

King County Bar Association

# 2003 Judicial Evaluation Survey

Evaluations of the Judges and Commissioners of the King County Superior Court

*January, 2004*

Prepared by:

Pamela A. Andrews, Co-Chair  
David Koch, Co-Chair  
Judicial Evaluation Committee  
King County Bar Association

With Assistance From:

Salisbury Research  
6820 43rd Street Court Northwest  
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335  
(253) 265-6062

## Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction.....	1
Summary of 2003 Results.....	1
Survey Framework.....	1
Survey Reliability.....	2
The Respondents.....	3
Aggregate Evaluations.....	4
Judges.....	6
Commissioners.....	12
Conclusion.....	15
Bibliography.....	15

## Introduction

The King County Bar Association has conducted and published surveys of its members' evaluations of judicial officers since 1972. The survey results are a summary of practicing attorneys' subjective assessments of the judges and commissioners who hear and decide their cases. The survey provides information to the public for judicial elections by presenting assessments of each judge so voters can make informed decisions by taking into account the collective opinions of those lawyers who practice in front of these judicial officers. It also provides important information to the public, the Bar, and the Bench on performance of the local judicial branch as a whole.

## Summary of the 2003 Results

The results of the 2003 Judicial Evaluation Survey present a strongly favorable assessment of the judges and commissioners of the King County Superior Court. Overall, judges and commissioners received positive ratings (satisfactory and above) more than 80% of the time. The overall evaluations of the judges and commissioners are consistent across respondent years of active practice, principal types of practice, and type and number of appearances before the Court. And, while there are a few exceptions, the individual judges and commissioners received positive ratings seven to eight times out of every ten ratings they received.

## Survey Framework

The 2003 evaluation survey of the judges and commissioners of the King County Superior Court took place during the months of September and October of 2003. The survey administration was a departure from the past. Rather than mail instruments to members of the Bar Association, the instrument was distributed as part of the *Bar Bulletin*, a monthly periodical sent by mail to all current members of the Bar Association. The instrument was also made available via email to those in the KCBA database, linked to the Bar Association's web site. Fifty copies each were placed at the King County Law Library and at the Attorneys Information Bureau in the downtown courthouse. In addition, 300 copies were delivered to four defender organizations and the King County Prosecutor's office. Approximately 100 were returned from the website. In all, 500 instruments were distributed through these methods. The greatest bulk, however (11,400), were distributed in the *Bar Bulletin*.

Surveys were considered valid only if they included a valid Washington Bar number and an attorney signature. This signature attests to the attorney's compliance with the instructions of the survey and agreement to respect the personal experience criteria for each judge or commissioner evaluated. In the *Bar Bulletin* version of the questionnaire, the signature section is printed on the flip-side of respondent demographic information. To ensure respondent confidentiality this section of the page is removed prior to processing the questionnaire for analysis.

Provided with the instrument was a cover letter containing an explanation of the purpose of the survey and a set of instructions for completing the survey. The most important part of the instructions was that evaluations be based on "personal experience and not on reputation or information received from others." The questionnaire followed-up on this with the inclusion of questions regarding the type and number of appearances before each judge evaluated. Evaluations without an indication of an appearance were excluded from the analysis.

Respondents are asked to evaluate judges on four dimensions:

### Decision Making

- Appropriately prepared for court.
- Capably identifies and analyzes factual and legal issues.
- Capably applies rules of evidence and procedure.
- Articulates a ruling and grounds for it in a clear and concise manner.

Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficiently uses court time.</li> <li>• Enforces court rules and deadlines fairly.</li> <li>• Controls the courtroom appropriately.</li> <li>• Renders timely decisions.</li> </ul>
Demeanor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats all participants courteously and respectfully.</li> </ul>
Impartiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performs without bias or prejudice.</li> <li>• Avoids behavior that creates an appearance of bias or prejudice (e.g., inappropriate contacts with parties/counsel).</li> </ul>
Overall Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall performance of this individual considering all of the attributes above.</li> </ul>

This evaluation is made on a 5-point scale with points labeled: unsatisfactory, less than satisfactory, satisfactory, more than satisfactory and excellent.

The questionnaires were processed by Salisbury Research, which also undertook the data analysis and provided methodological and statistical consultation to the Judicial Evaluation Committee.

## Survey Reliability

The representativeness of the responding population is the most important factor for assessing reliability of the survey. John A. Krosnick (1999) explains that the representativeness of a sample is more important than response rate. If the sample reflects the overall population, even if obtained with a low response rate, it still stands as a reliable basis for making generalizations. Many factors indicate the survey is representative of the attorneys who appeared in Superior Court over the past four years so that the survey results are an accurate summary of the subjective opinions of the attorneys who know the judges and commissioners from their work experiences.

First, as attorneys, the respondents were relatively homogeneous. Compared with a heterogeneous population, fewer responses may be needed. Second, the overall results of this survey are highly consistent with those of previous surveys. Stability of results supports reliability. Third, respondents were required to base their evaluations on personal work experience, and must certify their responses meet this requirement. Fourth, the literature on survey methodology indicates that respondents of mail surveys are more motivated than non-respondents, which generally bodes well for the quality of the ratings.

More than 14,500 surveys were distributed to attorneys in King County through a variety of mechanisms: by inserts in the *Bar Bulletin*, by making the survey available on-line and by providing forms at repositories at the courts. By the end of November, 627 surveys were returned, with most arriving late September to early October. A definitively accurate return rate is not calculable because the actual number of surveys forms that were received by “qualified” attorneys (i.e., those who met the criteria regarding adequate courtroom encounters with the judge and commissioners during the four year period) is unknown. Taking the most liberal assumption regarding survey distribution – that the 14,500 forms each went to a “qualified” attorney -- the return rate would be approximately 4%, which is not unusual for a survey of this type. However, we know this rate to be artificially low because the survey population was grossly over-identified in an effort to reach all possible qualified respondents, as there was no clear way to identify only the qualified respondent population. The requirement of meeting the experience criteria also means the survey was more selective about who could participate. In addition, changes in the legal environment – such as increased use of ADR and the elimination of automatic oral argument on motions – have reduced the number and frequency of attorneys who appear in Superior Court.

It is also significant to consider the purpose of the survey. Attorneys who practice in Superior Court use the survey in their daily practices; it is important for them to have an accurate assessment of the judiciary. The survey is an important part of that information.

Thus, each respondent, and the respondents as a whole, had a vested interest in being honest and accurate so they receive a useful document for their own use.

## The Respondents

Attorneys are asked to provide two pieces of information about their practice: how many years have they been active in their practice; and what is the principal nature of their practice in the Superior Court. On average, responding attorneys have 17.7 years of experience, ranging from one to 52 years. When broken down into five year intervals the majority of the respondents (75%) have more than 10 years of experience (see Table 1). The respondents appear to have the experience necessary to provide competent evaluations of judicial performance.

Table 1: Years of Active Practice

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 to 5 years	54	9%
6 to 10 years	98	16%
11 to 15 years	95	16%
16 to 20 years	105	18%
21 to 25 years	93	16%
26 to 30 years	66	11%
31 to 35 years	36	6%
36 to 40 years	13	2%
41 or more years	3	1%
No Response	36	6%
Total	599	100%

Respondents were presented with nine categories for principal nature of their practice in the Superior Court, and asked to select no more than two. All but 33 of the respondents provided this information, with 318 (53%) indicating a single primary practice before the Superior Court and 236 (39%) indicating two primary practices. Twelve respondents indicated more than two primary practices.

Table 2: Primary Nature of Practice in Subject Courts  
(N = 599)

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Civil Tort-Plaintiff	117	20%
Civil Tort-Defense	113	19%
Commercial & General Civil	186	31%
Criminal-Defense	82	14%
Criminal-Prosecution	56	9%
Other Government Practice	31	5%
Domestic Relations/Family Law	120	20%
Estate/Probate	51	9%
Other	73	12%

The results for primary practice are well distributed across the categories offered (see Table 2). The highest single category is “Commercial & General Civil” at 31%, but it is out-weighted by the combined civil tort categories (39%). The criminal bar is also well represented, with 23% of respondents involved in either defense or prosecution. For the 73 respondents who checked “Other,” guardianship, juvenile dependency, land use, real estate and employment are frequently mentioned. (The complete list of “Other” practice areas is presented in Appendix B.)

For each judicial rating the respondent was asked to indicate the type and number of appearances made before that judge. The types of appearance are: motion and hearing, trial, and appeal. The number of each is categorized as: none, one, or multiple. Most often mentioned as the basis for an evaluation, either singly or in conjunction with another type, are motions and hearings, accounting for 94% of identified experience (see Table 3). Trials serve as the basis for 30% of the evaluations. Appeals are rarely referenced as the basis for an evaluation (4%).

Table 3: Types and Number of Appearances

	<i>None</i>		<i>One</i>		<i>Multiple</i>	
	<u>Nmbr</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Nmbr</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Nmbr</u>	<u>Pct</u>
Motions & Hearings	423	6%	1,921	26%	4,913	68%
Trials	5,123	71%	1,357	19%	777	11%
Appeals	5,599	96%	154	3%	60	1%

Almost 70% of the evaluations are based on experiences gained exclusively during motions and/or hearings (see Table 4). One possible criticism of the judicial evaluation survey is that ratings are based on too few meaningful experiences. The fact that most ratings are based on motions and/or hearings would tend to support this. However, 67% of the motions and/or hearings evaluations are based on multiple experiences (4,913 of the 7,280 evaluations). Ratings based on a single motion or trial amount to less than one-quarter of all valid evaluations. Moreover, a single motion or hearing, if sufficiently complex, provides a suitable basis for rendering an evaluation. The stress placed on the personal experience criteria in the instructions further supports the conclusion that those evaluations so rendered are based on sufficiently complex motions or hearings.

Table 4: Appearance Combinations

<u>Motions &amp; Hearings</u>	<u>Trials</u>	<u>Appeals</u>	<u>Evaluations</u>	<u>Percent</u>
X	—	—	4,996	68.6%
X	X	—	1,719	23.6%
X	—	X	74	1.0%
X	X	X	67	0.9%
—	X	—	350	4.8%
—	X	X	3	0.0%
—	—	X	71	1.0%

## Aggregate Evaluations

The rating scale for the 2003 survey consists of five categories: unsatisfactory, less than satisfactory, satisfactory, more than satisfactory, and excellent. Overall, and by judge and commissioner sub-groupings, most evaluations fell into the two highest categories (see Table 5). Fifty-five percent or better of the evaluations for decision making, courtroom efficiency, judicial demeanor and overall preference fell into the categories “more than satisfactory” and “excellent.” Furthermore, the percent of “positive” ratings (satisfactory or better) ranged from 76% (commissioners—judicial demeanor) to 89% (judges—demeanor). Overall, respondents see the Superior Court to be well above average on each of the evaluative criteria.

Table 5: Aggregate Results

	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Judges	5,778	339	6%	596	10%	1,187	21%	1,857	32%	1,799	31%
Commissioners	1,429	102	7%	151	11%	324	23%	468	33%	384	27%
Overall	7,207	441	6%	747	10%	1,511	21%	2,325	32%	2,183	30%

	<b>Efficiency</b>											
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
Judges	5,744	252	4%	418	7%	1,302	23%	1,928	34%	1,844	32%	
Commissioners	1,412	63	4%	108	8%	341	24%	471	33%	429	30%	
Overall	7,156	315	4%	526	7%	1,643	23%	2,399	34%	2,273	32%	

	<b>Demeanor</b>											
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
Judges	5,711	255	4%	368	6%	1,007	18%	1,646	29%	2,435	43%	
Commissioners	1,426	145	10%	194	14%	303	21%	391	27%	393	28%	
Overall	7,137	400	6%	562	8%	1,310	18%	2,037	29%	2,828	40%	

	<b>Impartiality</b>											
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
Judges	5,730	308	5%	476	8%	1,067	19%	1,577	28%	2,302	40%	
Commissioners	1,423	102	7%	152	11%	293	21%	389	27%	487	34%	
Overall	7,153	410	6%	628	9%	1,360	19%	1,966	27%	2,789	39%	

	<b>Overall Performance</b>											
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
Judges	5,742	288	5%	530	9%	1,199	21%	1,883	33%	1,842	32%	
Commissioners	1,420	103	7%	161	11%	318	22%	485	34%	353	25%	
Overall	7,162	391	5%	691	10%	1,517	21%	2,368	33%	2,195	31%	

This result comes as no surprise: attorneys have evaluated the Superior Court well above average throughout nearly two decades (see Table 6). Data available from surveys since 1986 show that this high assessment of the Superior Court, at least for overall performance, extends back into the 1980s.

Table 6: Aggregate “Positive” Evaluations, 1986 to 2003

<u>Year</u>	<u>Decision Making</u>	<u>Courtroom Efficiency</u>	<u>Judicial Demeanor</u>	<u>Overall Performance</u>
1986	—	—	—	85%
1987	—	—	—	85%
1989	—	—	—	82%
1991	82%	88%	88%	86%
1995	81%	87%	86%	85%
1999	85%	89%	87%	86%
2003	84%	88%	87%	85%

Positive evaluations are “satisfactory,” “adequate” or higher.

## Judges

The results for the 48 judges of the King County Superior Court are presented in Table 7, which appears on the following five pages. The table provides total number of valid evaluations, and the number and percent of evaluations for each of the five rating categories. Judges and Commissioners with less than two years on the bench were excluded from the survey.

When assessing the evaluations, keep in mind that they cover performance for the past four years. Results that have low variability (e.g. tend to favor one or two rating categories) would suggest consistency in performance over time. Results that have high variability (e.g., are more evenly distributed among the rating categories) may indicate either an inconsistent performance over time, or a steady change in performance over time. It is not possible to differentiate between these two possibilities with the information on hand.

One temptation when viewing individual results is to rank the judges from high to low. This practice is not recommended for a variety of reasons, including differing evaluation populations and the low level of specificity possible in attitude measurement. The judges are assessed by different subgroups of attorneys who, although they share some general characteristics, combine to create a unique evaluation environment. How similar these environments are to each other is not presently known, making inter-judge comparisons a shaky proposition. Regarding measurement, it is possible to calculate very precise values, but this does not mean that similarly precise distinctions exist between or among judges. For example, an average of 4.2 for overall performance is higher than an average of 4.1, but does the difference of 0.1 points justify ranking one judge ahead of another? For this survey the answer is no. In fact, it is not known what constitutes a meaningful difference for this survey, which suggests that definitive comparisons not be undertaken using this data.

Furthermore, any method for ranking judges is inherently arbitrary. Rankings based on averages, percentages of particular rating categories, or deviations from a specified standard will probably produce different results. Each set of these results would be indefensible, as no one method is quantifiably superior to another.



Table 7: Results for Individual Judges

	Total	Decision Making									
		Unsatisfactory		Less Than Satisfactory		Satisfactory		More Than Satisfactory		Excellent	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alsdorf, Robert	234	7	3%	13	6%	20	9%	59	25%	135	58%
Armstrong, Sharon	197	6	3%	14	7%	36	18%	67	34%	74	38%
Barnett, Suzanne	158	29	18%	27	17%	40	25%	42	27%	20	13%
Canova, Greg	127	9	7%	10	8%	25	20%	43	34%	40	31%
Carey, Cheryl	60	1	2%	5	8%	14	23%	25	42%	15	25%
Cayce, James	109	7	6%	19	17%	30	28%	35	32%	18	17%
Clark, Patricia	127	19	15%	26	20%	35	28%	31	24%	16	13%
Doerty, James	218	21	10%	30	14%	41	19%	62	28%	64	29%
Downing, William	156	1	1%	14	9%	31	20%	38	24%	72	46%
DuBuque, Joan	138	5	4%	8	6%	16	12%	60	43%	49	36%
Eadie, Richard	122	4	3%	14	11%	30	25%	38	31%	36	30%
Erlick, John	111	3	3%	8	7%	23	21%	32	29%	45	41%
Fleck, Deborah	94	4	4%	11	12%	20	21%	29	31%	30	32%
Fox, Michael	182	5	3%	12	7%	32	18%	75	41%	58	32%
Gain, Brian	72	0	0%	5	7%	10	14%	31	43%	26	36%
Haley, Donald	133	17	13%	33	25%	34	26%	30	23%	19	14%
Hall, Glenna	153	22	14%	23	15%	28	18%	48	31%	32	21%
Halpert, Helen	127	7	6%	10	8%	33	26%	55	43%	22	17%
Hayden, Michael	113	0	0%	6	5%	22	19%	52	46%	33	29%
Heavey, Michael	74	10	14%	18	24%	18	24%	16	22%	12	16%
Hilyer, Bruce	112	6	5%	11	10%	22	20%	43	38%	30	27%
Hubbard, Philip	115	6	5%	15	13%	35	30%	39	34%	20	17%
Inveen, Laura	70	1	1%	3	4%	19	27%	29	41%	18	26%
Jones, Richard	125	2	2%	6	5%	19	15%	47	38%	51	41%
Kallas, Paris	67	1	1%	6	9%	11	16%	30	45%	19	28%
Kessler, Ronald	102	4	4%	6	6%	15	15%	41	40%	36	35%
Lau, Linda	171	14	8%	11	6%	43	25%	54	32%	49	29%
Lukens, Terry	106	3	3%	8	8%	9	8%	41	39%	45	42%
Lum, Dean	138	5	4%	16	12%	34	25%	44	32%	39	28%
MacInnes, Nicole	121	8	7%	14	12%	25	21%	31	26%	43	36%
Mattson, George	87	2	2%	3	3%	10	11%	25	29%	47	54%
McBroom, Douglas	94	9	10%	18	19%	28	30%	17	18%	22	23%
McCullough, LeRoy	78	6	8%	18	23%	30	38%	11	14%	13	17%
McDermott, Richard	103	8	8%	12	12%	27	26%	21	20%	35	34%
Mertel, Charles	119	4	3%	10	8%	36	30%	40	34%	29	24%
Middaugh, Laura	71	10	14%	12	17%	22	31%	16	23%	11	15%
North, Douglass	104	2	2%	12	12%	19	18%	38	37%	33	32%
Ramsdell, Jeffery	107	0	0%	4	4%	11	10%	43	40%	49	46%
Robinson, Palmer	105	0	0%	9	9%	21	20%	37	35%	38	36%
Schapira, Carol	140	26	19%	26	19%	23	16%	44	31%	21	15%
Scott, Steven	144	4	3%	4	3%	17	12%	44	31%	75	52%
Shaffer, Catherine	89	6	7%	17	19%	23	26%	21	24%	22	25%
Spearman, Michael	127	5	4%	9	7%	37	29%	38	30%	38	30%
Spector, Julie	79	4	5%	3	4%	19	24%	22	28%	31	39%
Trickey, Michael	131	1	1%	10	8%	25	19%	48	37%	47	36%
Wartnik, Anthony	97	0	0%	4	4%	17	18%	39	40%	37	38%
White, Jay	111	10	9%	11	10%	22	20%	45	41%	23	21%
Yu, Mary	173	16	9%	13	8%	35	20%	44	25%	65	38%

Table 7: Results for Individual Judges, continued

	Total	Efficiency									
		Unsatisfactory		Less Than Satisfactory		Satisfactory		More Than Satisfactory		Excellent	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Als Dorf, Robert	233	1	0%	4	2%	18	8%	69	30%	141	61%
Armstrong, Sharon	192	6	3%	8	4%	36	19%	63	33%	79	41%
Barnett, Suzanne	158	14	9%	24	15%	53	34%	44	28%	23	15%
Canova, Greg	126	5	4%	7	6%	28	22%	42	33%	44	35%
Carey, Cheryl	61	0	0%	6	10%	13	21%	27	44%	15	25%
Cayce, James	106	3	3%	17	16%	29	27%	35	33%	22	21%
Clark, Patricia	126	10	8%	7	6%	37	29%	46	37%	26	21%
Doerty, James	215	13	6%	13	6%	48	22%	72	33%	69	32%
Downing, William	151	0	0%	5	3%	25	17%	45	30%	76	50%
DuBuque, Joan	138	2	1%	4	3%	20	14%	61	44%	51	37%
Eadie, Richard	121	5	4%	8	7%	30	25%	41	34%	37	31%
Erlick, John	108	4	4%	7	6%	24	22%	35	32%	38	35%
Fleck, Deborah	93	11	12%	16	17%	18	19%	21	23%	27	29%
Fox, Michael	181	5	3%	11	6%	38	21%	66	36%	61	34%
Gain, Brian	72	0	0%	1	1%	15	21%	23	32%	33	46%
Haley, Donald	131	17	13%	30	23%	38	29%	31	24%	15	11%
Hall, Glenna	154	21	14%	20	13%	31	20%	54	35%	28	18%
Halpert, Helen	127	6	5%	4	3%	35	28%	49	39%	33	26%
Hayden, Michael	112	0	0%	5	4%	23	21%	58	52%	26	23%
Heavey, Michael	71	7	10%	11	15%	22	31%	17	24%	14	20%
Hilyer, Bruce	112	4	4%	7	6%	29	26%	42	38%	30	27%
Hubbard, Philip	114	5	4%	5	4%	34	30%	47	41%	23	20%
Inveen, Laura	71	0	0%	3	4%	23	32%	29	41%	16	23%
Jones, Richard	124	0	0%	6	5%	22	18%	38	31%	58	47%
Kallas, Paris	67	1	1%	1	1%	12	18%	30	45%	23	34%
Kessler, Ronald	104	0	0%	4	4%	19	18%	33	32%	48	46%
Lau, Linda	170	8	5%	11	6%	36	21%	67	39%	48	28%
Lukens, Terry	106	1	1%	2	2%	21	20%	36	34%	46	43%
Lum, Dean	137	3	2%	12	9%	42	31%	44	32%	36	26%
MacInnes, Nicole	123	6	5%	11	9%	25	20%	36	29%	45	37%
Mattson, George	87	1	1%	8	9%	10	11%	28	32%	40	46%
McBroom, Douglas	95	7	7%	18	19%	23	24%	24	25%	23	24%
McCullough, LeRoy	78	16	21%	14	18%	18	23%	18	23%	12	15%
McDermott, Richard	104	1	1%	8	8%	35	34%	25	24%	35	34%
Mertel, Charles	119	2	2%	10	8%	36	30%	47	39%	24	20%
Middaugh, Laura	71	6	8%	9	13%	27	38%	21	30%	8	11%
North, Douglass	103	2	2%	3	3%	19	18%	43	42%	36	35%
Ramsdell, Jeffery	106	0	0%	2	2%	24	23%	34	32%	46	43%
Robinson, Palmer	103	1	1%	5	5%	25	24%	36	35%	36	35%
Schapiro, Carol	140	20	14%	24	17%	34	24%	40	29%	22	16%
Scott, Steven	143	2	1%	2	1%	22	15%	49	34%	68	48%
Shaffer, Catherine	89	5	6%	6	7%	22	25%	30	34%	26	29%
Spearman, Michael	126	2	2%	3	2%	43	34%	36	29%	42	33%
Spector, Julie	79	3	4%	5	6%	12	15%	24	30%	35	44%
Trickey, Michael	131	1	1%	4	3%	30	23%	54	41%	42	32%
Wartnik, Anthony	97	4	4%	7	7%	26	27%	32	33%	28	29%
White, Jay	110	11	10%	12	11%	27	25%	33	30%	27	25%
Yu, Mary	172	10	6%	9	5%	29	17%	57	33%	67	39%

Table 7: Results for Individual Judges, continued

	<b>Demeanor</b>										
	<b>Total</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Als Dorf, Robert	232	12	5%	7	3%	17	7%	47	20%	149	64%
Armstrong, Sharon	193	3	2%	5	3%	27	14%	51	26%	107	55%
Barnett, Suzanne	156	11	7%	21	13%	40	26%	44	28%	40	26%
Canova, Greg	125	2	2%	7	6%	24	19%	48	38%	44	35%
Carey, Cheryl	61	0	0%	3	5%	6	10%	19	31%	33	54%
Cayce, James	105	2	2%	8	8%	20	19%	39	37%	36	34%
Clark, Patricia	127	31	24%	29	23%	24	19%	20	16%	23	18%
Doerty, James	210	11	5%	14	7%	45	21%	53	25%	87	41%
Downing, William	153	5	3%	11	7%	20	13%	31	20%	86	56%
DuBuque, Joan	137	6	4%	10	7%	21	15%	46	34%	54	39%
Eadie, Richard	120	1	1%	7	6%	24	20%	30	25%	58	48%
Erlick, John	110	3	3%	2	2%	17	15%	33	30%	55	50%
Fleck, Deborah	93	2	2%	5	5%	17	18%	25	27%	44	47%
Fox, Michael	180	4	2%	21	12%	28	16%	53	29%	74	41%
Gain, Brian	72	1	1%	2	3%	9	13%	21	29%	39	54%
Haley, Donald	132	11	8%	12	9%	38	29%	35	27%	36	27%
Hall, Glenna	154	16	10%	17	11%	30	19%	43	28%	48	31%
Halpert, Helen	124	5	4%	7	6%	27	22%	40	32%	45	36%
Hayden, Michael	112	2	2%	18	16%	28	25%	47	42%	17	15%
Heavey, Michael	70	4	6%	7	10%	21	30%	22	31%	16	23%
Hilyer, Bruce	112	3	3%	7	6%	22	20%	37	33%	43	38%
Hubbard, Philip	114	5	4%	4	4%	19	17%	40	35%	46	40%
Inveen, Laura	72	0	0%	5	7%	15	21%	24	33%	28	39%
Jones, Richard	123	0	0%	3	2%	14	11%	34	28%	72	59%
Kallas, Paris	67	3	4%	4	6%	6	9%	19	28%	35	52%
Kessler, Ronald	102	11	11%	14	14%	32	31%	30	29%	15	15%
Lau, Linda	165	10	6%	10	6%	28	17%	49	30%	68	41%
Lukens, Terry	104	2	2%	2	2%	18	17%	31	30%	51	49%
Lum, Dean	138	1	1%	5	4%	21	15%	43	31%	68	49%
MacInnes, Nicole	122	5	4%	8	7%	20	16%	34	28%	55	45%
Mattson, George	87	3	3%	3	3%	22	25%	29	33%	30	34%
McBroom, Douglas	93	3	3%	4	4%	18	19%	27	29%	41	44%
McCullough, LeRoy	78	2	3%	5	6%	18	23%	29	37%	24	31%
McDermott, Richard	104	3	3%	3	3%	13	13%	30	29%	55	53%
Mertel, Charles	118	0	0%	4	3%	19	16%	36	31%	59	50%
Middaugh, Laura	71	15	21%	10	14%	20	28%	18	25%	8	11%
North, Douglass	95	1	1%	4	4%	14	15%	30	32%	46	48%
Ramsdell, Jeffery	107	1	1%	2	2%	11	10%	29	27%	64	60%
Robinson, Palmer	104	1	1%	2	2%	23	22%	33	32%	45	43%
Schapiro, Carol	140	19	14%	16	11%	23	16%	43	31%	39	28%
Scott, Steven	143	2	1%	5	3%	19	13%	44	31%	73	51%
Shaffer, Catherine	89	7	8%	10	11%	21	24%	19	21%	32	36%
Spearman, Michael	125	3	2%	4	3%	24	19%	35	28%	59	47%
Spector, Julie	77	8	10%	4	5%	16	21%	13	17%	36	47%
Trickey, Michael	131	0	0%	0	0%	19	15%	44	34%	68	52%
Wartnik, Anthony	97	0	0%	1	1%	12	12%	28	29%	56	58%
White, Jay	109	2	2%	4	4%	17	16%	36	33%	50	46%
Yu, Mary	170	14	8%	12	7%	22	13%	40	24%	82	48%

Table 7: Results for Individual Judges, continued

	Total	Impartiality									
		Unsatisfactory		Less Than Satisfactory		Satisfactory		More Than Satisfactory		Excellent	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Als Dorf, Robert	233	8	3%	15	6%	25	11%	51	22%	134	58%
Armstrong, Sharon	194	7	4%	14	7%	31	16%	49	25%	93	48%
Barnett, Suzanne	156	20	13%	27	17%	30	19%	38	24%	41	26%
Canova, Greg	126	8	6%	7	6%	28	22%	39	31%	44	35%
Carey, Cheryl	62	1	2%	3	5%	12	19%	21	34%	25	40%
Cayce, James	105	3	3%	11	10%	22	21%	36	34%	33	31%
Clark, Patricia	128	21	16%	27	21%	30	23%	26	20%	24	19%
Doerty, James	210	17	8%	21	10%	38	18%	51	24%	83	40%
Downing, William	153	3	2%	14	9%	23	15%	33	22%	80	52%
DuBuque, Joan	136	3	2%	7	5%	21	15%	44	32%	61	45%
Eadie, Richard	121	7	6%	7	6%	23	19%	31	26%	53	44%
Erlick, John	110	6	5%	3	3%	20	18%	25	23%	56	51%
Fleck, Deborah	93	5	5%	6	6%	16	17%	28	30%	38	41%
Fox, Michael	181	5	3%	18	10%	29	16%	52	29%	77	43%
Gain, Brian	72	0	0%	5	7%	10	14%	20	28%	37	51%
Haley, Donald	132	12	9%	16	12%	37	28%	32	24%	35	27%
Hall, Glenna	153	17	11%	17	11%	30	20%	37	24%	52	34%
Halpert, Helen	126	5	4%	13	10%	21	17%	48	38%	39	31%
Hayden, Michael	112	1	1%	7	6%	27	24%	50	45%	27	24%
Heavey, Michael	69	6	9%	7	10%	19	28%	20	29%	17	25%
Hilyer, Bruce	113	3	3%	11	10%	26	23%	32	28%	41	36%
Hubbard, Philip	115	4	3%	4	3%	28	24%	40	35%	39	34%
Inveen, Laura	71	2	3%	7	10%	17	24%	24	34%	21	30%
Jones, Richard	124	1	1%	6	5%	17	14%	34	27%	66	53%
Kallas, Paris	66	2	3%	4	6%	12	18%	19	29%	29	44%
Kessler, Ronald	103	3	3%	7	7%	25	24%	27	26%	41	40%
Lau, Linda	169	11	7%	11	7%	33	20%	52	31%	62	37%
Lukens, Terry	105	5	5%	5	5%	11	10%	34	32%	50	48%
Lum, Dean	136	3	2%	7	5%	24	18%	41	30%	61	45%
MacInnes, Nicole	123	8	7%	12	10%	24	20%	32	26%	47	38%
Mattson, George	87	2	2%	2	2%	12	14%	25	29%	46	53%
McBroom, Douglas	93	3	3%	8	9%	19	20%	32	34%	31	33%
McCullough, LeRoy	77	3	4%	16	21%	25	32%	15	19%	18	23%
McDermott, Richard	105	8	8%	8	8%	19	18%	29	28%	41	39%
Mertel, Charles	119	2	2%	13	11%	29	24%	36	30%	39	33%
Middaugh, Laura	71	11	15%	11	15%	17	24%	15	21%	17	24%
North, Douglass	99	2	2%	10	10%	13	13%	26	26%	48	48%
Ramsdell, Jeffery	106	1	1%	5	5%	17	16%	28	26%	55	52%
Robinson, Palmer	104	1	1%	6	6%	26	25%	27	26%	44	42%
Schapiro, Carol	139	26	19%	15	11%	25	18%	37	27%	36	26%
Scott, Steven	143	4	3%	4	3%	18	13%	38	27%	79	55%
Shaffer, Catherine	88	10	11%	17	19%	17	19%	19	22%	25	28%
Spearman, Michael	128	5	4%	8	6%	32	25%	29	23%	54	42%
Spector, Julie	77	7	9%	6	8%	15	19%	17	22%	32	42%
Trickey, Michael	130	3	2%	5	4%	20	15%	35	27%	67	52%
Wartnik, Anthony	96	0	0%	1	1%	13	14%	33	34%	49	51%
White, Jay	110	5	5%	10	9%	17	15%	36	33%	42	38%
Yu, Mary	173	19	11%	12	7%	25	14%	38	22%	79	46%

Table 7: Results for Individual Judges, continued

	Overall Performance										
	Total	Unsatisfactory		Less Than Satisfactory		Satisfactory		More Than Satisfactory		Excellent	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Als Dorf, Robert	234	5	2%	16	7%	17	7%	62	26%	134	57%
Armstrong, Sharon	194	6	3%	12	6%	36	19%	59	30%	81	42%
Barnett, Suzanne	158	24	15%	27	17%	42	27%	36	23%	29	18%
Canova, Greg	127	8	6%	9	7%	24	19%	48	38%	38	30%
Carey, Cheryl	62	1	2%	5	8%	12	19%	27	44%	17	27%
Cayce, James	106	4	4%	18	17%	26	25%	35	33%	23	22%
Clark, Patricia	128	20	16%	30	23%	32	25%	30	23%	16	13%
Doerty, James	215	19	9%	24	11%	40	19%	63	29%	69	32%
Downing, William	153	2	1%	12	8%	26	17%	41	27%	72	47%
DuBuque, Joan	137	3	2%	11	8%	19	14%	59	43%	45	33%
Eadie, Richard	120	3	3%	10	8%	34	28%	33	28%	40	33%
Erlck, John	110	4	4%	3	3%	26	24%	33	30%	44	40%
Fleck, Deborah	93	4	4%	12	13%	17	18%	32	34%	28	30%
Fox, Michael	180	3	2%	15	8%	31	17%	69	38%	62	34%
Gain, Brian	72	0	0%	5	7%	9	13%	24	33%	34	47%
Haley, Donald	131	18	14%	23	18%	42	32%	31	24%	17	13%
Hall, Glenna	154	20	13%	25	16%	31	20%	46	30%	32	21%
Halpert, Helen	126	5	4%	10	8%	30	24%	58	46%	23	18%
Hayden, Michael	112	0	0%	7	6%	24	21%	61	54%	20	18%
Heavey, Michael	73	8	11%	14	19%	19	26%	21	29%	11	15%
Hilyer, Bruce	113	3	3%	12	11%	24	21%	38	34%	36	32%
Hubbard, Philip	115	8	7%	7	6%	36	31%	41	36%	23	20%
Inveen, Laura	71	1	1%	3	4%	21	30%	28	39%	18	25%
Jones, Richard	124	1	1%	4	3%	18	15%	39	31%	62	50%
Kallas, Paris	66	2	3%	2	3%	11	17%	28	42%	23	35%
Kessler, Ronald	102	1	1%	11	11%	25	25%	35	34%	30	29%
Lau, Linda	169	12	7%	11	7%	38	22%	57	34%	51	30%
Lukens, Terry	106	3	3%	6	6%	14	13%	36	34%	47	44%
Lum, Dean	138	3	2%	10	7%	32	23%	52	38%	41	30%
MacInnes, Nicole	123	4	3%	16	13%	28	23%	31	25%	44	36%
Mattson, George	87	1	1%	3	3%	14	16%	32	37%	37	43%
McBroom, Douglas	92	5	5%	15	16%	20	22%	31	34%	21	23%
McCullough, LeRoy	78	3	4%	11	14%	37	47%	15	19%	12	15%
McDermott, Richard	104	2	2%	14	13%	28	27%	24	23%	36	35%
Mertel, Charles	118	1	1%	11	9%	30	25%	47	40%	29	25%
Middaugh, Laura	71	10	14%	14	20%	21	30%	17	24%	9	13%
North, Douglass	100	4	4%	5	5%	19	19%	42	42%	30	30%
Ramsdell, Jeffery	106	0	0%	4	4%	14	13%	40	38%	48	45%
Robinson, Palmer	104	1	1%	5	5%	25	24%	36	35%	37	36%
Schapira, Carol	139	24	17%	24	17%	24	17%	44	32%	23	17%
Scott, Steven	142	3	2%	2	1%	21	15%	41	29%	75	53%
Shaffer, Catherine	88	7	8%	13	15%	22	25%	25	28%	21	24%
Spearman, Michael	126	5	4%	4	3%	39	31%	39	31%	39	31%
Spector, Julie	78	5	6%	7	9%	14	18%	22	28%	30	38%
Trickey, Michael	131	1	1%	4	3%	25	19%	47	36%	54	41%
Wartnik, Anthony	96	0	0%	1	1%	15	16%	43	45%	37	39%
White, Jay	111	7	6%	11	10%	20	18%	42	38%	31	28%
Yu, Mary	172	15	9%	13	8%	28	16%	49	28%	67	39%

## Commissioners

The results for the 10 commissioners of the King County Superior Court are presented in Table 8. The table provides total number of valid evaluations, and the number and percent of evaluations for each of the five rating categories.

As with the judges, when assessing the evaluations keep in mind that they cover performance for the past four years. Results that have low variability (e.g. tend to favor one or two rating categories) would suggest consistency in performance over time. Results that have high variability (e.g., are more evenly distributed among the rating categories) may indicate either an inconsistent performance over time, or a steady change in performance over time. It is not possible to differentiate between these two possibilities with the information on hand.

One temptation when viewing individual results is to rank the commissioners from high to low. This practice is not recommended for a variety of reasons, including differing evaluation populations and the low level of specificity possible in attitude measurement. The commissioners are assessed by different subgroups of attorneys who, although they share some general characteristics, combine to create a unique evaluation environment. How similar these environments are to each other is not presently known, making inter-commissioner comparisons a shaky proposition. Regarding measurement, it is possible to calculate very precise values, but this does not mean that similarly precise distinctions exist between or among commissioners. For example, an average of 4.2 for overall performance is higher than an average of 4.1, but does the difference of 0.1 points justify ranking one commissioner ahead of another? For this survey the answer is no. In fact, it is not known what constitutes a meaningful difference for this survey, which suggests that definitive comparisons not be undertaken using this data.

Furthermore, any method for ranking commissioners is inherently arbitrary. Rankings based on averages, percentages of particularly rating categories, or deviations from a specified standard will probably produce different results. Each set of these results would be indefensible, since no one method is quantifiably superior to another.

Table 8: Results for Individual Commissioners

	<u>Total</u>	<b>Decision Making</b>									
		<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bradburn-Johnson, N.	112	16	14%	17	15%	35	31%	31	28%	13	12%
Canada-Thurston, B.	149	21	14%	28	19%	45	30%	34	23%	21	14%
Gaddis, Stephen	207	12	6%	27	13%	37	18%	73	35%	58	28%
Gallaher, Richard	67	5	7%	4	6%	19	28%	30	45%	9	13%
Holman, Holis	91	11	12%	16	18%	28	31%	19	21%	17	19%
Ponomarchuk, Leonid	113	1	1%	8	7%	23	20%	36	32%	45	40%
Prochnau, Kimberley	190	9	5%	11	6%	35	18%	63	33%	72	38%
Sellers, Marylin	150	18	12%	25	17%	36	24%	49	33%	22	15%
Velategui, Carlos	211	6	3%	13	6%	45	21%	78	37%	69	33%
Watness, Eric	149	3	2%	3	2%	23	15%	60	40%	60	40%

	<u>Total</u>	<b>Efficiency</b>									
		<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bradburn-Johnson, N.	111	8	7%	14	13%	39	35%	36	32%	14	13%
Canada-Thurston, B.	146	13	9%	19	13%	39	27%	33	23%	42	29%
Gaddis, Stephen	205	5	2%	15	7%	51	25%	72	35%	62	30%
Gallaher, Richard	68	5	7%	4	6%	26	38%	26	38%	7	10%
Holman, Holis	89	5	6%	9	10%	22	25%	35	39%	18	20%
Ponomarchuk, Leonid	110	1	1%	5	5%	25	23%	36	33%	43	39%
Prochnau, Kimberley	189	8	4%	7	4%	35	19%	66	35%	73	39%
Sellers, Marylin	146	10	7%	22	15%	37	25%	54	37%	23	16%
Velategui, Carlos	210	5	2%	8	4%	43	20%	64	30%	90	43%
Watness, Eric	148	3	2%	6	4%	29	20%	51	34%	59	40%

	<u>Total</u>	<b>Demeanor</b>									
		<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bradburn-Johnson, N.	112	9	8%	19	17%	29	26%	29	26%	26	23%
Canada-Thurston, B.	148	45	30%	38	26%	38	26%	13	9%	14	9%
Gaddis, Stephen	206	24	12%	25	12%	45	22%	59	29%	53	26%
Gallaher, Richard	69	1	1%	2	3%	17	25%	32	46%	17	25%
Holman, Holis	91	19	21%	20	22%	21	23%	18	20%	13	14%
Ponomarchuk, Leonid	113	9	8%	13	12%	26	23%	38	34%	27	24%
Prochnau, Kimberley	189	9	5%	10	5%	29	15%	53	28%	88	47%
Sellers, Marylin	149	19	13%	23	15%	32	21%	53	36%	22	15%
Velategui, Carlos	210	11	5%	40	19%	50	24%	57	27%	52	25%
Watness, Eric	149	0	0%	4	3%	21	14%	42	28%	82	55%

Table 8: Results for Individual Commissioners, continued

	<b>Impartiality</b>										
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bradburn-Johnson, N.	113	17	15%	16	14%	29	26%	28	25%	23	20%
Canada-Thurston, B.	148	16	11%	27	18%	40	27%	31	21%	34	23%
Gaddis, Stephen	206	14	7%	25	12%	49	24%	60	29%	58	28%
Gallaher, Richard	68	2	3%	3	4%	20	29%	27	40%	16	24%
Holman, Holis	91	16	18%	18	20%	19	21%	21	23%	17	19%
Ponomarchuk, Leonid	113	2	2%	11	10%	23	20%	30	27%	47	42%
Prochnau, Kimberley	187	10	5%	13	7%	27	14%	49	26%	88	47%
Sellers, Marylin	149	15	10%	20	13%	32	21%	45	30%	37	25%
Velategui, Carlos	210	9	4%	17	8%	37	18%	58	28%	89	42%
Watness, Eric	148	1	1%	2	1%	21	14%	44	30%	80	54%

	<b>Overall Performance</b>										
	<u>Total</u>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>		<i>Less Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Satisfactory</i>		<i>More Than Satisfactory</i>		<i>Excellent</i>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Bradburn-Johnson, N.	113	17	15%	14	12%	33	29%	37	33%	12	11%
Canada-Thurston, B.	147	21	14%	30	20%	46	31%	33	22%	17	12%
Gaddis, Stephen	205	14	7%	31	15%	42	20%	73	36%	45	22%
Gallaher, Richard	68	4	6%	3	4%	20	29%	33	49%	8	12%
Holman, Holis	91	12	13%	19	21%	24	26%	22	24%	14	15%
Ponomarchuk, Leonid	113	3	3%	7	6%	28	25%	41	36%	34	30%
Prochnau, Kimberley	188	9	5%	9	5%	34	18%	63	34%	73	39%
Sellers, Marylin	149	16	11%	26	17%	31	21%	58	39%	18	12%
Velategui, Carlos	208	6	3%	20	10%	41	20%	74	36%	67	32%
Watness, Eric	148	1	1%	4	3%	22	15%	54	36%	67	45%



## Conclusion

The results of the 2003 Judicial Evaluation Survey present a strongly favorable assessment of the judges and commissioners of the King County Superior Court. Overall, judges and commissioners received positive ratings (satisfactory and above) more than 80% of the time. The overall evaluations of the judges and commissioners are consistent across respondent years of active practice, principal types of practice, and type and number of appearances before the Court. And, while there are a few exceptions, the individual judges and commissioners received positive ratings seven to eight times out of every ten ratings they received. The very high positive overall results document that high standards of judicial performance were once again the norm in King County Superior Court for the past four years.

### Bibliography

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

## Appendix A: Questionnaire

The following four pages contain a copy of the questionnaire for the 2003 Judicial Evaluation Survey.

## Appendix B: "Other" Principal Practice Types

Unedited, the responses for "other" principal practice are:

Abestos Defense	Land Use/Environmental
Adoption	Landlord/Tenant
APA Reviews	Landlord-Tenant
Appeals related	Landlord-Tenant
Asbestos Defense	Limited asbestos defense litigation
Business Litigation	Matters in connection with an appeal.
Civil Commitment Cases-Defense	Plaintiff's Employment Claims
Civil/SVP-Prosecution	RAJL Appeals
Civil-Dependency	RCW 71.09 Proceedings
Civil-Employment	Real Estate
Condemnation	Real Estate
Construction Defect	Semi-retired
Construction Defect-Plaintiffs	Surety-Defense
Creditor-Debitor	Traffic
Dependencies, BECCA	Trust Cases
Dependency	Worker's Comp
Dependency	Worker's Compensation Insurance Claims
Dependency	Worker's Compensation-Civil
Dependency	
Dependency/Terminations	
Dependency-Juvenile Litigation	
Elder Law	
Elder Law	
Eminent Domain	
Employment	
Employment	
Employment Law	
Employment Law	
Employment Law	
Employment Law-Employer Side	
Employment-Plaintiff	
Employment-Plaintiff	
Environment & Land Use	
Environmental	
Environmental/Conservation Law	
Environmental-civil	
Environmental-Land Use Law	
Ex Parte/GAL Appointments	
General Practice	
Guardianship	
Guardianships	
Insurance Law	
Juvenile	
Juvenile Court Dependency/UFC	
Juvenile Law/Dependency	
Juvenile Litigation	
Labor	
Labor and Employment-Defense	
Labor Employment	
Labor Law	
Labor/Employment	
Land Use	
Land Use Appeals	
Land Use Appeals	
Land Use Petition Act Matters	