

From: "Christopher B. Vreeland" <cbv@vreelandlaw.com>
To: <MSC_clerk@courts.mi.gov>
Date: 5/3/2012 10:04 AM
Subject: ADM File No.2012-03

Dear Mr. Davis:

As an attorney whose client base contains a significant percentage of people who do not speak English sufficiently to participate adequately in court proceedings, I am highly interested in this proposal. I also suspect that I would qualify as a Spanish language interpreter under the proposal as a "qualified foreign language interpreter." I have interpreted in numerous court proceedings, both criminal and civil, in Michigan state courts in at least five different counties. I have also been counsel in criminal and civil matters where an interpreter has been used on many occasions.

My comments are as follows:

1. Subrule B: Alternative A is my preferred choice because it appears to leave more discretion to the trial judge than Alternative B. I do not like Alternative C because I do not see how access to court services should be provided at court expense only to folks who are indigent. I believe we currently offer hearing aids to people in court proceedings to facilitate participation without regard to ability.
2. Subrule F(4): Alternative B is the only option I would support. As set forth above, I see interpretation services as a necessary accommodation for people to have meaningful access to the legal process and I do not see how we can charge anybody for it.

I would be happy to serve on the Foreign Language Board of Review specified in the proposal. I believe I would qualify under at least two of the potential membership categories provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Christopher B. Vreeland