

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet
 DF-46 (REV 08/15)

Fiscal Year 2016-17	Business Unit 0250	Department Judicial Branch	Priority No. 006
Budget Request Name 0250-006-BCP-BR-2016-GB		Program 0150-STATE TRIAL COURTS	Subprogram 0150037-COURT INTERPRETERS

Budget Request Description
 Language Access in the California Courts

Budget Request Summary

The Judicial Council proposes an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$7.0 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2017 to fund and support implementation of one key element of the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, expanding interpreter services into all civil proceedings. This funding is critical to improve access to justice for the 7 million Limited English Proficient Californians and promote efficiency for the courts.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed N/A	
Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the Department of Technology, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR SPR Project No. Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? Yes No

Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By Donna Hershkowitz	Date	Reviewed By Patrick Ballard	Date
Chief Administrative Officer <i>Shelby Mendonca</i>	Date <i>12/31/15</i>	Administrative Director <i>Patrick Ballard</i>	Date <i>12/31/15</i>

Department of Finance Use Only

Additional Review: Capital Outlay ITCU FSCU OSAE CALSTARS Dept. of Technology

BCP Type: Policy Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA <i>B Z</i>	Date submitted to the Legislature <i>1/7/16</i>
--------------------	--

A. Budget Request Summary

The Judicial Council proposes an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$7.0 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016–2017 to fund and support implementation of one key element of the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, expanding interpreter services into all civil proceedings. This funding is critical to improve access to justice for the 7 million Limited English Proficient (LEP) Californians and promote efficiency for the courts.

B. Background/History (Provide relevant background/history and provide program resource history. Provide workload metrics, if applicable.)

Access to the courts for all Californians is critical to ensure the legitimacy of our system of justice and the trust and confidence of Californians in our courts. Without meaningful language access, Californians who speak limited English are denied access to the very laws created to protect them.

California is home to the most diverse population in the country. There are approximately 7 million LEP residents and potential court users speaking more than 200 languages and dispersed over a vast geographic area. According to data recently released by the US Census Bureau, 44% of Californians age 5 and over speak a language other than English at home. That percentage rises to 54% in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The most commonly spoken languages vary widely both within and among counties; indigenous languages have become more common and also more visible, particularly in rural areas; and the influx of new immigrants brings with it newly emerging languages throughout the state. This richly diverse and dynamic population is one of our greatest assets, and a significant driver of the state's economic and social growth and progress. It also means that the state's institutions, including the judicial branch, must continually adapt to meet the needs of its constituents. And it means that this language barrier is not going away. Californians continue to face significant obstacles to meaningful access to our justice system. The California courts also face unique challenges every day, particularly in courtrooms with high volume calendars in which the vast majority of litigants are self-represented (such as traffic, family law, and small claims, where parties must represent themselves). Courts must confront these challenges with limited resources, having endured severe budget cuts during the past several years that have significantly interfered with their ability to maintain adequate levels of service. Although some funding has been restored to the courts, the branch is not funded to the level required to be able to provide all the services Californians need and expect in the resolution of their legal disputes.

While the provision of comprehensive language access across our system of justice will undoubtedly require additional resources and funding, the branch also understands that fundamental and systemic changes in our approach to language access, at the statewide and local levels, are both necessary and feasible. The Chief Justice recognized that developing a comprehensive statewide language access plan was a critical first step in addressing the needs of the state's LEP population in a more systematic fashion.

On January 22, 2015, the Judicial Council approved a comprehensive *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*, which includes 8 strategic goals and 75 detailed recommendations to be completed in three distinct phases.¹ The Judicial Council's Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force (Task Force), chaired by Supreme Court Associate Justice Mariano Florentino-Cuellar, advises the Chief Justice and Judicial Council on implementation of the recommendations. The Task Force will establish the necessary systems for monitoring compliance with the plan. The Task Force's charge is to turn the Language Access Plan (LAP) into a practical roadmap for courts by creating an implementation plan for full implementation in all 58 trial courts.

¹ Note: Phase 1 = Implementation of these LAP recommendations should begin in 2015; Phase 2 = Implementation of these LAP recommendations may begin immediately, where practicable, but should begin by 2016-2017; Phase 3 = Implementation of these LAP recommendations may begin immediately, but may require significant foundational steps, time and resources in order to be completed by 2020.

Fundamental to California's LAP is the principle that the plan's implementation will be adequately funded so the expansion of language access services will take place without impairing other court services.

The annual funding dedicated for language access is Program 0150037, which provides funding for court interpreter services. The funding for interpreter services has historically been limited primarily to constitutionally-mandated cases, including criminal cases and juvenile matters. Current funding is not sufficient to support growth and expansion of interpreter services into domestic violence, family law, guardianship and conservatorship, small claims, unlawful detainers and other civil matters. This augmentation will allow the courts to continue to provide court interpreter services in civil matters, and assure all 58 trial courts that increased funding for expanded court interpreter services for limited English proficient court users in civil is available.

Federal Compliance

On August 16, 2010, the US Department of Justice (DOJ) issued a letter clarifying the requirement that courts receiving federal financial assistance must provide meaningful access to LEP persons in order to comply with federal law. According to the 2010 DOJ letter to all state chief justices and court administrators, courts that receive federal funding must provide interpreters, free of charge, in all court proceedings to avoid violating civil rights laws. The DOJ had previously provided guidance documents that emphasize that applicable civil rights law requires courts receiving federal financial assistance to provide meaningful access to all civil, criminal or administrative hearings, at no charge to LEP individuals. They further explain that such access: should be extended to LEP parties and other LEP individuals whose presence or participation is appropriate to the court proceedings, should be provided in court programs and activities outside of the courtroom, and should include language services for communication between LEP individuals and court appointed or court managed service providers. While recognizing budget concerns and constraints on the part of state and local courts, the August 2010 memorandum to state court administrators bluntly stated: Fiscal pressures, however, do not provide an exemption from civil rights requirements.

In February 2011, the US DOJ initiated an investigation of the Los Angeles Superior Court and the Judicial Council of California. The investigation was prompted by a December 2010 complaint filed by the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles on behalf of two litigants who were not provided with Korean interpreters for their court hearings. The complaint alleges that in failing to provide the interpreters, the courts violated Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits national origin discrimination. These cases, according to the complaint, "are just two examples of many LAFLA (Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles) clients who have been denied access to the courts based on their limited-English proficiency." In a letter dated May 22, 2013, the DOJ summarized the observations they had made during the course of their investigation, identified 4 major areas of concern, and issued 8 recommendations for steps toward compliance with Title VI and DOJ's Title VI implementing regulations. Key among their findings and recommendations were the following:

1. Title VI requires interpreter services in court proceedings be provided free of charge and requires interpreters in all court proceedings, not merely criminal and juvenile matters.
2. LEP litigants must be provided interpreting services from competent interpreters and not family or friends.
3. The Judicial Council should consider efficiencies and practices that can improve and increase language services in proceedings and operations, including appropriately utilizing technology such as video remote interpreting.
4. The Judicial Council should arrange for translation of fee waiver forms into the most common languages.

The Judicial Council and Los Angeles Superior Court both have been working collaboratively with DOJ toward voluntary compliance, without the need for legal action to be taken. DOJ monitored the drafting of the LAP with great interest, and continues to monitor implementation closely. Failure to take meaningful steps to implement the plan will likely lead to action by the US DOJ which might result in a less measured implementation strategy.

Constitutional and Statutory Direction

Effective January 1, 2015, Evidence Code section 756 and Government Code section 68092.1 were added, setting forth the joint commitment of the legislative and judicial branches of government to carry out the goal of providing interpreters to all parties who require one, regardless of case type and level of income. The Evidence Code section provides that “[t]o the extent required by other state or federal laws, the Judicial Council shall reimburse courts for court interpreter services provided in civil actions and proceedings to any party who is present in court and who does not proficiently speak or understand the English language for the purpose of interpreting the proceedings in a language the party understands, and assisting communications between the party, his or her attorney, and the court.” The code then sets forth a case type priority order for the provision of interpreters “if sufficient funds are not appropriated to provide an interpreter to every party that meets the standard of eligibility.”

Additionally, Article 1, §14 of the California Constitution provides for the right to an interpreter in criminal matters; Code of Civil Procedure §116.550(a) and (d) discuss the right to an interpreter in small claims; and Evidence Code §§ 752, 730, 731(a) & (c) speak to the right of witnesses to have interpreters.

C. State Level Considerations

California is the most diverse state in the country, with approximately 7 million LEP residents and potential court users dispersed over a vast geographic area and speaking more than 200 languages. Without proper language assistance, LEP court users will be excluded from meaningful participation in the judicial process. Many LEP litigants appear without an attorney and without a qualified interpreter, and courts have had to rely on friends and/or family members of the court user—individuals who generally do not understand legal terminology or court procedures—to act as the court interpreter. Further, LEP court users’ language needs are not limited to the courtroom; the need for language assistance extends to all points of contact with the public, including clerks’ offices, self-help centers, court-connected clinics, and beyond.

The California judicial branch has long supported the need for language access services in the courts. However, until recently, the branch had not adopted a comprehensive plan to provide recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all LEP court users. The *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts* (LAP), adopted by the Judicial Council on January 22, 2015, sets forth a comprehensive plan to provide recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all LEP court users. The comprehensive plan consists of eight goals and 75 recommendations, including priorities the Judicial Council hopes to phase in for implementation by the courts and Judicial Council during the next five years (2015–2020). The plan aligns with the US DOJ’s recommendations for California to expand its language access efforts. It also aligns with recent legislation in California (Assem. Bill 1657; Stats. 2014, ch. 721) that sets out priorities for the provision of court interpreters in civil proceedings. Extensive language assistance has been and continues to be a priority in the state’s courts, including providing court interpreters for many types of cases.

The *Strategic Plan for Language Access* supports Goal I of the Judicial Council’s 2006–2016 strategic plan—Access, Fairness, and Diversity—which sets forth that:

- All persons will have equal access to the courts and court proceedings and programs;
- Court procedures will be fair and understandable to court users; and
- Members of the judicial branch community will strive to understand and be responsive to the needs of court users from diverse cultural backgrounds.

The LAP also aligns with the 2008–2011 operational plan for the judicial branch, which identifies additional objectives, including:

- Increase qualified interpreter services in mandated court proceedings and seek to expand services to additional court venues; and
- Increase the availability of language access services to all court users.

The LAP also aligns with the Chief Justice's Access 3D framework and enhances equal access by serving people of all languages, abilities, and needs, in keeping with California's diversity.

At public hearings regarding language access conducted in 2014, key language access stakeholders expressed support for the courts to enhance and expand language access services for California's approximately 7 million LEP residents. These stakeholders included members of the public, including LEP court users; bench officers and court staff from the trial courts; members of the State Bar and Legislature (Assemblyman Ed Chau); court interpreters, including court employee interpreter members of the California Federation of Interpreters (CFI) and independent court interpreter organizations; legal services providers; and educators. Fundamental to California's Language Access Plan is the principle that the plan's implementation will be adequately funded so the expansion of language access services will take place without impairing other court services. Failure to take meaningful steps to implement the plan will likely lead to action by the US DOJ which might result in a less measured implementation strategy.

D. Justification

Interpreter Services in Civil Matters: Until recently, California courts provided spoken language interpreter services at court cost to parties in criminal and juvenile cases, and in some domestic violence matters, but generally did not do so in other civil case types. Changes to state law and policy have both outlined a goal of providing interpreters in all civil matters at court cost, and allowed for expanded provision of services to begin happening. In order to allow courts to continue providing the interpreter services in civil matters that have begun, and allow for further expansions (in more courts, into different case types, or into other languages), the Judicial Council requires an increase to Program 0150037 funding for court interpreter services.

Background

For LEP court users, fundamental interests are at stake not only in criminal and juvenile matters, but also in civil matters, which effect housing, personal safety, divorce, custody of children, the determination of a parental relationship or other matters. This is why providing interpreters in all court cases is important.

New State Law

Prior to January 1, 2015, there were two primary barriers to trial courts providing interpreters in civil cases: 1) It was unclear whether local California courts had the legal authority to provide interpreters at court cost to LEP parties, especially those who had not been evaluated as indigent; and, 2) Insufficient funding available to do so, even if the authority to do so were clear.

The Judicial Council sponsored Assembly Bill 1657 to make this ability clear. Effective January 1, 2015, AB 1657 authorized courts to provide interpreters to all parties in civil matters, regardless of income; specified that courts were not permitted to charge parties for interpreter services provided by the court and set forth a case type priority and preference for how to deploy interpreters when courts do not have sufficient resources to provide interpreters for all persons.

Government Code section 68092.1, added by AB 1657, also clearly articulated the following legislative intent: "The Legislature finds and declares that it is imperative that courts provide interpreters to all parties who require one, and that both the legislative and judicial branches of government continue in their joint commitment to carry out this shared goal."

New State Policy

On January 22, 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*. The LAP (Recommendation No. 8) provides that qualified interpreters must be provided in the California courts to LEP court users in all court proceedings, including civil proceedings, as prioritized in Evidence Code section 756, and including Family Court Services mediation.

Federal Investigation

In addition to the above California events, there has been an on-going investigation into both Los Angeles Superior Court and the Judicial Council by the US DOJ Office of Civil Rights. The DOJ has firmly and publically conveyed their point of view that federal law requires states to provide interpreters in all civil matters at court cost.

Until sufficient funds are appropriated, courts can only take small steps to provide interpreters in all other case types through the priority order set out in Evidence Code section 756. As discussed in more detail below, full access to language services cannot be achieved until court efforts are fully funded through the Program 45.45 fund, which funds court interpreter services in both criminal and civil matters.

Program 0150037 Appropriation

Each year there is an appropriation in the Budget Act for Program 0150037, which is used to reimburse courts for interpretive services. For FY 2014–2015 the appropriation was \$94.560 million of which \$94.473 million was available to reimburse courts for interpretive services (\$87,000 of the annual appropriation is for the Court Interpreter Data Collection System). This funding historically has been used solely to provide interpreter services in what used to be referred to as “mandatory cases” – that is, criminal and juvenile matters. Courts provided interpreters in civil matters in very limited circumstances. Over the years, there have been unspent monies from the Program 0150037 appropriation. Judicial Council policy, since 2009–2010, is that any remaining funding from the Program 0150037 appropriation is to be used to reimburse trial courts for the cost of interpreter services. The fund balance rose to approximately \$13 million in unspent funding. However, as those funds accumulated before the recent changes to law and policy providing for the provision of interpreters in civil case types, the surplus is anticipated to be exhausted in FY 2016-17.

Available Data and Development of Civil Cost Projections

Prior to July 1, 2014, courts were required to report on financial expenditures related to interpreting services, but reporting in detail about court interpreter usage was not mandatory. In January 2014, the Judicial Council directed trial courts to track the use of interpreters in civil matters and report this information to the Judicial Council in the format and timeframe specified by the Judicial Council. Reporting instructions and specifications were developed, and effective July 1, 2014, reporting on court interpreter usage became mandatory. Courts were required to specify the number of interpretations provided, and in what case types, and to do so quarterly. This new set of requirements will provide the best statewide usage data California courts have seen, and will ultimately help us project need and gaps in services.

Data has been compiled and calculated for most courts for FY 2014–2015. Usage data for Los Angeles has been estimated through a detailed sampling of daily interpreter logs from the court. Estimates for interpreter usage in Los Angeles have been completed for the first and second quarters of the fiscal year, and efforts are underway to complete the sampling for quarter 3. At this time, this data does not provide sufficient information to determine the full cost of providing interpreters in civil matters (see information below regarding the rollout of interpreters in civil, which prohibits us from simply using current usage numbers to determine the cost).

In the absence of usage data that will help us predict costs, the council developed a formula using information from the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study² and case characteristics data from the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) was developed to calculate need. The basic formula is two-pronged. The first prong calculates the number of events (i.e. hearings, status conferences, etc) that will likely need interpretation: $[(\% \text{ of LEP population} \times \text{total civil filings}) \times \text{average number of events per case}] \times \% \text{ of events likely to require an interpretation}$. (For purposes of this calculation, it is assumed that the LEP population has the same propensity to file as non-LEP litigants.) The second prong calculates costs.

After analysis of the data required to run the formula, we found a lack of usable information on the average number of events per case or the percent of events likely to need an interpretation. Unfortunately, not all courts report in JBSIS, nor do the reporting courts consistently report hearing and pro per data³. There is no way to know the extent of the underreporting, but, based on other research, it is believed to be considerable. Consequently, the estimated number of court events needing interpretation in FY 2015–2016 is unreliable and the formula could not be used at this time to estimate costs. In the absence of necessary interpreter usage data and data to populate the formula that was developed, the council turned to known information about the use of Program 0150037 funds to determine the amount of the requested funding.

Current Program 0150037 Expenditure Projections and Need for \$7.0 Million in FY 2016–2017

Beginning in May 2014, the Los Angeles Superior Court led expansion efforts in the provision of court interpreters for civil cases (first only where parties were indigent), and now provides court interpreters for LEP parties free of charge in unlawful detainers, civil harassment, conservatorship, guardianship, elder abuse, and all family law matters. Other courts began providing interpreters in civil over time, some just recently and others have not yet begun. Courts ability to begin providing interpreters in these case types required the completion of impact bargaining in each of the 4 bargaining regions, as the description of the work performed in the Memorandums of Understanding had previously only applied to criminal and juvenile matters and civil only incidentally.

While the final Program 0150037 expenditures for FY 2014–2015 will not be finalized until winter of 2015, it is anticipated that, due to current civil expansion efforts, the California courts will have used all of the annual Program 0150037 appropriation this year and nearly \$1 million of the \$13 million savings. It is important to note, however, that the FY 2014–2015 expenditures are not yet reflective of what the full year costs of expanding into civil are for the following reasons, among others:

- A number of courts have not yet begun providing interpreters in civil matters, including large courts such as San Diego, San Bernardino, and Riverside
- Some courts only began expanding to civil in the past few months
- Because the law did not change until January 1, 2015, those courts that did expand to civil earlier were likely only providing interpreters to indigent litigants and not all litigants
- Some courts began a slow roll out of case types in which they were going to provide civil (starting with 1 or 2 and then expanding to 3 or 4).

² The 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study is a recurring study done every five years to determine interpreter need in criminal, juvenile, and certain family cases. The 2015 study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts and was expanded to include an analysis of civil interpreter use and need. A copy of the study may be accessed at the following link: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lr-2015-Language-Need-and-Interpreter-Use-Study.pdf>.

³ Pro per data needed for estimating the percent of cases likely to need interpretation.

Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet

DF-46 (REV 08/15)

With the expansion into civil, and the increase in interpreter salaries obtained through collective bargaining over the next two years, current expenditure projections (using Los Angeles' expenditures as representative) indicate that nearly \$5.8 million more of the savings will be used in FY 2015–2016 (See Exhibit A, Projection Estimates of Court Interpreter Reimbursements, as of December 24, 2015). For FY 2016–2017, the amount of savings anticipated to be used is \$6.9 million, but only \$6.4 million will remain, resulting in a Program 0150037 deficit of over \$500,000. It is important to note, however, that expenditures in Los Angeles may prove to be an unreliable proxy for the costs of funding this expansion throughout the state. Due to the large number of interpreter employees the court has, it may be able to provide greater amounts of interpreter services without any additional costs than other courts with just a few interpreter employees. Los Angeles may be in a position to capitalize on incidental available time to a much greater extent than courts with few employee interpreters. Other courts may need to hire proportionately more interpreters or independent contractors than Los Angeles, thus rendering the estimates based on expenditures in Los Angeles substantially lower than reality. Data in the coming years will allow us to better determine the accuracy of this estimation method.

If no new ongoing funding for Program 0150037 is received in FY 2016–2017, courts that have done minimal expansion will likely see no ability to expand services, and courts that have already begun meaningful expansion will see no other recourse than to reduce, or perhaps stop altogether, their provision of interpreter services in civil cases. The progress made toward providing meaningful access to justice for LEP court users will take a large step backward. To support continuing civil expansion and not risk having to roll back expansion efforts, the Program 0150037 fund requires an augmentation of \$7.0 million beginning in FY 2016–2017. This will allow the courts to continue to provide court interpreter services in civil matters, and assure all 58 trial courts that increased funding for provision of expanded court interpreter services for LEP court users in civil will be made available beginning in July 2016, thereby providing confidence that they can and should proceed with expansion. Once the Judicial Council has more complete data based on actual court expenditures for civil court interpreter expansion, including data from all courts for the current fiscal year, it will be able to more fully forecast cost projections and models for full civil expansion in the courts.

E. Outcomes and Accountability (*Provide summary of expected outcomes associated with Budget Request and provide the projected workload metrics that reflect how this proposal improves the metrics outlined in the Background/History Section.*)

Increased provision of court interpreters for LEP court users in civil matters. Funding will allow more courts to provide interpreters in multiple languages in growing numbers of civil cases and case types. Expansion of court interpreter services in civil matters is consistent with the direction of the US DOJ and the findings set forth in Government Code section 68092.1 that it is imperative that courts provide interpreters to all parties who require one, and that both the legislative and judicial branches of government continue in their joint commitment to carry out this shared goal. Courts will continue to report on interpreter usage, by case type, and the Judicial Council will be able to more effectively calculate the continuing unmet need.

F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives

1. Do not approve funding for interpreters in civil case types.

Pro: No impact to the General Fund.

Con: Courts and the Judicial Council will be limited in their ability to expand language access services for LEP court users due to a lack of funding. Failure to take meaningful steps to implement the plan will likely lead to action by the US DOJ which might result in a less measured implementation strategy.

2. Approve 50% of the funding requested.

Pro: Courts will be able to continue to provide interpreters in at least some of the civil matters they have been providing services in, or will begin before July 1, 2016.

Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet

DF-46 (REV 08/15)

Con: If inadequate funding is received in FY 2016–2017 for Program 0150037, it is expected that courts will have to reduce their provision of interpreter services in civil cases, and the progress made toward providing meaningful access to justice will take a large step backward. Courts and the Judicial Council will be severely limited in their ability to expand language access services for LEP court users due to a lack of adequate funding.

Failure to take meaningful steps to implement the plan will likely lead to action by the US DOJ, which might result in a less measured implementation strategy.

3. Approve the full General Fund augmentation of \$7.0 million for the trial courts

Pro: This will allow the courts to continue to provide court interpreter services in civil matters, and assure all 58 trial courts that increased funding for provision of expanded court interpreter services for LEP court users in civil will be made available beginning in July 2016, thereby providing confidence that they can proceed with expansion and not risk having to roll back expansion efforts.

Con: Impact on general fund, would require additional general fund resources/appropriation.

G. Implementation Plan

The Language Access Plan Implementation Task Force was formed in March 2015 and advises the Judicial Council on implementation of the recommendations contained in the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts. As part of its charge, the Task Force will develop an implementation plan for presentation to the Judicial Council and identify the costs associated with implementing the plan's recommendations. The plan contains 75 recommendations to be completed in three distinct phases. In the current fiscal year (2015–2016), work has commenced on some of the phase 1 LAP recommendations. One of the deliverables in the current contract with the NCSC is to identify the full costs of LAP implementation in California over the next three to five years. Based on the work they do, the Task Force will prioritize implementation of additional recommendations for FY 2017-2018. With regard to the proposal in this BCP:

- Funding for interpreter services. Courts will be able to seamlessly continue to provide interpreter services in the case types in which they have already begun providing interpreters, and may be able to expand to additional languages or additional case types.

H. Supplemental Information *(Describe special resources and provide details to support costs including appropriate back up.)*

I. Recommendation

The Judicial Council recommends the Alternative #3, an ongoing General Fund augmentation of \$7.0 million for FY 2016–2017 to fund and support court efforts to provide interpreters in all case types.

BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Language Access

DP Name: 0250-006-BCP-DP-2016-GB

Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
54XX - Special Items of Expense	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Total Operating Expenses and Equipment	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000
Total Budget Request	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

Fund Summary

Fund Source - Local Assistance
0001 - General Fund

0001 - General Fund	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Total Local Assistance Expenditures	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000
Total All Funds	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

Program Summary

Program Funding
0150037 - Court Interpreters

0150037 - Court Interpreters	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Total All Programs	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000