

April 24, 2015

TO: Office Receptionist, Clerk

As a Certified Court Reporter for over 32 years, I am writing to urge the members of the Supreme Court to adopt the proposed changes to 28(c), (d) and (e) for many reasons. Addressing 28(c) first, I believe the changes outlined will prohibit the practice of insurance companies and large corporations entering into exclusive agreements or contracts with court reporting firms or networks that require the provision of preferential services and pricing offered to one of the party litigants that are not offered equally to all of the parties. In a typical arrangement, an insurance company will agree to use one court-reporting agency exclusively to report all their depositions in exchange for offering reduced rates and other special perks.

The proposed change to 28(d) will allow for a system in place wherein court reporters and, very importantly, court reporting firms can be required to show proof of equal terms and held accountable by being required to sign an affidavit of equal terms upon request.

The proposed change to 28(e) will prevent court reporting firms from making changes to transcripts after the original transcript has been completed. It will also allow certified court reporters to ensure equal terms have been provided to all parties, which has already been called out in the rule, but there is currently no means or requirements related in enforcement. Lastly, it will prevent unethical and unscrupulous "stretching" of transcripts by changing the characters per line of the transcript in order to create a longer transcript to invoice parties for. This has nothing to do with limiting competition, as some court reporters are alleging in their comments to the Court. It has everything to do with protecting consumers.

The adoption of CR 80, which currently reads "Except as otherwise ordered by the court the minimum qualification to become an authorized transcriptionist in order to complete and file an official certified court transcript from electronically recorded proceedings is certification as a court reporter or certification by AAERT (American Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers) or proof of one year of supervised mentorship with a certified court reporter or an authorized transcriptionist. Courts may require additional or different qualifications or at their discretion" should exclude the unintentionally added words "or different" in the last sentence. Please adopt the proposed amendment to 80(d) as well. RAP 9.2(g) is important because the official record should be transcribed by the court reporter who was present to report it.

I urge the Court to adopt the amendment in CR 80 as it was *originally submitted* by CMC and **also** adopt the proposed additional amendment submitted by WCRA adding the below clarifying language:

CR 80 (d) Supplemental Stenographic Record. If the superior court elects to record a proceeding solely by means of an electronic recording device, any party may, at its own expense, engage a certified court reporter to record the proceeding stenographically. Where a proceeding has been recorded both electronically and by a certified court reporter, either form of record, or both, may be used to create the verbatim report of proceedings for appellate review under RAP 9.2.

Thank you for your considerations herein.

Sincerely,

Connie Church, CCR, RPR, CLR, CRR
Certified Court Reporter #2555

Tracy, Mary

From: Hinchcliffe, Shannon
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 9:12 AM
To: Tracy, Mary
Subject: FW: Letter to Supreme Court
Attachments: Letter to Supreme Court.docx

From: Connie Church [churchhouse@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 9:09 AM
To: AOC DE - Rules Comments
Subject: Letter to Supreme Court

Please see my attached comments regarding Washington State court rules.

Connie Church, CCR, RPR, CRR, CLR
Certified Court Reporter #2555