

King County Bar Association

2001 Judicial Evaluation Survey

Evaluations of the District Court and Municipal Court Judges

November, 2001

Prepared By:

Judicial Evaluation Committee
King County Bar Association

And

Bart Salisbury
Salisbury Research

I. Introduction

Since 1972, the King County Bar Association has conducted and published surveys of its members' evaluations of judicial officers. While the survey instrument has evolved over the years, the results remain a compilation of practicing attorneys' subjective assessments of the judges, magistrates and commissioners who hear and decide their cases.

Through the publication of this report, the King County Bar Association provides information to the public concerning judicial elections and judicial appointments. The report presents assessments of each judge so voters can make more informed decisions by taking into account the collective assessment of those who have the most exposure to judicial performance – practicing attorneys. However, the survey is not designed, nor are the results intended, to provide detailed or comparative rankings between the judges, magistrates and commissioners. Finally, the report also provides important information to the Bar, the public and the Bench on performance of the local judicial branch as a whole.

II. The Survey Instrument

The survey evaluated the following attributes of the District and Municipal Court judges, magistrates and commissioners:

<u>Attribute</u>	<u>Characteristics associated with Attribute</u>
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capably identifies and analyzes factual and legal issues• Articulates a ruling in a clear and concise manner• Capably applies rules of evidence and procedure
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Efficiently uses court time• Enforces court rules and deadlines fairly• Controls the courtroom appropriately• Renders timely decisions
Demeanor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Treats all participants courteously and respectfully
Appearance of Fairness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Performs without bias or prejudice (e.g., gender or race)• Avoids contacts with parties/counsel that create appearance of bias or prejudice.
Overall Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The overall performance of this individual considering all of the attributes above.

Ratings: Each attribute may be rated: (1) Unsatisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (3) Satisfactory; (4) More than Satisfactory; and (5) Excellent.

It should be noted that several changes were made to the survey instrument for this evaluation. These changes were based on feedback received from earlier surveys and an effort by the committee to streamline the survey instrument.

The only substantive change was to the “attribute” previously listed as demeanor. In past evaluations, this category included the following two characteristics:

- Treats all participants fairly, courteously and respectfully
- Does not demonstrate gender, racial or other kind of bias

The Committee agreed that these characteristics were, indeed, quite different from one another, requiring separate treatment. For this survey, judges were still rated for their judicial demeanor (“treats all participants courteously and respectfully”). They were also rated under a new attribute, “appearance of fairness”. Appearance of fairness included the following two characteristics:

- Performs fairly and without bias or prejudice
- Avoids behavior that creates an appearance of bias or prejudice (e.g. inappropriate contacts with parties/counsel)

III. Survey Distribution and Response Rate

In a change of practice from earlier District and Municipal Court Evaluations, surveys were mailed to all members of the Washington Bar Association practicing in King County. Previously, the survey had been mailed to only those attorneys who, according to court records, had appeared in any of those courts during the previous four years. This new approach, however, was in keeping with practices established during the last Superior Court Evaluation.

While the Judicial Evaluation Committee knew that most attorneys receiving the survey would not be eligible to participate (each participating attorney must meet the “personal appearance criteria”) we believed that there was no reliable method to identify and target only those who were eligible. Court lists, it was feared, might not be accurate as to who actually appeared (as opposed to the attorney of record in a case). Thus, the Committee decided to distribute the survey widely to insure that all eligible lawyers would receive the survey.

In addition, reminder strategies were used to encourage lawyers practicing in District and Municipal courts to respond. As an example, both defender and prosecutor groups were contacted and urged to participate. As a result of these efforts, the Committee was satisfied that all eligible practitioners had a fair opportunity to participate.

In order to be accepted for analysis, a returned survey had to possess an attorney signature and bar number. This signature certified the attorney's compliance with the instructions of the survey and agreement that he/she met the personal appearance criteria for each judicial officer evaluated. The signature is made on a page separate from the demographic and evaluation questions. To ensure respondent confidentiality, the signature page was removed prior to processing the questionnaire for analysis.

On August 31, 2001, 10,600 surveys were mailed to members of the Bar in King County. A total of 488 persons submitted survey responses. Of those responses, 419 were valid (signature and Bar number present). This represents a response rate of approximately 5%. Moreover, these 419 respondents submitted an aggregate of over 4,967 individual judicial evaluations.

IV. Summary of 2001 Results

The KCBA's 2001 Judicial Evaluation Survey results reflect a strong favorable assessment of District and Municipal Court judges, magistrates and commissioners. If the evaluations for individual judges, magistrates and commissioners are combined into an aggregate evaluation, the bench was rated to be well above satisfactory. The judges and commissioners received evaluations of satisfactory and above more than 81% of the time.

This aggregate impression of the judges, magistrates and commissioners remains consistent regardless of the responding attorneys' years of active practice, principal type of practice and type and number of appearances before the Court. That is, the attorneys tended to agree on judicial performance, despite differences in their practice, experience and number of appearances before the courts.

V. Aggregate Evaluations

King County District Court

Number of Evaluators = 383

	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	2,870	6%	11%	25%	34%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	2,865	5%	9%	25%	34%	27%
Judicial Demeanor	2,877	9%	11%	21%	30%	30%
Appearance of Fairness	2,871	8%	10%	21%	31%	29%
Overall Performance	2,881	6%	12%	23%	35%	24%

Seattle Municipal Court

Number of Evaluators = 212

	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	1,226	9%	14%	28%	29%	20%
Courtroom Efficiency	1,224	6%	10%	30%	32%	23%

Judicial Demeanor	1,231	9%	14%	23%	26%	28%
Appearance of Fairness	1,227	8%	13%	25%	28%	26%
Overall Performance	1,233	7%	15%	28%	30%	20%

Other Municipal Courts

Number of Evaluators = 182

	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	1,226	7%	11%	31%	31%	19%
Courtroom Efficiency	1,224	6%	12%	28%	33%	21%
Judicial Demeanor	1,231	7%	10%	24%	33%	26%
Appearance of Fairness	1,227	7%	12%	23%	31%	26%
Overall Performance	1,233	7%	11%	29%	32%	21%

VI. Individual Judges, Magistrates and Commissioners¹

The results of the 59 judges, magistrates and commissioners for the District and Municipal courts are presented in the next 18 pages in tables A through F. The results are displayed in 3 groupings. The King County District Court judges and commissioners are presented in tables A and B. The Seattle Municipal Court judges and magistrates are presented in tables –C and D. The remaining King County Municipal Court judges and commissioners are presented in tables E and F. Each table states the total number of valid evaluations and the percent of evaluations for each of the five rating categories. Additionally, each set of results presents the evaluators experience with each judge, commissioner, and magistrate, through self-reported nature of proceedings.

Table A
King County District Court Judges

Admire, David (Northeast) Experience—	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	107	3%	22%	75%
Trials	107	46%	25%	29%
Appeals	107	98%	1%	1%

¹ The survey is not intended, nor should its results be used, to create a ranking of judges. There are at least two reasons for this. First, it is significant that each judicial officer has a different evaluation population. That is, each judge is assessed by different subgroups of lawyers who have made the requisite appearances before that judicial officer. Second, the method of measurement is not exact. Respondents are making subjective assessments of performance that do not lend themselves to cross comparison. That is, the rating criteria used by one evaluator may vary greatly from another. For these reasons, comparisons would be both unfair and unwarranted.

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	104	5%	7%	27%	38%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	105	1%	6%	29%	39%	26%
Judicial Demeanor	105	8%	5%	16%	40%	31%
Appearance of Fairness	104	9%	5%	17%	36%	34%
Overall Performance	105	7%	6%	19%	42%	27%

Bathum, Rick (Aukeen)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	73	0%	21%	79%
Trials	73	67%	12%	21%
Appeals	73	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	71	1%	4%	13%	48%	34%
Courtroom Efficiency	71	1%	3%	17%	41%	38%
Judicial Demeanor	71	4%	1%	11%	31%	52%
Appearance of Fairness	71	4%	4%	13%	30%	49%
Overall Performance	71	3%	6%	8%	46%	37%

Chow, Mark (Seattle)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	131	4%	21%	76%
Trials	131	62%	17%	21%
Appeals	131	98%	1%	1%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	126	13%	15%	30%	28%	14%
Courtroom Efficiency	126	10%	10%	31%	29%	21%
Judicial Demeanor	126	11%	21%	26%	28%	13%
Appearance of Fairness	126	10%	17%	29%	31%	14%
Overall Performance	127	9%	20%	33%	26%	11%

Delaurenti, Charles (Renton)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	126	1%	21%	79%
Trials	126	51%	11%	38%
Appeals	126	94%	2%	5%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	120	2%	2%	23%	40%	33%
Courtroom Efficiency	119	1%	3%	17%	36%	43%
Judicial Demeanor	121	1%	2%	12%	31%	55%
Appearance of Fairness	121	1%	2%	13%	37%	47%
Overall Performance	121	1%	1%	14%	43%	41%

Eiler, Judith (Federal Way)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	125	4%	24%	72%
Trials	125	50%	23%	26%
Appeals	125	96%	1%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	123	17%	17%	33%	24%	9%
Courtroom Efficiency	121	12%	16%	32%	26%	13%
Judicial Demeanor	123	37%	20%	24%	12%	7%
Appearance of Fairness	123	19%	23%	28%	21%	10%
Overall Performance	124	19%	25%	26%	25%	5%

Garrow, Janet (Bellevue)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	82	2%	22%	76%
Trials	82	57%	17%	26%
Appeals	82	95%	1%	4%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	81	17%	19%	32%	20%	12%
Courtroom Efficiency	82	12%	15%	28%	34%	11%
Judicial Demeanor	82	16%	17%	29%	23%	15%
Appearance of Fairness	80	18%	13%	31%	24%	15%
Overall Performance	81	16%	16%	33%	23%	11%

Goodman, Darcy (Seattle)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	125	2%	20%	78%
Trials	125	60%	15%	25%
Appeals	125	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	119	0%	7%	28%	41%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	119	0%	3%	29%	36%	32%
Judicial Demeanor	119	0%	3%	16%	33%	49%
Appearance of Fairness	119	0%	5%	18%	35%	42%
Overall Performance	119	0%	5%	24%	39%	32%

Harn, Corinna (Southwest)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	87	2%	11%	86%
Trials	87	61%	14%	25%
Appeals	87	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	85	8%	11%	28%	36%	16%
Courtroom Efficiency	84	2%	7%	30%	40%	20%
Judicial Demeanor	85	8%	14%	28%	27%	22%
Appearance of Fairness	85	8%	12%	24%	27%	29%
Overall Performance	85	7%	8%	34%	31%	20%

Jacke, Linda (Bellevue)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	129	1%	19%	80%
Trials	129	57%	16%	27%
Appeals	129	95%	3%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	125	7%	15%	23%	30%	25%

Courtroom Efficiency	125	4%	8%	22%	35%	31%
Judicial Demeanor	125	6%	13%	22%	34%	25%
Appearance of Fairness	124	11%	13%	23%	27%	26%
Overall Performance	127	7%	18%	22%	29%	24%

Kato, Eileen (Seattle)

Experience—	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	170	2%	31%	66%		
Trials	170	64%	20%	16%		
Appeals	170	98%	1%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	164	11%	16%	21%	27%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	164	7%	10%	27%	30%	26%
Judicial Demeanor	165	13%	13%	24%	26%	24%
Appearance of Fairness	165	15%	12%	18%	32%	24%
Overall Performance	166	13%	17%	20%	30%	20%

Leverette, E.T. (Federal Way)

Experience—	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	109	1%	17%	82%		
Trials	109	37%	27%	37%		
Appeals	109	93%	3%	5%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	108	2%	13%	23%	39%	23%
Courtroom Efficiency	108	2%	11%	30%	33%	24%
Judicial Demeanor	108	6%	19%	27%	31%	17%
Appearance of Fairness	108	6%	12%	22%	36%	24%
Overall Performance	108	3%	17%	27%	35%	19%

Linde, Barbara (Seattle)

Experience—	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	125	5%	20%	75%		
Trials	125	60%	16%	24%		
Appeals	125	97%	2%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	121	7%	17%	29%	23%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	122	2%	7%	34%	26%	30%
Judicial Demeanor	122	6%	7%	25%	31%	31%
Appearance of Fairness	122	8%	16%	23%	21%	31%
Overall Performance	123	6%	17%	27%	24%	27%

McBeth, Robert (Renton)

Experience—	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	138	4%	14%	82%		
Trials	138	43%	20%	37%		
Appeals	138	94%	1%	5%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	136	4%	7%	19%	40%	29%
Courtroom Efficiency	134	4%	10%	25%	29%	31%
Judicial Demeanor	136	19%	24%	23%	18%	16%
Appearance of Fairness	136	11%	24%	21%	24%	20%

Overall Performance	134	7%	20%	20%	35%	18%
Nault, Peter (Northeast)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	108	3%	15%	82%		
Trials	108	45%	19%	36%		
Appeals	108	96%	2%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	105	8%	7%	21%	30%	35%
Courtroom Efficiency	105	6%	4%	23%	34%	33%
Judicial Demeanor	105	8%	6%	16%	25%	46%
Appearance of Fairness	105	10%	7%	14%	23%	46%
Overall Performance	106	8%	6%	17%	27%	42%
Ottinger, Mary Ann (Issaquah)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	125	0%	16%	84%		
Trials	125	61%	13%	26%		
Appeals	125	96%	2%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	123	2%	8%	22%	37%	30%
Courtroom Efficiency	123	3%	7%	17%	35%	38%
Judicial Demeanor	123	7%	16%	19%	29%	29%
Appearance of Fairness	123	11%	9%	19%	31%	31%
Overall Performance	123	4%	8%	24%	39%	24%
Phillipson, Darrell (Aukeen)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	98	0%	12%	88%		
Trials	98	49%	12%	39%		
Appeals	98	94%	0%	6%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	96	4%	11%	19%	40%	26%
Courtroom Efficiency	96	2%	13%	16%	39%	31%
Judicial Demeanor	96	3%	11%	14%	34%	38%
Appearance of Fairness	96	7%	5%	17%	32%	39%
Overall Performance	96	4%	10%	15%	38%	33%
Saint Clair, J. Wesley (Northeast)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	123	2%	20%	79%		
Trials	123	54%	15%	31%		
Appeals	123	96%	2%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	119	3%	11%	27%	31%	28%
Courtroom Efficiency	119	2%	7%	35%	29%	28%
Judicial Demeanor	120	3%	10%	20%	30%	37%
Appearance of Fairness	119	6%	8%	24%	30%	32%
Overall Performance	120	2%	11%	25%	36%	27%

Seitz, Vicki (Southwest)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	102	5%	11%	84%
Trials	102	41%	25%	34%
Appeals	102	95%	2%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	101	8%	19%	30%	32%	12%
Courtroom Efficiency	99	12%	16%	24%	31%	16%
Judicial Demeanor	101	10%	15%	29%	25%	22%
Appearance of Fairness	101	11%	11%	29%	28%	22%
Overall Performance	101	8%	17%	32%	29%	15%

Smith, Douglas (Shoreline)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	100	2%	16%	82%
Trials	100	43%	23%	34%
Appeals	100	96%	2%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	98	2%	7%	32%	37%	22%
Courtroom Efficiency	98	2%	10%	24%	41%	22%
Judicial Demeanor	98	3%	11%	20%	37%	29%
Appearance of Fairness	98	2%	7%	30%	36%	26%
Overall Performance	99	1%	9%	25%	42%	22%

Spearman, Mariane (Seattle)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	78	0%	22%	78%
Trials	78	56%	14%	29%
Appeals	78	95%	1%	4%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	76	3%	9%	18%	43%	26%
Courtroom Efficiency	74	3%	5%	19%	38%	35%
Judicial Demeanor	76	4%	7%	16%	41%	33%
Appearance of Fairness	76	7%	5%	16%	38%	34%
Overall Performance	75	3%	8%	15%	47%	28%

Stead, Robert (Federal Way)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	84	7%	14%	79%
Trials	84	33%	20%	46%
Appeals	84	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	81	4%	12%	31%	31%	22%
Courtroom Efficiency	81	1%	12%	30%	32%	25%
Judicial Demeanor	81	4%	10%	23%	32%	31%
Appearance of Fairness	81	4%	9%	20%	38%	30%
Overall Performance	80	4%	10%	28%	36%	23%

Steiner, David (Northeast)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	67	0%	22%	78%

Trials	67	52%	18%	30%
Appeals	67	97%	3%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	64	3%	3%	27%	42%	25%
Courtroom Efficiency	64	5%	5%	19%	42%	30%
Judicial Demeanor	64	3%	6%	19%	33%	39%
Appearance of Fairness	64	3%	6%	17%	47%	27%
Overall Performance	64	3%	5%	22%	45%	25%

Thompson, Linda (Aukeen)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	95	2%	14%	84%
Trials	95	60%	12%	28%
Appeals	95	96%	1%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	92	27%	20%	29%	21%	3%
Courtroom Efficiency	92	12%	17%	33%	30%	8%
Judicial Demeanor	92	26%	24%	23%	20%	8%
Appearance of Fairness	92	28%	22%	22%	22%	7%
Overall Performance	93	26%	23%	26%	23%	3%

Thompson, Richard (Southwest)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	87	1%	13%	86%
Trials	87	45%	11%	44%
Appeals	87	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	85	7%	6%	29%	39%	19%
Courtroom Efficiency	85	14%	13%	26%	31%	16%
Judicial Demeanor	85	6%	2%	24%	41%	27%
Appearance of Fairness	85	5%	5%	21%	39%	31%
Overall Performance	86	5%	8%	26%	37%	24%

Wacker, Robert (Shoreline)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	98	4%	7%	89%
Trials	98	44%	20%	36%
Appeals	98	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	95	5%	6%	24%	40%	24%
Courtroom Efficiency	96	4%	9%	25%	35%	26%
Judicial Demeanor	96	3%	6%	21%	41%	29%
Appearance of Fairness	95	2%	5%	20%	40%	33%
Overall Performance	94	1%	7%	27%	35%	30%

Yeatts, Fred (Bellevue)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	124	2%	20%	77%
Trials	124	51%	16%	33%
Appeals	124	98%	1%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	122	1%	7%	21%	41%	30%
Courtroom Efficiency	123	8%	10%	20%	37%	25%
Judicial Demeanor	122	1%	4%	10%	37%	48%
Appearance of Fairness	122	3%	5%	19%	35%	38%
Overall Performance	123	2%	6%	20%	45%	28%

Table B
King County District Court Commissioner

Harper, Anne						
<i>Experience—</i>						
	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	132	3%	11%	86%		
Trials	132	58%	14%	28%		
Appeals	132	100%	0%	0%		
 <i>Evaluations—</i>						
	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	130	2%	10%	20%	35%	34%
Courtroom Efficiency	130	2%	5%	19%	38%	37%
Judicial Demeanor	130	5%	5%	20%	33%	38%
Appearance of Fairness	130	3%	8%	18%	28%	42%
Overall Performance	130	3%	7%	18%	37%	35%

Table D
Seattle Municipal Court Judges

Bonner, Fred						
<i>Experience—</i>						
	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	112	3%	10%	88%		
Trials	112	40%	18%	42%		
Appeals	112	96%	2%	2%		
 <i>Evaluations—</i>						
	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	109	5%	16%	32%	32%	16%
Courtroom Efficiency	109	2%	14%	18%	30%	36%
Judicial Demeanor	109	7%	25%	21%	23%	24%
Appearance of Fairness	108	5%	18%	24%	33%	20%
Overall Performance	110	3%	17%	25%	40%	15%

Chapman, Arthur						
<i>Experience—</i>						
	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	73	0%	8%	92%		
Trials	73	55%	16%	29%		
Appeals	73	100%	0%	0%		
 <i>Evaluations—</i>						
	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	69	0%	10%	38%	32%	20%
Courtroom Efficiency	67	1%	7%	49%	25%	16%
Judicial Demeanor	69	0%	4%	36%	36%	23%
Appearance of Fairness	69	0%	4%	36%	36%	23%
Overall Performance	69	0%	7%	38%	41%	14%

Doyle, Theresa						
<i>Experience—</i>						
	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	92	0%	10%	90%		
Trials	92	47%	12%	41%		
Appeals	92	97%	0%	3%		
 <i>Evaluations—</i>						
	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	88	2%	1%	15%	39%	43%
Courtroom Efficiency	88	1%	0%	15%	42%	42%

Judicial Demeanor	88	1%	1%	10%	24%	64%
Appearance of Fairness	88	1%	6%	11%	25%	57%
Overall Performance	88	1%	2%	10%	35%	51%

Hightower, Judith

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	114	1%	14%	85%
Trials	114	53%	11%	37%
Appeals	114	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	110	15%	18%	28%	27%	12%
Courtroom Efficiency	110	15%	22%	28%	21%	14%
Judicial Demeanor	111	23%	23%	22%	17%	14%
Appearance of Fairness	111	9%	22%	28%	25%	16%
Overall Performance	112	11%	28%	27%	22%	13%

Holifield, George

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	123	2%	13%	85%
Trials	123	37%	17%	46%
Appeals	123	97%	0%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	120	18%	18%	39%	18%	8%
Courtroom Efficiency	120	10%	13%	43%	24%	10%
Judicial Demeanor	120	21%	25%	29%	16%	9%
Appearance of Fairness	119	21%	19%	29%	20%	11%
Overall Performance	121	16%	21%	37%	20%	7%

Hurtado, Michael

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	138	2%	12%	86%
Trials	138	66%	13%	21%
Appeals	138	98%	0%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	134	15%	19%	19%	23%	25%
Courtroom Efficiency	135	5%	7%	19%	34%	35%
Judicial Demeanor	135	8%	13%	19%	23%	36%
Appearance of Fairness	134	9%	18%	22%	22%	28%
Overall Performance	135	7%	24%	17%	25%	27%

Kondo, C. Kimi

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	109	0%	15%	85%
Trials	109	45%	14%	41%
Appeals	109	97%	0%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	105	10%	18%	37%	24%	10%
Courtroom Efficiency	105	7%	12%	44%	29%	9%
Judicial Demeanor	105	8%	13%	33%	29%	17%
Appearance of Fairness	105	6%	15%	33%	28%	18%
Overall Performance	106	6%	17%	39%	29%	9%

Levinson, Anne

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	63	0%	19%	81%
Trials	63	78%	13%	10%
Appeals	63	97%	2%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	58	16%	21%	28%	24%	12%
Courtroom Efficiency	58	16%	5%	24%	38%	17%
Judicial Demeanor	59	19%	12%	27%	27%	15%
Appearance of Fairness	58	21%	5%	29%	29%	16%
Overall Performance	58	16%	14%	38%	22%	10%

Mamiya, Ron

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	116	3%	9%	87%
Trials	116	33%	23%	44%
Appeals	116	96%	1%	3%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	113	7%	11%	29%	31%	22%
Courtroom Efficiency	114	0%	5%	36%	38%	21%
Judicial Demeanor	113	1%	10%	22%	30%	37%
Appearance of Fairness	114	5%	11%	21%	32%	31%
Overall Performance	115	3%	9%	33%	33%	22%

Rietschel, Jean

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	92	0%	12%	88%
Trials	92	40%	22%	38%
Appeals	92	99%	0%	1%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	91	1%	7%	23%	37%	32%
Courtroom Efficiency	91	1%	5%	29%	37%	27%
Judicial Demeanor	90	0%	11%	23%	32%	33%
Appearance of Fairness	90	3%	4%	26%	34%	32%
Overall Performance	90	0%	7%	27%	36%	31%

Table D
Seattle Municipal Court Magistrates

Beighle, Paul

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	71	1%	6%	93%		
Trials	71	54%	24%	23%		
Appeals	71	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	69	4%	13%	22%	39%	22%
Courtroom Efficiency	69	4%	7%	28%	38%	23%
Judicial Demeanor	70	6%	9%	13%	37%	36%
Appearance of Fairness	70	6%	9%	20%	30%	36%
Overall Performance	69	6%	10%	23%	35%	26%

Clark, Thomas A.

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	20	0%	25%	75%		
Trials	20	40%	15%	45%		
Appeals	20	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	20	0%	35%	15%	10%	40%
Courtroom Efficiency	20	5%	15%	35%	5%	40%
Judicial Demeanor	20	0%	25%	30%	5%	40%
Appearance of Fairness	20	10%	15%	30%	5%	40%
Overall Performance	20	5%	20%	30%	5%	40%

De Villa, Frances

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	46	2%	22%	76%		
Trials	46	67%	11%	22%		
Appeals	46	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	45	11%	7%	20%	44%	18%
Courtroom Efficiency	45	7%	4%	22%	40%	27%
Judicial Demeanor	45	9%	13%	13%	31%	33%
Appearance of Fairness	45	7%	13%	18%	31%	31%
Overall Performance	45	9%	11%	20%	36%	24%

Duffey, Charles

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	17	0%	24%	76%		
Trials	17	59%	6%	35%		
Appeals	17	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	17	6%	6%	29%	12%	47%
Courtroom Efficiency	17	6%	6%	29%	18%	41%
Judicial Demeanor	17	18%	0%	12%	29%	41%
Appearance of Fairness	16	19%	0%	13%	13%	56%
Overall Performance	17	12%	6%	24%	12%	47%

Hankins, Debbie

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	32	3%	13%	84%
Trials	32	63%	6%	31%
Appeals	32	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	29	17%	31%	31%	17%	3%
Courtroom Efficiency	28	11%	18%	36%	29%	7%
Judicial Demeanor	30	17%	10%	50%	23%	0%
Appearance of Fairness	30	17%	17%	40%	23%	3%
Overall Performance	29	17%	31%	34%	17%	0%

Wilson, Shirley

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	50	0%	10%	90%
Trials	50	54%	24%	22%
Appeals	50	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	49	12%	14%	27%	31%	16%
Courtroom Efficiency	48	4%	13%	33%	33%	17%
Judicial Demeanor	50	8%	8%	24%	36%	24%
Appearance of Fairness	50	10%	6%	26%	30%	28%
Overall Performance	49	10%	10%	24%	39%	16%

Table E
Other King County Municipal Court Judges

Berner, David (Enumclaw)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	31	0%	29%	71%		
Trials	31	61%	19%	19%		
Appeals	31	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	29	7%	21%	38%	21%	14%
Courtroom Efficiency	29	3%	38%	24%	21%	14%
Judicial Demeanor	29	7%	17%	28%	21%	28%
Appearance of Fairness	29	10%	17%	24%	28%	21%
Overall Performance	27	7%	15%	37%	22%	19%

Burns, Patrick (Auburn)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	52	0%	13%	87%		
Trials	52	54%	10%	37%		
Appeals	52	98%	0%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	51	10%	18%	35%	27%	10%
Courtroom Efficiency	51	10%	22%	31%	24%	14%
Judicial Demeanor	51	8%	10%	33%	31%	18%
Appearance of Fairness	51	12%	12%	29%	29%	18%
Overall Performance	52	12%	15%	33%	29%	12%

Codd, Paul (Sea Tac)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	44	0%	18%	82%		
Trials	44	64%	7%	30%		
Appeals	44	98%	0%	2%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	42	0%	14%	29%	38%	19%
Courtroom Efficiency	43	5%	12%	28%	37%	19%
Judicial Demeanor	43	0%	7%	21%	40%	33%
Appearance of Fairness	43	0%	9%	21%	47%	23%
Overall Performance	43	0%	7%	35%	42%	16%

Hartl, Colleen (Des Moines)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	28	0%	29%	71%		
Trials	28	64%	7%	29%		
Appeals	28	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	26	0%	4%	35%	38%	23%
Courtroom Efficiency	27	0%	7%	26%	44%	22%
Judicial Demeanor	27	0%	4%	19%	52%	26%
Appearance of Fairness	26	0%	4%	27%	42%	27%
Overall Performance	27	0%	4%	30%	44%	22%

Jurado, Terry (Renton)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	66	3%	24%	73%
Trials	66	61%	18%	21%
Appeals	66	97%	2%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	65	6%	15%	42%	23%	14%
Courtroom Efficiency	64	5%	20%	33%	28%	14%
Judicial Demeanor	66	8%	12%	38%	24%	18%
Appearance of Fairness	66	14%	12%	35%	18%	21%
Overall Performance	66	8%	17%	38%	23%	15%

Lukevich, Peter (Tukwila)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	60	2%	17%	82%
Trials	60	67%	10%	23%
Appeals	60	98%	2%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	56	13%	13%	36%	20%	20%
Courtroom Efficiency	55	5%	18%	31%	22%	24%
Judicial Demeanor	57	11%	23%	21%	30%	16%
Appearance of Fairness	56	11%	20%	25%	29%	16%
Overall Performance	57	11%	19%	33%	19%	18%

McSeveney, Robert (Kent)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	79	0%	11%	89%
Trials	79	47%	11%	42%
Appeals	79	97%	1%	1%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	77	3%	6%	23%	31%	36%
Courtroom Efficiency	78	3%	3%	19%	37%	38%
Judicial Demeanor	78	4%	4%	15%	29%	47%
Appearance of Fairness	78	4%	9%	18%	26%	44%
Overall Performance	78	4%	4%	22%	31%	40%

Portnoy, Linda (Lake Forest Park)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	47	2%	17%	81%
Trials	47	72%	9%	19%
Appeals	47	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	43	7%	9%	23%	42%	19%
Courtroom Efficiency	43	7%	9%	28%	37%	19%
Judicial Demeanor	43	12%	14%	12%	44%	19%
Appearance of Fairness	43	9%	19%	21%	33%	19%
Overall Performance	43	9%	9%	30%	33%	19%

Raines, Albert (Kirkland)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
--------------------	-------------------	-------------	------------	-----------------

Motions & Hearings	67	0%	15%	85%
Trials	67	64%	12%	24%
Appeals	67	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	62	15%	18%	31%	21%	16%
Courtroom Efficiency	62	13%	10%	35%	27%	15%
Judicial Demeanor	62	11%	15%	26%	29%	19%
Appearance of Fairness	62	10%	18%	26%	19%	27%
Overall Performance	62	10%	18%	27%	27%	18%

Rochon, L. Stephen (Maple Valley/Pacific)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	63	0%	13%	87%
Trials	63	49%	17%	33%
Appeals	63	97%	2%	2%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	61	10%	11%	31%	36%	11%
Courtroom Efficiency	62	11%	18%	37%	26%	8%
Judicial Demeanor	62	18%	13%	27%	27%	15%
Appearance of Fairness	61	11%	20%	26%	23%	20%
Overall Performance	61	10%	16%	33%	30%	11%

Rusden, John (Bothell)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	36	0%	14%	86%
Trials	36	61%	6%	33%
Appeals	36	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	36	11%	3%	25%	33%	28%
Courtroom Efficiency	36	6%	6%	17%	33%	39%
Judicial Demeanor	36	6%	0%	11%	39%	44%
Appearance of Fairness	36	6%	6%	11%	36%	42%
Overall Performance	36	8%	3%	17%	36%	36%

Tracy, David (Federal Way)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	43	0%	21%	79%
Trials	43	53%	12%	35%
Appeals	43	95%	0%	5%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	43	12%	14%	30%	42%	2%
Courtroom Efficiency	43	12%	12%	26%	37%	14%
Judicial Demeanor	43	9%	14%	30%	37%	9%
Appearance of Fairness	43	12%	14%	26%	33%	16%
Overall Performance	43	9%	16%	26%	44%	5%

West, Robert (Black Diamond)

<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>
Motions & Hearings	26	0%	27%	73%
Trials	26	54%	15%	31%
Appeals	26	100%	0%	0%

<i>Evaluations—</i>	Evaluations	Unsatisfactory	Less than Satisfactory	Satisfactory	More than Satisfactory	Excellent
Decision Making	23	0%	0%	65%	22%	13%
Courtroom Efficiency	25	0%	4%	36%	40%	20%
Judicial Demeanor	25	0%	4%	36%	36%	24%
Appearance of Fairness	25	0%	4%	24%	52%	20%
Overall Performance	25	0%	0%	48%	36%	16%

Table F
Other King County Municipal Court Commissioners

Eng, Park (Tukwila)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	18	0%	22%	78%		
Trials	18	61%	6%	33%		
Appeals	18	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	17	0%	6%	12%	41%	41%
Courtroom Efficiency	17	0%	0%	24%	35%	41%
Judicial Demeanor	17	0%	0%	18%	12%	71%
Appearance of Fairness	17	0%	6%	18%	18%	59%
Overall Performance	17	0%	6%	12%	35%	47%
Phillips, Glenn (Kent)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	44	0%	11%	89%		
Trials	44	55%	7%	39%		
Appeals	44	98%	2%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	43	7%	14%	33%	28%	19%
Courtroom Efficiency	43	7%	7%	26%	40%	21%
Judicial Demeanor	43	5%	12%	33%	23%	28%
Appearance of Fairness	43	7%	12%	28%	30%	23%
Overall Performance	43	7%	9%	30%	30%	23%
Platter, Tony (Federal Way)						
<i>Experience—</i>	<u>Evaluators</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>One</u>	<u>Multiple</u>		
Motions & Hearings	47	2%	19%	79%		
Trials	47	62%	11%	28%		
Appeals	47	100%	0%	0%		
<i>Evaluations—</i>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Less than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>More than Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Decision Making	45	2%	2%	18%	49%	29%
Courtroom Efficiency	44	0%	0%	25%	45%	30%
Judicial Demeanor	45	0%	0%	9%	53%	38%
Appearance of Fairness	45	0%	2%	7%	56%	36%
Overall Performance	44	2%	2%	14%	52%	30%

VII. The Survey Respondents

Attorneys were asked to provide two pieces of information about their practice: how many years they have been active in their practice; and the principal nature of their practice. On average, responding attorneys had 14.3 years of active experience. See below for detailed data reflecting the experience level of the attorneys that responded to the survey.

Years of Active Practice

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 or fewer	15	4%
2 to 3	44	11%
4 to 5	41	10%
6 to 7	33	8%
8 to 9	21	5%
10 to 11	29	7%
12 to 13	28	7%
14 to 15	25	6%
16 to 17	23	5%
18 to 19	26	6%
20 to 21	29	7%
22 to 23	20	5%
24 to 25	18	4%
26 to 30	25	6%
31 to 35	20	5%
36 or more	9	2%
Not Provided	13	3%
	N: 419	
	Mean: 14.3	
	Standard Deviation: 9.8	
	Median: 13.0	

The survey questionnaire also listed 9 categories for the principal nature of the respondent's practice in District or Municipal Court and asked them to select no more than two. See below for detailed data reflecting the practice categories of the attorneys responding to the survey

Primary Nature of Practice

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Civil Tort-Plaintiff	84	20%
Civil Tort-Defense	50	12%
Commercial & General Civil	95	23%
Criminal-Defense	188	45%
Criminal-Prosecution	88	21%
Other Government Practice	8	2%
Domestic Relations/Family Law	41	10%
Estate/Probate	18	4%
Other	25	6%
	N: 436	

VII. Survey Methodology and Reliability

The Committee believes that the survey results are an accurate summary of the subjective opinions of the attorneys who appear regularly before the judges, magistrates and commissioners of the King County District and Municipal Courts. The cornerstone of this conclusion lies in the broad representativeness of those responding to the survey.

This concept of representativeness is a critical factor in assessing reliability in a survey. In fact, it has been observed that representativeness of a sample is far more important

than response rate. If a sample size is reflective of the overall population, even if obtained with a low response rate, it still stands as a reliable basis for making generalizations.²

Many facts support the representativeness of this survey. First, respondents are relatively homogeneous in terms of their legal education and courtroom experience. Second, the literature on survey methodology indicates that respondents of mail surveys are more motivated and a good response, as occurred here, generally bodes well for the quality of the ratings. Third, the respondents are required to base their evaluations on their personal work experiences, and must certify that their responses meet this requirement. Finally, the demographic information supplied by the survey respondents clearly indicates a broad response across years in practice, and nature of legal practice.

This survey's response rate (5.0%) is not unusual for a mail survey, nor is it out of step with previous District and Municipal Court Surveys conducted by KCBA. However, it should be noted that establishing a meaningful response rate target for this survey is difficult for several reasons. First, the survey population total (the 10,600 recipients of the survey) was vastly greater than the number of lawyers eligible to respond. Second, it is impossible to determine the true population of eligible respondents for each court for the four years the survey covers. As a result, it is impossible to establish hard numbers for comparison.

The rate of response for this survey, however, is similar to past surveys of District and Municipal Court judges, magistrates and commissioners. Furthermore, there is a consistency in evaluation results for judges, commissioners, and magistrates across this and previous surveys that suggests not only that the respondents of this survey are representative, but that the results of the survey are reliable.

² Krosnick, John A. (1999). "Survey Research," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50:537-67. Annual Reviews.