**Comment regarding:**

**Sorenson’s Petition for a Declaratory Ruling or Alternatively a Rulemaking Regarding Call Handling Obligations”**

I want to add my comments in agreement with NAD. VRS Interpreters should not be the police of phone calls. This infringes on the rights of the caller to make their own decisions.

I would like to add my support to Sorenson’s claim which says, “It is not practical for interpreters to faithfully and accurately interpret a call while simultaneously making split-second judgments about whether the call’s content may violate a variety of differing, and sometimes inconsistent, state or federal laws.

First, within the RID’s Code of Professional Conduct (CPC) tenet 4.4 it states, “Facilitate communication access and equality, and support the full interaction and independence of consumers.” That tenet applies to all situations whether they are difficult or easy to accommodate for the interpreter.

It is also not possible to always know to the fullest extent whether a call is a “phony” call or just a call that we as the interpreter does not totally understand the shared content of the callers. Along with that, it is impossible for each interpreter to be abreast of all of the types of scam calls out there. The interpreter has enough to do just to interpret the call.