accounting for 3% of the total expenditures (\$6,266), and registered interpreters performed 95% of American Sign Language interpreting. Certified and registered interpreters performed almost all (99%) of the interpreting.

#### A27. Superior Court of San Mateo County

San Mateo County is located in the Bay Area, south of San Francisco. Its population is approximately 717,000. In the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of San Mateo County reported one FTE court interpreter coordinator and 7.60 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

The Superior Court of San Mateo County expended \$778,420 for contract per-diem court interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and as shown in Table A27. Sixty-eight percent of all interpretations were for Spanish language interpretations, and 88% of those were handled by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Tagalog, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Vietnamese were also translated frequently in the courts, with the majority of interpretations made by certified or registered interpreters.

## A28. Superior Court of Santa Barbara County

Santa Barbara County is a coastal county with a population of about 410,300. The Superior Court of Santa Barbara County reported 5 FTE staff interpreters, .5 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 3 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court expended approximately \$541,553 for contract per-diem interpretations. As with the rest of the state, the majority of interpretations were in the Spanish language (92%). Nearly all (99.8%) Spanish language interpretations were handled by court interpreters pro tempore or certified interpreters. There were several other languages translated in the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County during the time period of this report, but the expenditures for those interpretations were relatively small, compared to Spanish language interpretations. However, 96% of contract per-diem interpretations (for all languages) in the court were done by certified or registered interpreters.

## A29. Superior Court of Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County is one of the Bay Area counties and has a population of 1,729,900. The court reported 14 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005, whereas in fiscal year 2003-2004, only 6.5 FTE court interpreters pro tempore were reported.

In fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court of Santa Clara County spent \$1,270,204 on contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A29). Spanish language interpreting accounted for 59% of all expenditures during this period (\$743,291), and certified interpreters performed 67% of Spanish interpreting. The second highest expenditures were for Vietnamese interpreting accounting for 23% of the total expenditures (\$297,541), and certified interpreters performed 81% of Vietnamese interpretations. Mandarin, Tagalog, Punjabi, and Khmer ranked among the next highest expenditures, and each represented about 2 to 4% of total expenditures. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 67% of court interpretations.

## A30. Superior Court of Santa Cruz County

Located at the coast just south of the Bay Area, Santa Cruz County is one of the medium sized counties in our study with a population of 259,800. The Schedule 7A lists one interpreter coordinator FTE position in the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County for fiscal year 2004-2005.

Expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters in fiscal year 2003-2004 totaled \$443,599 and are shown in Table A30. Certified and registered interpreters performed 91% of interpreting, and Spanish language interpreting accounted for 91% of expenditures (\$405,041). The second highest expenditures were for American Sign Language interpreting, accounting for 5% of the total expenditures (\$22,224), and registered interpreters performed 78% of American Sign Language interpreting. Ninety-three percent of expenditures were for interpreting in designated languages, while 7% were for interpreting in nondesignated languages.

### A31. Superior Court of Shasta County

Shasta County, with an estimated population of 172,000, is located at the northern part of the state. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table 31A shows expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters for fiscal year 2003–2004. These expenditures totaled \$81,323. Spanish language interpreting accounted for 36% (\$29,679) of the total interpretations, followed by Lao and Mien (24% and 23% respectively). Certified and registered interpreters did 56% of all interpreting.

### A32. Superior Court of Siskiyou County

Located in the northernmost portion of the state, Siskiyou County has approximately 44,400 residents. The Superior Court of Siskiyou County reported no court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

The Superior Court reported \$45,593 in court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, as shown in Table A32. The majority of those expenditures were for Spanish language translations (86%) with 90% of those interpretations done by certified interpreters. Lao and All Other Language (generally Latin American dialects) were the second- and third-most translated languages, and registered interpreters were used for 34% and 100% of the translations, respectively.

### A33. Superior Court of Stanislaus County

Stanislaus County, with a population of about 481,600, is located in the Central Valley. The Superior Court of Stanislaus County reported 1 FTE staff interpreter, 1 FTE interpreter coordinator, and 2 FTE court interpreters pro tempore in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court expended approximately \$339,338 for contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A33). Spanish language interpretations accounted for nearly 80% of contract interpreter expenditures, with 90% performed by certified interpreters and court interpreters pro tempore. American Sign Language and Khmer were the second- and third-most translated languages, with expenditures of \$11,870 and \$10,994, respectively, for fiscal year 2003-2004.

### A34. Superior Court of Sutter County

Sutter County is one of the smaller counties located in the northern part of the Central Valley. There were about 83,200 residents in 2003. One pro tempore interpreter FTE was listed for the Superior Court of Sutter County in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Expenditures for contract per-diem interpreters during fiscal year 2003–2004 are shown in Table A34 and totaled \$119,883. Sixty-one percent of the expenditures (\$73,433) were for Spanish language interpreting. Punjabi accounted for the second-highest total interpreter expenditures (24%) with 72% of those interpretations performed by registered contract interpreters. Certified and registered interpreters performed 89% of interpreting overall, and 100% of the Hindi, Mandarin, Khmer, Mien, Romanian, Russian, and Vietnamese interpreting.

#### A35. Superior Court of Tehama County

Tehama County has a population of about 57,700. In the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Tehama County reported one FTE staff interpreter and one FTE court interpreter pro tempore.

The Superior Court of Tehama County expended \$14,130 for contract per-diem court interpretations, as reported in the CIDCS and as shown in Table A35. Spanish language interpretations accounted for 81% of expenditures, with 50% of the contract per-diem expenditures performed by certified interpreters. Mandarin was the second-most frequently translated language, representing 15% of expenditures, with 100% of interpretations done by certified interpreters.

#### A36. Superior Court of Tulare County

Tulare County, located in the Central Valley, has approximately 386,200 residents. In the fiscal year 2004-2005 Schedule 7A, the Superior Court of Tulare County reported 4 FTE court interpreters pro tempore.

As reported in the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, the Superior Court expended approximately \$689,719 for contract per-diem interpretations (see Table A36). Ninety-five percent of those expenditures were for Spanish language interpretations, with 69% performed by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. American Sign Language and Lao were the second- and third-most translated languages, though the expenditures for those languages were relatively small compared to Spanish language interpretations.

#### A37. Superior Court of Tuolumne County

Tuolumne County is located in the central Sierra Nevada Mountains and encompasses Yosemite National Park. The population is estimated at 56,500. The Superior Court of Tuolumne County reported no court interpreter FTEs in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004-2005.

The Superior Court reported \$12,833 in court interpreter expenditures to the CIDCS for fiscal year 2003-2004, as shown in Table A37. The majority of those expenditures were for Spanish language translations (83%) with 91% of those interpretations done by certified interpreters.

#### A38. Superior Court of Ventura County

Ventura County is located on the southern coast adjacent to Los Angeles County, with an estimated population of 791,300 in 2003. The Superior Court of Ventura County reported five FTE staff interpreters and one FTE interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A38 shows that \$500,541 was spent on contract per-diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with the majority of expenditures (97%) on Spanish language interpretations. Almost all of Spanish interpretations (99%) were conducted by certified court interpreters. Interpretations in Armenian, Vietnamese, Korean, and Other Languages were the other languages with expenditures exceeding \$5,000. Overall, certified or registered interpreters were used in 98% of court interpretations.

#### A39. Superior Court of Yolo County

There are about 181,300 residents in Yolo County. In fiscal year 2004–2005, the Superior Court of Yolo County reported one FTE interpreter coordinator in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A39 shows that Spanish accounted for 65% of contract per-diem interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with nearly all translations done by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Russian, American Sign Language, Punjabi and Lao were the other languages with expenditures greater than \$10,000 during the reporting period.

#### A40. Superior Court of Yuba County

Located in the Central Valley to the north of Sacramento County, Yuba County has an estimated population of 62,800 in 2003. No FTE positions in the court interpreters program were reported in the Schedule 7A for fiscal year 2004–2005.

Table A40 shows that \$30,856 was spent on contract per-diem court interpretations in fiscal year 2003–2004, with 52% of expenditures on Spanish language interpretations. Almost all of Spanish interpretations (99%) were conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or certified court interpreters. Another 43% of the expenditures were spent on interpretations in non-designated languages totaled \$13,277. Hmong represents the second-highest expenditures (17%) with 41% of those interpretations conducted by court interpreters pro tempore or registered court interpreters.

**Table A1: Superior Court of Amador County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	17,710	174	17,885	99.0%	67.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	<b>17,710</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>17,885</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>67.1%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (1)	-	180	7,421	7,600	2.4%	28.5%
American Sign Language	-	694	484	1,178	58.9%	4.4%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	<b>873</b>	<b>7,905</b>	<b>8,779</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>32.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>18,584</b>	<b>8,079</b>	<b>26,663</b>	<b>69.7%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A2: Superior Court of Butte County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	4,614	41,932	46,547	9.9%	43.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	2,205	-	2,205	100.0%	2.1%
Vietnamese	-	1,610	-	1,610	100.0%	1.5%
Korean	-	-	1,200	1,200	0%	1.1%
Russian (1)	-	-	536	536	0%	0.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	<b>8,430</b>	<b>43,668</b>	<b>52,098</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>49.0%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	-	29,507	3,533	33,040	89.3%	31.1%
American Sign Language	-	1,256	10,750	12,006	10.5%	11.3%
Mien	-	633	4,853	5,486	11.5%	5.2%
Punjabi	-	1,957	157	2,114	92.6%	2.0%
Lao	-	957	-	957	100.0%	0.9%
All Other Languages (2)	-	317	306	623	50.8%	0.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	<b>34,627</b>	<b>19,600</b>	<b>54,227</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>43,057</b>	<b>63,268</b>	<b>106,325</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Mandarin and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A3: Superior Court of Calaveras County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	192	6,528	6,720	2.9%	70.2%
Arabic	-	-	628	628	0.0%	6.6%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	-	7,156	7,156	0.0%	74.8%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Punjabi	639	299	-	938	100.0%	9.8%
All Other Languages (1)	-	-	841	841	0.0%	8.8%
American Sign Language	-	638	-	638	100.0%	6.7%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	639	937	841	2,416	65.2%	25.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	639	937	7,996	9,572	16.5%	100.0%

(1) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A4: Superior Court of Colusa County**  
**Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	72,255	221	72,476	99.7%	97.5%
Russian (1)	-	625	-	625	100.0%	0.8%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	72,880	221	73,101	99.7%	98.3%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Punjabi	-	1,267	-	1,267	100.0%	1.7%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	1,267	-	1,267	100.0%	1.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	74,147	221	74,368	99.7%	100.0%

(1) Russian became a certified language during FY 2003-04.



**Table A5: Superior Court of Contra Costa County**  
**Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	478,133	115,562	593,695	80.5%	75.0%
Vietnamese	-	16,672	3,898	20,570	81.1%	2.6%
Mandarin (1)	2,732	9,794	176	12,702	98.6%	1.6%
Tagalog	-	168	10,905	11,072	1.5%	1.4%
Portuguese	-	9,135	521	9,656	94.6%	1.2%
Cantonese	4,207	2,747	331	7,285	95.5%	0.9%
Korean	147	588	4,591	5,326	13.8%	0.7%
Russian (1)	-	3,345	-	3,345	100.0%	0.4%
Arabic	735	2,201	326	3,262	90.0%	0.4%
Japanese	-	-	1,279	1,279	0.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>7,821</b>	<b>522,784</b>	<b>137,587</b>	<b>668,192</b>	<b>79.4%</b>	<b>84.4%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	26,147	14,308	40,456	64.6%	5.1%
Punjabi	158	17,162	-	17,320	100.0%	2.2%
Lao	-	15,415	1,527	16,942	91.0%	2.1%
Mien	-	2,087	9,964	12,052	17.3%	1.5%
Tongan	-	9,366	2,659	12,025	77.9%	1.5%
Farsi(2)	-	4,949	1,104	6,053	81.8%	0.8%
Khmer	192	170	3,588	3,950	9.2%	0.5%
Eastern/Southern European Languages(3)	-	1,542	2,125	3,667	42.1%	0.5%
Tigrinya	-	2,149	709	2,858	75.2%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	-	2,347	392	2,739	85.7%	0.3%
All Other Languages (5)	-	1,158	1,058	2,216	52.2%	0.3%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (6)	-	147	1,169	1,316	11.2%	0.2%
Samoaan	-	851	-	851	100.0%	0.1%
Middle Eastern Languages (7)	-	-	393	393	0.0%	0.0%
Hmong	-	319	-	319	100.0%	0.0%
German	-	147	-	147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>83,956</b>	<b>38,996</b>	<b>123,303</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,172</b>	<b>606,740</b>	<b>176,584</b>	<b>791,495</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Dari (Persian of Afghanistan), Farsi, and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(3) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian and Polish

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu

(5) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(6) Includes Ilocano and Thai

(7) Includes Persian and Turkish

**Table A6: Superior Court of Del Norte County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	23,415	-	23,415	100%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>23,415</b>	-	<b>23,415</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table A7: Superior Court of El Dorado County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	32,229	55,490	9,830	97,549	89.9%	94.0%
Tagalog	-	-	1,684	1,684	0%	1.6%
Russian (1)	-	330	726	1,056	31.2%	1.0%
Japanese	-	696	-	696	100%	0.7%
Armenian (1)	-	187	-	187	100%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>32,229</b>	<b>56,702</b>	<b>12,240</b>	<b>101,171</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	347	1,851	2,197	15.8%	2.1%
Tongan	-	-	213	213	0%	0.2%
Hmong	183	-	-	183	100%	0.2%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>2,063</b>	<b>2,593</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32,412</b>	<b>57,049</b>	<b>14,303</b>	<b>103,764</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

**Table A8: Superior Court of Fresno County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	573,935	57,133	163,565	794,632	79.4%	69.3%
Armenian (1)	-	8,285	2,676	10,961	75.6%	1.0%
Russian (1)	-	5,685	1,712	7,397	76.9%	0.6%
Arabic	-	3,626	2,004	5,630	64.4%	0.5%
Vietnamese	-	-	7,687	7,687	0%	0.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	1,577	1,577	0%	0.1%
Korean	-	-	1,259	1,259	0%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	692	692	0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	-	470	470	0%	0.0%
Japanese	-	-	92	92	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>573,935</b>	<b>74,729</b>	<b>181,734</b>	<b>830,398</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>72.4%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Lao	28,649	14,014	36,941	79,604	53.6%	6.9%
Hmong	45,667	942	15,245	61,854	75.4%	5.4%
American Sign Language	-	1,607	54,802	56,410	2.8%	4.9%
Khmer	39,715	2,541	6,445	48,701	86.8%	4.2%
All Other Languages (7)	14,714	853	20,038	35,605	43.7%	3.1%
Punjabi	379	15,621	12,492	28,492	56.2%	2.5%
Mien	-	2,713	-	2,713	100%	0.2%
Middle Eastern Languages (2)	-	-	686	686	0%	0.1%
African Languages (3)	-	-	552	552	0%	0.05%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	-	-	534	534	0%	0.05%
Farsi	-	-	478	478	0%	0.04%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (5)	-	-	382	382	0%	0.03%
Italian	-	-	276	276	0%	0.02%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (6)	-	-	184	184	0%	0.02%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>129,124</b>	<b>38,291</b>	<b>149,055</b>	<b>316,470</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>27.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>703,058</b>	<b>113,020</b>	<b>330,789</b>	<b>1,146,868</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian, Russian, and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Persian and Turkish

(3) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu

(5) Includes Ilocano and Indonesian

(6) Includes Czech and Ukrainian

(7) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A9: Superior Court of Glenn County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	2,246	75,316	77,563	2.9%	88.6%
Russian (1)	-	670	-	670	100.0%	0.8%
Arabic	-	461	-	461	100.0%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	322	-	322	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	3,699	75,316	79,015	4.7%	90.3%
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	-	341	4,935	5,276	6.5%	6.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	3,241	3,241	0.0%	3.7%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	341	8,176	8,517	4.0%	9.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	4,039	83,492	87,532	4.6%	100.0%

(1) Russian became a certified language during FY 2003-04.

**Table A10: Superior Court of Imperial County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	134,394	128,637	175	263,206	99.9%	96.4%
Vietnamese	-	1,835	1,998	3,833	47.9%	1.4%
Korean	-	-	1,051	1,051	0%	0.4%
Cantonese	-	-	770	770	0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	347	265	611	56.7%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>134,394</b>	<b>130,819</b>	<b>4,259</b>	<b>269,471</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>98.7%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	693	2,103	2,796	24.8%	1.0%
Ukrainian	-	388	-	388	100%	0.1%
Punjabi	-	-	265	265	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,081</b>	<b>2,368</b>	<b>3,449</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>134,394</b>	<b>131,900</b>	<b>6,627</b>	<b>272,920</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Mandarin became a certified language in FY 2003-04.

**Table A11: Superior Court of Inyo County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore (1)	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	9,424	5,236	1,176	15,837	92.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,424</b>	<b>5,236</b>	<b>1,176</b>	<b>15,837</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Inyo County does not have Pro Tempore interpreters. However, occasionally, Court Interpreters Pro Tempore from other counties will be cross-assigned to the Superior Court of Inyo County. They are listed in the CIDCS as Court Interpreters Pro Tempore and paid by their home courts as such. The home courts then arrange for reimbursement from Inyo County.

**Table A12: Superior Court of Kern County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	99,113	498,091	155,630	752,833	79.3%	94.7%
Korean	-	5,041	-	5,041	100%	0.6%
Arabic	-	1,026	2,973	3,999	25.7%	0.5%
Armenian (1)	-	-	1,882	1,882	0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	1,762	-	1,762	100%	0.2%
Portuguese	-	879	-	879	100%	0.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	441	-	441	100%	0.1%
Japanese	-	147	-	147	100%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>99,113</b>	<b>507,387</b>	<b>160,484</b>	<b>766,984</b>	<b>79.1%</b>	<b>96.5%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (2)	-	9,237	798	10,035	92%	1.3%
Punjabi	-	3,793	4,548	8,341	45.5%	1.0%
All Other Languages (3)	-	4,611	751	5,362	86.0%	0.7%
American Sign Language	-	-	2,535	2,535	0%	0.3%
Khmer	-	1,095	-	1,095	100%	0.1%
Bengali	-	340	-	340	100%	0.0%
French	-	147	-	147	100%	0.0%
Hungarian	-	147	-	147	100%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>19,370</b>	<b>8,632</b>	<b>28,002</b>	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>99,113</b>	<b>526,757</b>	<b>169,116</b>	<b>794,986</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian, Russian, and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Cebuano, Ilocano, and Indonesian

(3) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A13: Superior Court of Kings County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	16,300	91,587	75,157	183,044	58.9%	98.6%
Portuguese	-	1,250	-	1,250	100.0%	0.7%
Vietnamese	-	560	-	560	100.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	16,300	93,397	75,157	184,853	59.3%	99.5%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Hmong	-	-	516	516	0.0%	0.3%
Ilocano	-	-	133	133	0.0%	0.1%
Mien	-	-	109	109	0.0%	0.1%
Lao	-	-	92	92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	-	850	850	0.0%	0.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	16,300	93,397	76,007	185,703	59.1%	100.0%

**Table A14: Superior Court of Lassen County**  
**Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	381	8,624	9,005	4.2%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>381</b>	<b>8,624</b>	<b>9,005</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table A15: Superior Court of Madera County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	220,860	824	39,574	261,258	84.9%	94.9%
Arabic	-	-	925	925	0%	0.3%
Cantonese	-	-	644	644	0%	0.2%
Korean	-	-	306	306	0%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	150	150	0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	-	129	129	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>220,860</b>	<b>824</b>	<b>41,728</b>	<b>263,412</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>95.7%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	4,668	4,668	0%	1.7%
American Sign Language	-	346	2,213	2,560	13.5%	0.9%
Hmong	-	-	2,323	2,323	0%	0.8%
Punjabi	-	-	1,462	1,462	0%	0.5%
German	-	-	572	572	0%	0.2%
Indonesian	-	-	146	146	0%	0.1%
Tigrinya	-	-	143	143	0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>11,528</b>	<b>11,874</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>220,860</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>53,256</b>	<b>275,286</b>	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian became a certified language in FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A16: Superior Court of Marin County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	10,798	169,421	3,515	183,734	98%	86.0%
Vietnamese	-	14,805	-	14,805	100%	6.9%
Cantonese	1,984	926	-	2,910	100%	1.4%
Korean	294	1,617	-	1,911	100%	0.9%
Russian (1)	265	946	-	1,211	100%	0.6%
Mandarin (1)	-	988	-	988	100%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	722	-	722	100%	0.3%
Arabic	-	161	-	161	100%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	97	97	0%	0.05%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>13,341</b>	<b>189,587</b>	<b>3,612</b>	<b>206,540</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Lao	-	1,617	256	1,873	86.3%	0.9%
Punjabi	-	1,248	-	1,248	100%	0.6%
Thai	-	559	407	966	57.9%	0.5%
Mien	147	-	585	732	20.1%	0.3%
American Sign Language	-	556	-	556	100%	0.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	147	256	403	36.5%	0.2%
French	-	-	358	358	0%	0.2%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (2)	-	294	-	294	100%	0.1%
Amharic	-	265	-	265	100%	0.1%
Turkish	-	-	189	189	0%	0.1%
Persian of Iran (Farsi)	-	147	-	147	100%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>4,833</b>	<b>2,051</b>	<b>7,030</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,488</b>	<b>194,419</b>	<b>5,662</b>	<b>213,570</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Bulgarian and Polish

**Table A17: Superior Court of Merced County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	9,215	109,750	220,950	339,914	35.0%	77.1%
Portuguese	-	40	8,346	8,386	0.5%	1.9%
Japanese	-	-	1,094	1,094	0.0%	0.2%
Armenian (1)	-	-	1,067	1,067	0.0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	350	428	778	45.0%	0.2%
Vietnamese	-	333	291	624	53.3%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	424	424	0.0%	0.1%
Korean	-	-	187	187	0.0%	0.0%
Arabic	-	-	121	121	0.0%	0.0%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	80	80	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	9,215	110,473	232,988	352,676	33.9%	80.0%
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Hmong	2,218	-	21,429	23,647	9.4%	5.4%
Mien	-	11,495	6,188	17,683	65.0%	4.0%
Punjabi	11,954	-	5,300	17,254	69.3%	3.9%
American Sign Language	-	2,853	10,299	13,152	21.7%	3.0%
Lao	-	6,182	4,180	10,362	59.7%	2.3%
All Other Languages (2)	576	695	3,538	4,810	26.4%	1.1%
Khmer	878	-	201	1,079	81.4%	0.2%
Assyrian	-	-	294	294	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	15,626	21,225	51,430	88,281	41.7%	20.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	24,841	131,698	284,418	440,957	35.5%	100.0%

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A18: Superior Court of Mono County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	18,598	-		18,598	100.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18,598</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>18,598</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table A19: Superior Court of Nevada County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	18,686	16,727	35,413	52.8%	78.6%
Vietnamese	-	5,159	-	5,159	100%	11.5%
Russian (1)	-	1,607	-	1,607	100%	3.6%
Portuguese	-	861	133	994	86.6%	2.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	<b>26,313</b>	<b>16,860</b>	<b>43,173</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>95.9%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	-	768	768	0%	1.7%
French	-	-	497	497	0%	1.1%
Punjabi	-	338	-	338	100%	0.8%
All Other Languages (2)	-	265	-	265	100%	0.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	<b>603</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>1,869</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>26,916</b>	<b>18,125</b>	<b>45,042</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003-04

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A20: Superior Court of Plumas County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	-	6,688	6,688	0.0%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	-	<b>6,688</b>	<b>6,688</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table A21: Superior Court of Sacramento County**  
**Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	42,369	604,519	7,440	654,329	98.9%	38.6%
Russian (1)	74,056	121,540	92	195,688	100.0%	11.5%
Vietnamese	-	45,856	61,540	107,396	42.7%	6.3%
Armenian (1)	9,064	69,258	-	78,322	100.0%	4.6%
Cantonese	-	24,901	9,655	34,556	72.1%	2.0%
Korean	-	721	12,778	13,499	5.3%	0.8%
Tagalog	-	-	7,014	7,014	0.0%	0.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	2,911	1,748	4,659	62.5%	0.3%
Arabic	-	3,499	-	3,499	100.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	1,323	-	1,323	100.0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	456	-	456	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>125,490</b>	<b>874,984</b>	<b>100,268</b>	<b>1,100,741</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	85,080	88,137	173,217	49.1%	10.2%
Hmong	113,201	6,472	11,290	130,963	91.4%	7.7%
Mien	24,230	33,309	7,988	65,527	87.8%	3.9%
Lao	-	41,057	4,086	45,143	90.9%	2.7%
Eastern/Southern European Languages(2)	-	28,800	5,244	34,045	84.6%	2.0%
Punjabi	3,504	29,910	92	33,506	99.7%	2.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (3)	2,181	24,808	267	27,256	99.0%	1.6%
All Other Languages (4)	147	13,067	8,262	21,476	61.5%	1.3%
Farsi (5)	-	18,786	-	18,786	100.0%	1.1%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (6)	-	2,787	13,961	16,748	16.6%	1.0%
Tongan	-	2,620	10,105	12,725	20.6%	0.8%
Khmer	7,215	2,818	198	10,231	98.1%	0.6%
African Languages (7)	-	3,100	-	3,100	100.0%	0.2%
Samoan	-	-	828	828	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>150,478</b>	<b>292,615</b>	<b>150,457</b>	<b>593,550</b>	<b>74.7%</b>	<b>35.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>275,968</b>	<b>1,167,598</b>	<b>250,725</b>	<b>1,694,292</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, Romanian, Serbian, and Ukrainian

(3) Includes Hindi and Urdu

(4) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique (1) May include Latin Am€ (1) May include Latin Amer

(5) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(6) Includes Fijian Hindustan, Illocano, Taiwanese and Thai

(7) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya

**Table A22: Superior Court of San Benito County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	2,713	54,590	1,060	58,363	98.2%	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,713</b>	<b>54,590</b>	<b>1,060</b>	<b>58,363</b>	<b>98.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table A23: Superior Court of San Bernardino County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	1,510,972	281,335	29,804	1,822,111	98.4%	89.1%
Vietnamese	-	29,604	1,566	31,169	95.0%	1.5%
Korean	-	21,875	-	21,875	100%	1.1%
Arabic	-	18,600	1,735	20,335	91.5%	1.0%
Mandarin (1)	-	16,730	-	16,730	100%	0.8%
Armenian (1)	-	346	5,409	5,756	6.0%	0.3%
Russian (1)	-	4,432	265	4,697	94.4%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	4,444	4,444	0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	2,353	398	2,751	85.5%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	976	530	1,506	64.8%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	921	299	1,220	75.5%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>1,510,972</b>	<b>377,172</b>	<b>44,450</b>	<b>1,932,594</b>	<b>97.7%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	6,134	41,776	47,909	12.8%	2.3%
Cambodian (Khmer)	-	-	11,452	11,452	0%	0.6%
Samoan	-	-	10,020	10,020	0%	0.5%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (2)	-	6,841	2,144	8,985	76.1%	0.4%
All Other Languages (3)	-	5,404	2,934	8,338	64.8%	0.4%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (4)	-	743	6,110	6,853	10.8%	0.3%
Punjabi	-	586	5,177	5,763	10.2%	0.3%
African Languages (5)	-	2,233	1,206	3,439	64.9%	0.2%
Other Asian Indian Languages (6)	-	336	2,892	3,228	10.4%	0.2%
Tongan	-	-	2,054	2,054	0%	0.1%
Farsi (7)	-	581	1,139	1,720	33.8%	0.1%
Other Western European Languages (8)	-	709	306	1,015	69.9%	0.05%
Middle Eastern Languages (9)	-	-	917	917	0%	0.04%
Lao	-	570	92	662	86.1%	0.03%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>24,136</b>	<b>88,217</b>	<b>112,353</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,510,972</b>	<b>401,308</b>	<b>132,667</b>	<b>2,044,947</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian, Mandarin, and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Greek, Hungarian, and Romanian

(3) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Indonesian and Thai

(5) Includes Amharic and Tigrinya

(6) Includes Bengali, Gujranti, Hindi and Urdu

(7) Includes Farsi and Persian of Iran

(8) Includes Dutch and German

(9) Includes Assyrian and Turkish

**Table A24: Superior Court of the County of San Diego  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	1,953,069	517,631	635	2,471,335	99.97%	83.8%
Vietnamese	3,180	60,030	32,916	96,126	65.8%	3.3%
Tagalog	-	-	33,297	33,297	0%	1.1%
Arabic	-	4,591	16,576	21,167	21.7%	0.7%
Russian (1)	-	15,823	184	16,007	98.9%	0.5%
Mandarin (1)	5,087	7,560	184	12,831	98.6%	0.4%
Korean	-	3,742	8,496	12,238	30.6%	0.4%
Japanese	-	-	9,730	9,730	0%	0.3%
Portuguese	-	2,029	1,740	3,769	53.8%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	-	3,130	3,130	0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	1,470	736	2,206	66.6%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>1,961,336</b>	<b>612,876</b>	<b>107,623</b>	<b>2,681,835</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	-	103,139	103,139	0%	3.5%
Khmer	12,939	-	19,053	31,992	40.4%	1.1%
African Languages (2)	-	-	30,042	30,042	0%	1.0%
Lao	14,267	4,069	8,238	26,574	69.0%	0.9%
All Other Languages (3)	2,942	3,577	16,671	23,190	28.1%	0.8%
Farsi (4)	-	12,762	5,076	17,838	71.5%	0.6%
Middle Eastern Languages (5)	4,399	1,735	3,330	9,464	64.8%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (6)	-	3,739	4,353	8,092	46.2%	0.3%
Hmong	-	-	5,149	5,149	0%	0.2%
Other Western European Languages (7)	530	2,058	2,258	4,846	53.4%	0.2%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (8)	2,147	147	460	2,754	83.3%	0.1%
Punjabi	-	-	2,132	2,132	0%	0.1%
Samoan	-	-	828	828	0%	0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (9)	-	-	368	368	0%	0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>37,224</b>	<b>28,087</b>	<b>201,096</b>	<b>266,407</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,998,560</b>	<b>640,963</b>	<b>308,719</b>	<b>2,948,242</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian, Mandarin, and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Amharic, Somali, Swahili, and Tingrinya

(3) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Farsi, Persian of Afghanistan (Dari), and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(5) Includes Chaldean, Hebrew, and Turkish

(6) Includes Albanian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Georgian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak, Ukrainian

(7) Includes French, German, and Italian

(8) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, Indonesian, and Thai

**Table A25: Superior Court of San Joaquin County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	114,570	254,313	141,482	510,365	72.3%	70.9%
Vietnamese	-	12,443	18,481	30,924	40.2%	4.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	541	3,096	3,637	14.9%	0.5%
Portuguese	-	-	1,971	1,971	0%	0.3%
Tagalog	-	-	1,371	1,371	0%	0.2%
Korean	-	-	1,205	1,205	0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	700	112	812	86.2%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	761	-	761	100%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	644	644	0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	285	-	285	100%	0.0%
Russian (1)	-	-	276	276	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>114,570</b>	<b>269,042</b>	<b>168,639</b>	<b>552,252</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	<b>76.7%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Khmer	23,839	2,354	27,436	53,629	48.8%	7.4%
All Other Languages (2)	412	-	33,631	34,043	1.2%	4.7%
Lao	-	-	16,397	16,397	0%	2.3%
American Sign Language	-	198	16,078	16,276	1.2%	2.3%
Hmong	-	-	16,152	16,152	0%	2.2%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (3)	-	-	11,951	11,951	0%	1.7%
Punjabi	8,200	812	2,751	11,763	76.6%	1.6%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	559	-	4,434	4,993	11.2%	0.7%
Farsi (5)	-	925	1,282	2,208	41.9%	0.3%
Samoan	-	-	460	460	0%	0.1%
Romanian	-	-	122	122	0%	0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>33,009</b>	<b>4,290</b>	<b>130,695</b>	<b>167,994</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>147,579</b>	<b>273,332</b>	<b>299,334</b>	<b>720,245</b>	<b>58.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Fijian Hindustani and Ilocano

(4) Includes Hindi, Pashto, and Urdu

(5) Includes Persian of Afghanistan (Dari) and Persian of Iran (Farsi)

**Table A26: Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	178,761	359	179,120	99.8%	94.9%
Armenian (1)	-	1,000	-	1,000	100.0%	0.5%
Cantonese	579	-	-	579	100.0%	0.3%
Japanese	-	430	-	430	100.0%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	368	368	0.0%	0.2%
Arabic	-	-	184	184	0.0%	0.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	92	92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	579	180,191	1,003	181,772	99.4%	96.3%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	5,935	331	6,266	94.7%	3.3%
Ilocano	-	-	552	552	0.0%	0.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	242	242	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	5,935	1,125	7,060	84.1%	3.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	579	186,125	2,128	188,832	98.9%	100.0%

(1) Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A27: Superior Court of San Mateo County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	214,454	251,371	64,986	530,810	87.8%	68.2%
Tagalog	-	39,916	23,922	63,838	62.5%	8.2%
Mandarin (1)	-	38,179	-	38,179	100%	4.9%
Cantonese	16,924	6,719	-	23,643	100%	3.0%
Vietnamese	-	23,181	-	23,181	100%	3.0%
Russian (1)	-	16,605	-	16,605	100%	2.1%
Portuguese	-	-	12,585	12,585	0%	1.6%
Japanese	-	-	5,255	5,255	0%	0.7%
Korean	932	1,982	-	2,913	100%	0.4%
Arabic	-	853	-	853	100%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>232,309</b>	<b>378,805</b>	<b>106,748</b>	<b>717,863</b>	<b>85.1%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Tongan	-	16,427	2,605	19,032	86.3%	2.4%
Samoan	-	9,645	752	10,397	92.8%	1.3%
Punjabi	-	8,474	-	8,474	100%	1.1%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Island (2)	-	6,991	184	7,175	97.4%	0.9%
American Sign Language	-	1,911	4,445	6,356	30.1%	0.8%
Other Asian Indian Languages (3)	167	1,981	-	2,148	100%	0.3%
Lao	-	2,082	-	2,082	100%	0.3%
Farsi (4)	-	-	2,075	2,075	0.0%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (5)	-	1,075	-	1,075	100%	0.1%
Turkish	-	-	664	664	0.0%	0.1%
Italian	-	480	-	480	100%	0.1%
Tigrinya	-	335	-	335	100%	0%
All Other Languages	-	265	-	265	100%	0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>49,665</b>	<b>10,725</b>	<b>60,558</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>232,477</b>	<b>428,470</b>	<b>117,473</b>	<b>778,420</b>	<b>84.9%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Mandarin and Russian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Burmese, Ilocano, and Thai

(3) Includes Hindi and Urdu

(4) Includes Farsi and Persian of Afghanistan (Dari)

(5) Includes Croatian and Polish

**Table A28: Superior Court of Santa Barbara County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	89,518	407,425	1,072	498,016	99.8%	92.0%
Armenian (1)	-	2,016	1,597	3,613	55.8%	0.7%
Korean	-	2,356	368	2,724	86.5%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	1,245	-	1,245	100%	0.2%
Tagalog	-	-	980	980	0%	0.2%
Mandarin (1)	-	641	278	920	69.7%	0.2%
Vietnamese	-	842	-	842	100%	0.2%
Arabic	-	776	-	776	100%	0.1%
Japanese	-	773	-	773	100%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>89,518</b>	<b>416,075</b>	<b>4,296</b>	<b>509,889</b>	<b>99.2%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	12,118	2,660	14,778	82.0%	2.7%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	12,850	12,850	0%	2.4%
Hmong	-	-	1,723	1,723	0%	0.3%
Ilocano	-	-	1,238	1,238	0%	0.2%
Hebrew	-	810	-	810	100%	0.1%
Italian	-	265	-	265	100%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,193</b>	<b>18,471</b>	<b>31,664</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>89,518</b>	<b>429,268</b>	<b>22,767</b>	<b>541,553</b>	<b>95.8%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A29: Superior Court of Santa Clara County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	394,051	105,499	243,741	743,291	67.2%	58.5%
Vietnamese	49,821	191,084	56,636	297,541	81.0%	23.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	46,220	359	46,579	99.2%	3.7%
Tagalog	-	174	34,080	34,254	0.5%	2.7%
Korean	5,708	2,665	10,409	18,781	44.6%	1.5%
Cantonese	-	724	9,029	9,753	7.4%	0.8%
Russian (1)	-	3,323	5,838	9,161	36.3%	0.7%
Japanese	-	-	2,796	2,796	0.0%	0.2%
Arabic	-	-	243	243	0.0%	0.0%
Portuguese	-	147	-	147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>449,580</b>	<b>349,836</b>	<b>363,130</b>	<b>1,162,546</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>91.5%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Punjabi	25,865	4,948	-	30,813	100.0%	2.4%
Khmer	-	8,662	16,211	24,873	34.8%	2.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	18,510	18,510	0.0%	1.5%
African Languages (2)	-	355	9,385	9,741	3.6%	0.8%
Eastern/Southern European Languages(3)	-	5,661	-	5,661	100.0%	0.4%
Other Asian Indian Languages (4)	930	1,174	3,249	5,353	39.3%	0.4%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (5)	-	-	5,297	5,297	0.0%	0.4%
Farsi (6)	294	1,702	1,914	3,910	51.1%	0.3%
Tongan	-	2,552	-	2,552	100.0%	0.2%
Middle Eastern Languages (7)	-	-	591	591	0.0%	0.0%
All Other Languages (8)	-	-	267	267	0.0%	0.0%
Dutch	-	-	92	92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>27,089</b>	<b>25,055</b>	<b>55,515</b>	<b>107,659</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>476,669</b>	<b>374,891</b>	<b>418,645</b>	<b>1,270,204</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Footnotes:

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Amharic, Amharic (Ethiopian), Oromo, Somali, and Tigrinya

(3) Includes Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Polish, Romanian, and Serbian

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu

(5) Includes Ilocano, Ilogono, and Thai

(6) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(7) Includes Hebrew and Turkish

(8) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A30: Superior Court of Santa Cruz County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	99,341	278,142	27,559	405,041	93.2%	91.3%
Tagalog	-	1,461	734	2,195	66.6%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	1,694	-	1,694	100.0%	0.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	1,210	-	1,210	100.0%	0.3%
Korean	-	325	113	438	74.2%	0.1%
Japanese	-	-	371	371	0.0%	0.1%
Cantonese	340	-	-	340	100.0%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	184	184	0.0%	0.0%
Vietnamese	-	173	-	173	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	99,681	283,005	28,961	411,646	93.0%	92.8%
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	17,430	4,794	22,224	78.4%	5.0%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	6,021	6,021	0.0%	1.4%
Punjabi	-	2,061	-	2,061	100.0%	0.5%
Thai	-	809	-	809	100.0%	0.2%
Croatian	-	517	-	517	100.0%	0.1%
Khmer	-	206	-	206	100.0%	0.0%
Italian	-	-	114	114	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	21,023	10,929	31,952	65.8%	7.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	99,681	304,028	39,890	443,599	91.0%	100.0%

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A31: Superior Court of Shasta County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	20,434	9,245	29,679	68.9%	36.5%
Vietnamese	-	1,146	-	1,146	100.0%	1.4%
Mandarin (1)	-	-	426	426	0.0%	0.5%
Russian (1)	-	-	210	210	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	21,580	9,881	31,461	68.6%	38.7%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Mien	-	5,283	14,578	19,862	26.6%	24.4%
Lao	-	15,501	3,463	18,964	81.7%	23.3%
American Sign Language	-	-	7,318	7,318	0.0%	9.0%
Punjabi	526	1735.5	-	2,262	100.0%	2.8%
Thai	-	1,070	-	1,070	100.0%	1.3%
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	387	387	0.0%	0.5%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	526	23,589	25,747	49,862	48.4%	61.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	526	45,169	35,628	81,323	56.2%	100.0%

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A32: Superior Court of Siskiyou County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	9,482	26,087	3,761	39,329	90.4%	86.3%
Russian (1)	-	733	205	938	78.1%	2.1%
Mandarin (1)	-	704	-	704	100.0%	1.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>9,482</b>	<b>27,523</b>	<b>3,966</b>	<b>40,971</b>	<b>90.3%</b>	<b>89.9%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (2)	-	811	1,525	2,336	34.7%	5.1%
Lao	-	2,286	-	2,286	100%	5.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,097</b>	<b>1,525</b>	<b>4,622</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,482</b>	<b>30,621</b>	<b>5,491</b>	<b>45,593</b>	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages in FY 2003-04

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A33: Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	101,485	136,803	28,003	266,291	89.5%	78.5%
Portuguese	-	-	7,697	7,697	0.0%	2.3%
Vietnamese	-	1,716	441	2,157	79.6%	0.6%
Cantonese	-	787	587	1,374	57.3%	0.4%
Arabic	-	-	882	882	0.0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	645	240	885	72.9%	0.3%
Armenian (1)	-	-	250	250	0.0%	0.1%
Russian (1)	-	-	930	930	0.0%	0.3%
Tagalog	-	-	456	456	0.0%	0.1%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>101,485</b>	<b>139,951</b>	<b>39,486</b>	<b>280,922</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	11,870	-	11,870	100.0%	3.5%
Khmer	-	3,780	7,214	10,994	34.4%	3.2%
Lao	-	3,367	5,505	8,872	38.0%	2.6%
Punjabi	5,863	460	2,370	8,693	72.7%	2.6%
Assyrian	-	-	6,853	6,853	0.0%	2.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages (2)	2,672	-	1,649	4,321	61.8%	1.3%
Romanian	-	2,626	-	2,626	100.0%	0.8%
Farsi (3)	-	1,322	715	2,037	64.9%	0.6%
Finnish	-	-	947	947	0.0%	0.3%
Samoan	-	-	508	508	0.0%	0.1%
Hmong	-	-	456	456	0.0%	0.1%
Mien	-	-	147	147	0.0%	0.0%
Hebrew	-	-	92	92	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>8,535</b>	<b>23,425</b>	<b>26,456</b>	<b>58,416</b>	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>17.2%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>110,020</b>	<b>163,376</b>	<b>65,942</b>	<b>339,338</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Russian, Mandarin, and Armenian became certified languages in FY 2003-04

(2) Includes Hindi and Pashto

(3) Includes Farsi and Dari (Persian of Afghanistan)

**Table A34: Superior Court of Sutter County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	54,648	16,506	2,279	73,433	96.9%	61.3%
Russian (1)	380	885	-	1,265	100.0%	1.1%
Vietnamese	-	912	-	912	100.0%	0.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	491	-	491	100.0%	0.4%
Korean	-	-	307	307	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>55,028</b>	<b>18,794</b>	<b>2,586</b>	<b>76,408</b>	<b>96.6%</b>	<b>63.7%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Punjabi	9,441	10,745	7,950	28,136	71.7%	23.5%
All Other Languages (2)	875	4,269	138	5,283	97.4%	4.4%
Hmong	632	1,619	418	2,669	84.3%	2.2%
American Sign Language	-	354	1,481	1,835	19.3%	1.5%
Hindi	610	1,188	-	1,798	100.0%	1.5%
Lao	-	953	355	1,308	72.9%	1.1%
Romanian	-	1,021	-	1,021	100.0%	0.9%
Mien	-	892	-	892	100.0%	0.7%
Khmer	-	341	-	341	100.0%	0.3%
Persian of Iran (Farsi)	-	193	-	193	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>11,558</b>	<b>21,574</b>	<b>10,343</b>	<b>43,475</b>	<b>76.2%</b>	<b>36.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66,586</b>	<b>40,369</b>	<b>12,928</b>	<b>119,883</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table 35: Superior Court of Tehama County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	5,724	5,673	11,397	50.2%	80.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	2,098	-	2,098	100%	14.8%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	<b>7,822</b>	<b>5,673</b>	<b>13,495</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>95.5%</b>
Non-designated Languages						
Language	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Registered	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	-	339	339	0%	2.4%
All Other Languages (2)	-	296	-	296	100%	2.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	<b>296</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>8,118</b>	<b>6,012</b>	<b>14,130</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Mandarin became a certified language in FY 2003-04

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table 36: Superior Court of Tulare County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	226,434	222,911	203,321	652,666	68.8%	94.6%
Portuguese	-	-	2,282	2,282	0%	0.3%
Vietnamese	-	-	626	626	0%	0.1%
Armenian (1)	-	-	460	460	0%	0.1%
Arabic	-	-	184	184	0%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>226,434</b>	<b>222,911</b>	<b>206,873</b>	<b>656,218</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>95%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
American Sign Language	-	-	14,178	14,178	0%	2.1%
Lao	-	-	9,576	9,576	0%	1.4%
Ilocano	-	265	3,745	4,010	6.6%	0.6%
Hmong	-	-	1,932	1,932	0%	0.3%
Punjabi	-	-	1,657	1,657	0%	0.2%
Mien	-	-	1,652	1,652	0%	0.2%
Khmer	322	-	175	497	64.8%	0.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>32,914</b>	<b>33,501</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>226,756</b>	<b>223,176</b>	<b>239,786</b>	<b>689,719</b>	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Armenian became a certified language in FY 2003-04

**Table A37: Superior Court of Tuolumne County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	-	9,598	1,004	10,603	90.5%	82.6%
Russian (1)	344	-	-	344	100%	2.7%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>9,598</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>10,947</b>	<b>90.8%</b>	<b>85.3%</b>
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
<b>Language</b>	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
All Other Languages (2)	-	-	900	900	0%	7.0%
American Sign Language	-	-	784	784	0%	6.1%
Farsi	-	-	202	202	0%	1.6%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>9,598</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>12,833</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>

(1) Russian became a certified language in FY 2003-04

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

**Table A38: Superior Court of Ventura County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	-	479,117	7,030	486,147	98.6%	97.1%
Armenian (1)	-	7,665	-	7,665	100.0%	1.5%
Vietnamese	-	7,513	139	7,652	98.2%	1.5%
Korean	-	3,420	2,279	5,699	60.0%	1.1%
Tagalog	-	-	3,292	3,292	0.0%	0.7%
Japanese	-	1,502	-	1,502	100.0%	0.3%
Mandarin (1)	-	1,093	147	1,240	88.1%	0.2%
Arabic	-	1,142	-	1,142	100.0%	0.2%
Russian (1)	-	504	-	504	100.0%	0.1%
Portuguese	-	265	-	265	100.0%	0.1%
Cantonese	-	147	92	239	61.5%	0.0%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	-	479,117	7,030	486,147	98.6%	97.1%
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
All Other Languages (2)	-	1,301	4,250	5,551	23.4%	1.1%
Farsi (3)	-	2,141	-	2,141	100.0%	0.4%
Punjabi	-	1,693	216	1,909	88.7%	0.4%
Lao	-	913	671	1,585	57.6%	0.3%
Eastern/Southern European Languages (4)	-	1,555	-	1,555	100.0%	0.3%
Thai	-	677	-	677	100.0%	0.1%
Hebrew	-	463	-	463	100.0%	0.1%
Italian	-	369	-	369	100.0%	0.1%
Hindi	-	147	-	147	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	-	9,258	5,137	14,395	64.3%	2.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	488,374	12,167	500,541	97.6%	100.0%

(1) Russian, Mandarin and Armenian became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(3) Includes Farsi, and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(4) Includes Greek and Polish

**Table A39: Superior Court of Yolo County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

Designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Certified Contractor/ Opt Out	Noncertified Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
Spanish	791	208,244	687	209,722	99.7%	64.6%
Russian (1)	176	26,059	317	26,552	98.8%	8.2%
Tagalog	-	-	9,674	9,674	0.0%	3.0%
Vietnamese	-	-	4,434	4,434	0.0%	1.4%
Cantonese	-	1,313	1,874	3,188	41.2%	1.0%
Korean	-	-	2,547	2,547	0.0%	0.8%
Mandarin (1)	-	683	1,261	1,944	35.1%	0.6%
Arabic	-	680	-	680	100.0%	0.2%
Japanese	-	617	-	617	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	966	237,597	20,794	259,358	92.0%	79.9%
Non-designated Languages						
	Pro Tempore	Registered Contractor/ Opt out	Nonregistered Contractor	Language Total	% Certified	Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures
American Sign Language	-	500	13,214	13,714	3.6%	4.2%
Punjabi	-	6,119	6,029	12,147	50.4%	3.7%
Lao	-	6,874	3,626	10,501	65.5%	3.2%
Mien	-	4,730	2,132	6,862	68.9%	2.1%
Farsi(2)	-	6,857	-	6,857	100.0%	2.1%
Hmong	784	0	4,590	5,373	14.6%	1.7%
All Other Languages (3)	147	677	2,428	3,252	25.3%	1.0%
Other Asian Indian Languages(4)	-	1,460	1,268	2,728	53.5%	0.8%
Khmer	1,937	310	-	2,248	100.0%	0.7%
Other Asian, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island (5)	-	-	1,431	1,431	0.0%	0.4%
Samoaan	-	-	220	220	0.0%	0.1%
Tongan	-	-	110	110	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	2,868	27,528	35,047	65,443	46.4%	20.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,835	265,125	55,841	324,801	82.8%	100.0%

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.

(2) Includes Farsi and Farsi (Persian of Iran)

(3) May include Latin American Languages, such as Mixteco, Trique, Qanjobal (Kanjobal), Tzotzil, Zapateco as well as instances where a language was not specified for an interpretation.

(4) Includes Hindi and Urdu

**Table A40: Superior Court of Yuba County  
Expenditures on Contract Per-diem Interpreting by Language and Certification Status, July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004**

<b>Designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Certified Contractor/ Opt Out</b>	<b>Noncertified Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Certified</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Spanish	147	15,703	175	16,025	98.9%	51.9%
Armenian	530	313	-	843	100.0%	2.7%
Mandarin (1)	-	299	-	299	100.0%	1.0%
Cantonese	-	265	-	265	100.0%	0.9%
Russian (1)	-	147	-	147	100.0%	0.5%
<b>Total Designated Languages</b>	677	16,727	175	17,579	99.0%	57.0%
<b>Non-designated Languages</b>						
	<b>Pro Tempore</b>	<b>Registered Contractor/ Opt out</b>	<b>Nonregistered Contractor</b>	<b>Language Total</b>	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>Language as a % of Interpreter Expenditures</b>
Hmong	294	1,916	3,179	5,389	41.0%	17.5%
Punjabi	-	2,566	-	2,566	100.0%	8.3%
American Sign Language	-	-	2,392	2,392	0.0%	7.8%
Italian	-	1,673	-	1,673	100.0%	5.4%
Lao	-	1,039	218	1,257	82.7%	4.1%
<b>Total Nondesignated Languages</b>	294	7,194	5,789	13,277	56.4%	43.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	971	23,921	5,964	30,856	80.7%	100.0%

(1) Russian and Mandarin became certified languages during FY 2003-04.