



2000

---

VOTER INFORMATION  
GUIDE

---

REPORT OF  
THE ARIZONA COMMISSION ON  
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON  
**JPR**  
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**Report of The Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review**

**Merit Selection of Judges**

In 1974, the voters of Arizona decided that superior court judges in counties with populations over 250,000 (currently Maricopa and Pima) and all appellate judges on Arizona's Supreme Court and Court of Appeals should first be appointed by the Governor from a list of qualified candidates recommended by a Commission consisting primarily of public members. Thereafter, during periodic elections, Arizona voters would decide whether to retain those judges. As a voter, you determine if the judges should remain in office.

One intent of merit selection is to remove politics from the judicial selection process. Another is to avoid the appearance or possibility of compromising judicial impartiality and integrity if judges are forced to solicit campaign contributions from, among others, attorneys who may practice before them, or people who may someday appear before them in court.

**High Standards are Set for Arizona's Judiciary**

Arizona judges are expected to meet high standards of performance.

- A judge should administer justice fairly, ethically, uniformly, promptly and efficiently.
- Judges should be free from personal bias when making decisions and decide cases based on the proper application of law.
- Judges should issue prompt rulings that can be understood and make decisions that demonstrate competent legal analysis.
- Judges should act with dignity, courtesy and patience. They should effectively manage their courtroom and the administrative responsibilities of their office.

**Arizona's Commission on Judicial Performance Review**

Established in 1992 by an amendment to the Arizona Constitution, the 30-member Commission is made up of a majority of people like yourself, drawn from the public-at-large. Attorneys and judges make up the rest of the Commission. The Commission establishes performance standards for judges, decides whether or not a judge meets those standards, and communicates its findings to you, the voters.

The Commission collects information on judges' performance by distributing written surveys and conducting public hearings for persons who have first-hand knowledge of the job performance of judges appearing on the 2000 general election ballot. The Commission also accepts written comments regarding the performance of judges.

The responses to the surveys are compiled by an independent data center and the results forwarded to the Commission. Its members review all the information on each judge and vote whether the judge met - or did not meet - judicial performance standards. When the Commission votes, the judges' names are encoded so that members do not know which judge they were voting on until all the votes are counted.

**Evaluating Judges' Job Performance**

Once judges take the bench, the public expects them to be good judges; however, most citizens have very little information to use when evaluating a judge's performance. The Commission on Judicial Performance Review has the duty to provide meaningful and accurate information to the public for its use in making informed decisions regarding retention of merit-selected judges.

Every two years, the job performance of superior court judges in Maricopa and Pima Counties is evaluated. Court staff, jurors, litigants, witnesses, persons representing themselves and attorneys are asked to participate by completing survey forms. This past year, surveys were distributed during a six-month period ending on March 31, 2000.

The job performance of justices of the Arizona Supreme Court and Court of Appeal's judges were also evaluated using similar methods on a continuous basis.

The collection of reliable data was key to the success of this evaluation process and the Commission has confidence in the accuracy of the data it has received. The distribution of survey instruments to certain respondent groups, however, was accomplished in a cost-effective process which may not have been, in all respects, in accordance with scientific procedures.

The following pages contain evaluations of the job performance of judges who are subject to retention by voters in this election. These evaluations were based on survey results gathered from court staff, jurors, litigants, witnesses, persons representing themselves and attorneys. Information obtained at public hearings and signed, written public comments were also considered.

Depending on the Superior Court judge's assignment, the judge may not have responses in certain categories (indicated by N/A).

Members of the Arizona Supreme Court and Court of Appeals were evaluated by the lawyers who appeared before them. Because appellate courts do not hold trials, there were no litigant, witness or juror responses to consider.

Commission members reviewed, considered, and weighed carefully, the evaluation data from the survey process, public hearings, and written public comments before deciding whether a judge met - or did not meet - judicial performance standards.

**Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review**

**Public Members**

David Armstead, Phoenix	Ed Beasley, Glendale	Jessie Lou Blakeslee, Tempe
Espinola O. Brunson, Phoenix	Rod D. Covey, Phoenix	Daniel J. Durrenberger, Tempe
David A. Garber, Tucson	Lola L. Grabb, Tucson	Mary Guerra-Willekens, Phoenix
Winifred Hershberger, Tucson	David L. Hetrick, Tucson	Andrea Ibáñez, Chair, Tucson
Dr. Margaret Kenski, Tucson	Karen E. Osborne, Phoenix	Claire E. Scheuren, Tucson
Dolores L. Sirkis, Tempe	Jacque Steiner, Phoenix	Charles P. Thompson, Phoenix

**Attorney Members**

Andrew M. Federhar, Tucson	Jean K. Gage, Vice Chair, Tucson	Robert Houser, Phoenix
Fredrick M. Jones, Phoenix	Rosemary Marquez, Tucson	Christopher M. Skelly, Phoenix

**Judge Members**

**Superior Court**

- Rebecca A. Albrecht, Maricopa County
- Mark W. Armstrong, Maricopa County
- Deborah Bernini, Pima County
- Clark Munger, Pima County

**Appellate Courts**

- Cecil B. Patterson, Division I
- John Pelander, Division II

**Supreme Court**

Voters in **all counties** should vote on the following justices:

**Justice Frederick J. Martone**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Justice Martone meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1972. Appointed to the Supreme Court in 1992.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Justice Martone from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	100%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	94%	N/A
Integrity	99%	98%
Judicial Temperament	95%	N/A
Legal Ability	95%	96%

**Justice Ruth V. McGregor**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Justice McGregor meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1974. Appointed to the Supreme Court in 1998.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Justice McGregor from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	97%	96%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	96%	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	N/A
Legal Ability	86%	100%

**Justice Thomas A. Zlaket**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Justice Zlaket meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1965. Appointed to the Supreme Court in 1992.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Justice Zlaket from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	75%	88%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	91%	N/A
Integrity	92%	98%
Judicial Temperament	91%	N/A
Legal Ability	79%	95%

**Court of Appeals Division I**

Voters in **Maricopa County** should vote on the following judge:

**Maricopa County**

**Judge Rebecca Berch**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Berch meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1979. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1998.



**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Berch from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	100%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	98%	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
Legal Ability	91%	96%

Voters in **Apache, Coconino, La Paz, Mohave, Navajo, Yavapai & Yuma Counties** should vote on the following judge:

**Apache, Coconino, La Paz, Mohave, Navajo, Yavapai & Yuma Counties**

**Judge William F. Garbarino**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Garbarino meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1967. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1991.



**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Garbarino from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	95%	96%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	98%	N/A
Integrity	93%	97%
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
Legal Ability	87%	93%

**Court of Appeals Division II**

Voters in **Pima County** should vote on the following judges:

**Pima County**

**Judge J. William Brammer, Jr.**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Brammer meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1967. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1997.



**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Brammer from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	92%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	96%	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	N/A
Legal Ability	81%	98%

**Judge William E. Druke**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Druke meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1969. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1992.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Druke from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	89%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	95%	N/A
Integrity	88%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	N/A
Legal Ability	82%	98%

**Judge Philip G. Espinosa**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Espinosa meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1983. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1992.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Espinosa from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	92%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	95%	N/A
Integrity	90%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	N/A
Legal Ability	83%	98%

**Court of Appeals Division II (continued)**

Voters in **Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, Graham, Pinal and Santa Cruz** Counties should vote on the following judge:

**Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, Graham, Pinal and Santa Cruz Counties**

**Judge Joseph W. Howard**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 1 the Commission concluded that Judge Howard meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1997.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Howard from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's five evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Superior Court Judges
Administrative Performance	90%	96%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	94%	N/A
Integrity	90%	99%
Judicial Temperament	89%	N/A
Legal Ability	74%	97%

**Superior Court in Maricopa County**

Voters in **Maricopa County** should vote on the following judges:

**Judge Linda A. Akers**

**Vote:** By a vote of 26 to 3 the Commission concluded that Judge Akers meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1975. Appointed a judge in 1996. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Akers from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	94%	98%	89%
Communication Skills	91%	100%	94%
Integrity	88%	100%	85%
Judicial Temperament	80%	100%	91%
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	81%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Rebecca A. Albrecht**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Albrecht meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1975. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned to Juvenile Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Albrecht from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	N/A	100%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A	100%
Integrity	99%	N/A	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A	100%
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Louis A. Araneta**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Araneta meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1978. Appointed a judge in 1993. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Araneta from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	95%	N/A	95%
Communication Skills	97%	N/A	94%
Integrity	98%	N/A	96%
Judicial Temperament	97%	N/A	91%
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Silvia R. Arellano**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Arellano meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1978. Appointed a judge in 1990. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Arellano from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	97%	100%
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Anna M. Baca**

**Vote:** By a vote of 23 to 6 the Commission concluded that Judge Baca meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1980. Appointed a judge in 1994. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Baca from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	87%
Communication Skills	79%	100%	97%
Integrity	85%	100%	94%
Judicial Temperament	68%	100%	93%
Legal Ability	77%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	82%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Eddward Ballinger, Jr.**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Ballinger meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1979. Appointed a judge in 1998. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Ballinger from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	96%	97%	96%
Communication Skills	90%	99%	100%
Integrity	90%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	91%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	86%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	85%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Colin F. Campbell**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Campbell meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1977. Appointed a judge in 1990. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Campbell from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	96%
Communication Skills	93%	100%	97%
Integrity	91%	100%	93%
Judicial Temperament	89%	100%	93%
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	86%	N/A	N/A

**Judge David R. Cole**

**Vote:** By a vote of 27 to 2 the Commission concluded that Judge Cole meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Special Assignment Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Cole from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	96%	95%	100%
Communication Skills	78%	99%	100%
Integrity	79%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	74%	99%	100%
Legal Ability	84%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	58%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Donald F. Daughton**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Daughton meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1956. Appointed a judge in 1965; reappointed in 1997. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Probate Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Daughton from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	100%
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	96%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Thomas Dunevant III**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Dunevant meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1978. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Dunevant from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	95%
Communication Skills	94%	99%	93%
Integrity	96%	100%	93%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	93%
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Kenneth L. Fields**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Fields meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1973. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Fields from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	97%
Communication Skills	87%	100%	92%
Integrity	92%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	86%	100%	95%
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	78%	N/A	N/A

**Judge John Foreman**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Foreman meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1972. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Foreman from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	92%	100%	100%
Integrity	93%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	92%	100%	88%
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Pamela J. Franks**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Franks meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1978. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Juvenile Department as Associate Presiding Judge during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Franks from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	N/A	97%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A	98%
Integrity	95%	N/A	98%
Judicial Temperament	89%	N/A	98%
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	92%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Frank T. Galati**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Galati meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1973. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Galati from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Cheryl K. Hendrix**

**Vote:** By a vote of 21 to 8 the Commission concluded that Judge Hendrix meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1971. Appointed a judge in 1981. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Hendrix from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	78%	N/A	83%
Communication Skills	82%	N/A	76%
Integrity	88%	N/A	72%
Judicial Temperament	60%	N/A	70%
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	76%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Ruth H. Hilliard**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Hilliard meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1977. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Hilliard from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	99%	89%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	91%
Integrity	95%	100%	90%
Judicial Temperament	83%	100%	91%
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Sherry Hutt**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Hutt meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1975. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Hutt from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	88%	99%	97%
Communication Skills	81%	100%	98%
Integrity	86%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	91%	100%	98%
Legal Ability	79%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	76%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Barbara M. Jarrett**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Jarrett meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1977. Appointed a judge in 1992. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Jarrett from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	99%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	100%
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Paul A. Katz**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Katz meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Katz from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	86%	98%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Roger W. Kaufman**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Kaufman meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1963. Appointed a judge in 1993. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Kaufman from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Gregory H. Martin**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Martin meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1972. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned as Associate Presiding Judge of Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Martin from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	94%
Communication Skills	98%	99%	92%
Integrity	96%	100%	92%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	93%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Crane McClennen**

**Vote:** By a vote of 26 to 3 the Commission concluded that Judge McClennen meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1972. Appointed a judge in 1997. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge McClennen from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	68%	N/A	91%
Communication Skills	87%	N/A	89%
Integrity	92%	N/A	91%
Judicial Temperament	89%	N/A	91%
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	82%	N/A	N/A

**Judge James E. McDougall**

**Vote:** By a vote of 22 to 7 the Commission concluded that Judge McDougall meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1969. Appointed a judge in 1981. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge McDougall from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	59%	N/A	90%
Communication Skills	84%	N/A	96%
Integrity	91%	N/A	93%
Judicial Temperament	80%	N/A	93%
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	70%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Michael R. McVey**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge McVey meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1981. Appointed a judge in 1993. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge McVey from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	100%
Integrity	83%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	83%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	75%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Robert D. Myers**

**Vote:** By a vote of 26 to 3 the Commission concluded that Judge Myers meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1962. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Superior Court during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Myers from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	95%	N/A	100%
Communication Skills	82%	N/A	100%
Integrity	94%	N/A	100%
Judicial Temperament	77%	N/A	100%
Legal Ability	87%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	87%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Michael J. O'Melia**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge O'Melia meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1968. Appointed a judge in 1984. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge O'Melia from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	90%	N/A	97%
Communication Skills	84%	N/A	95%
Integrity	89%	N/A	97%
Judicial Temperament	90%	N/A	95%
Legal Ability	88%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	75%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Robert H. Oberbillig**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Oberbillig meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1982. Appointed a judge in 1998. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Oberbillig from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	99%	92%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	94%
Integrity	95%	100%	91%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	92%
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Ronald S. Reinstein**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Reinstein meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1973. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned as Associate Presiding Judge of Superior Court and also handled special assignment criminal cases during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Reinstein from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	N/A	100%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A	83%
Integrity	99%	N/A	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A	100%
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A

**Judge David L. Roberts**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Roberts meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1961. Appointed a judge in 1981. Assigned to Family Court Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Roberts from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	89%	N/A	100%
Communication Skills	81%	N/A	100%
Integrity	81%	N/A	100%
Judicial Temperament	83%	N/A	100%
Legal Ability	88%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	76%	N/A	N/A

**Judge William P. Sargeant III**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Sargeant meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1963. Appointed a judge in 1986. Assigned to Juvenile Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Sargeant from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	N/A	97%
Communication Skills	94%	N/A	97%
Integrity	95%	N/A	96%
Judicial Temperament	95%	N/A	96%
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Maricopa County (continued)**

**Judge Barry C. Schneider**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Schneider meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1968. Appointed a judge in 1985. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Schneider from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	96%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	96%	100%
Integrity	96%	97%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	97%	100%
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Steven D. Sheldon**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Sheldon meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1974. Appointed a judge in 1989. Assigned to Special Assignment Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Sheldon from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	98%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	98%
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County**

Voters in **Pima County** should vote on the following judges:

**Judge Edgar B. Acuña**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Acuña meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed a judge in 1997. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Acuña from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	92%
Communication Skills	88%	99%	93%
Integrity	93%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	89%	100%	92%
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County (continued)**

**Judge Gordon T. Alley**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Alley meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1964. Appointed a judge in 1990. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Superior Court in Pima County during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Alley from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	94%	N/A	N/A
Communication Skills	86%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	92%	N/A	N/A
Judicial Temperament	87%	N/A	N/A
Legal Ability	87%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Deborah Bernini**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Bernini meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1981. Appointed a judge in 1997. Assigned to Juvenile Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Bernini from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	N/A	100%
Communication Skills	97%	N/A	100%
Integrity	99%	N/A	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A	100%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Michael Brown**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Brown meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1959. Appointed a judge in 1981. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Brown from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	88%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	86%	99%	100%
Integrity	80%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	78%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	85%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	72%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County (continued)**

**Judge Patricia Escher**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Escher meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed a judge in 1997. Assigned to Juvenile Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Escher from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	94%	N/A	96%
Communication Skills	92%	N/A	95%
Integrity	89%	N/A	96%
Judicial Temperament	89%	N/A	95%
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Richard Fields**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Fields meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1978. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1997. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Fields from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	98%	92%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	92%
Integrity	99%	100%	91%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	92%
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Howard Hantman**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Hantman meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1971. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1994. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Hantman from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	100%
Integrity	91%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	78%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County (continued)**

**Judge Kenneth Lee**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Lee meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1981. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1997. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Lee from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	98%	95%
Communication Skills	92%	100%	93%
Integrity	94%	99%	94%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	97%
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A

**Judge John S. Leonardo**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Leonardo meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1972. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1993. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Leonardo from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Leslie Miller**

**Vote:** By a vote of 26 to 2 the Commission concluded that Judge Miller meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1985. Assigned as Associate Presiding Judge of Superior Court in Pima County during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Miller from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	87%	N/A	N/A
Communication Skills	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	89%	N/A	N/A
Judicial Temperament	79%	N/A	N/A
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	96%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County (continued)**

**Judge Clark Munger**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Munger meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1967. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1997. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Munger from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	91%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	96%
Integrity	91%	100%	88%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%	90%
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A

**Judge John Quigley**

**Vote:** By a vote of 28 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Quigley meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1960. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1997. Assigned as Presiding Judge of Domestic Relations Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Quigley from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	97%	N/A	89%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A	86%
Integrity	92%	N/A	92%
Judicial Temperament	81%	N/A	82%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Charles S. Sabalos**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Sabalos meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.

**Profile:** Law degree 1974. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1993. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Sabalos from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.



Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	96%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	100%
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A

**Superior Court in Pima County (continued)**

**Judge Bernardo Velasco**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Velasco meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1974. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1985. Assigned to Criminal Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Velasco from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	99%	100%
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	100%
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	96%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Stephen Villarreal**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Villarreal meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1975. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1998. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Villarreal from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	98%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	95%
Integrity	97%	100%	96%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	97%
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	92%	N/A	N/A

**Judge Nanette Warner**

**Vote:** By a vote of 29 to 0 the Commission concluded that Judge Warner meets Arizona's standards of judicial performance.



**Profile:** Law degree 1976. Appointed to the Superior Court in 1985. Assigned to Civil Department during the review period.

**Survey Results:** The following are the composite percentage scores received by Judge Warner from evaluators who rated the judge satisfactory or above in each of the Commission's six evaluation categories.

Evaluation Category	Attorneys	Jurors	Litigants/Witnesses
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	96%
Integrity	98%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	98%
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A