ARIZONA COMMISSION ON
JPR
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

2008 REVIEW OF JUDGES' PERFORMANCE

The information in this pamphlet is provided to help you decide how you want to vote on the judges listed on the 2008 ballot.

- Information on the Arizona Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges begins on Page 2.
- Information on the Pima County Superior Court judges begins on Page 5.
- Information on the Maricopa County Superior Court judges begins on Page 13.
- A JUDGE CHECKLIST is provided on the back inside cover of the pamphlet, Page 28.
- After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the checklist.
- Use the checklist when marking your ballot.

For more information about the judge review process or the JPR Commission, please contact:

Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review
1501 West Washington Street
Suite 221
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

E-mail: jpr@courts.az.gov

Internet: www.azjudges.info

Telephone: (602) 452-3098

This publication can be provided in alternative formats upon request.

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE, COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:
Scott Bales

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:
Diane M. Johnsen
Patricia A. Orozco
Ann A. Scott Timmer
Sheldon H. Weisberg

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:
Garye L. Vasquez

JUSTICE/JUDGE REVIEWS

ALL ARIZONA VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

BALES, SCOTT
Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 2005

	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"	
Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	**Attorney Responses** *Surveys Distributed: 256* *Surveys Returned: 75*	**Superior Court Judge Responses** *Surveys Distributed: 13* *Surveys Returned: 5*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**100%**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES

JOHNSEN, DIANE M.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 347 Surveys Returned: 63*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 29*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	91%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

SCOTT TIMMER, ANN A.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2000

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed:1,489 Surveys Returned: 309*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 387 Surveys Returned: 103*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	86%	100%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	98%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

APACHE/COCONINO/LA PAZ/MOHAVE/NAVAJO/YAVAPAI/YUMA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES

OROZCO, PATRICIA A.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2004

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 753 Surveys Returned: 123*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 162 Surveys Returned: 40*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	91%	97%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

WEISBERG, SHELDON H.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 1992

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 942* *Surveys Returned: 190*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 267* *Surveys Returned: 53*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**95%**	**100%**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**95%**	**97%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

COCHISE/GILA/GRAHAM/GREENLEE/PINAL/SANTA CRUZ COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION II JUDGE

VASQUEZ, GARYE L.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 187* *Surveys Returned: 40*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 44* *Surveys Returned: 31*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**88%**	**95%**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**96%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – PIMA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Acuña, Edgar B.
Aragón, Jr., Gustavo
Bernini, Deborah
Cornelio, Carmine
Eikleberry, Jane L.
Escher, Patricia
Fields, Richard S.
Hantman, Howard
Kearney, Jan E.
Kelly, Virginia C.
Lee, Kenneth
Leonardo, John S.
Miller, Leslie B.
Miller, Michael O.
Munger, Clark W.
Sabalos, Charles S.
Simmons, Sarah R.
Tang, Paul E.
Villarreal, Stephen C.
Warner, Nanette

PIMA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS

ACUÑA, EDGAR B.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

23 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
6 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 170 Surveys Returned: 54*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 93 Surveys Returned: 20*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 40 Surveys Returned: 39*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**95%**	**98%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**89%**	**96%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**62%**	**82%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

ARAGÓN, JR. GUSTAVO
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2006

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 75 Surveys Returned: 29*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 40 Surveys Returned: 29*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**71%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**95%**	**100%**	**93%**
Communication Skills	**84%**	**100%**	**96%**
Judicial Temperament	**93%**	**100%**	**96%**
Administrative Performance	**86%**	**94%**	**96%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

BERNINI, DEBORAH
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 73*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 155 Surveys Returned: 52*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 29 Surveys Returned: 26*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**95%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

CORNELIO, CARMINE
Assignment During Survey Period: Family; Presiding Arbitration
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2002

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 5*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 181 Surveys Returned: 81*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 176 Surveys Returned: 61*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**96%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**93%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**89%**	**94%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**95%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

EIKLEBERRY, JANE L.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 112 Surveys Returned: 28*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 290 Surveys Returned: 62*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**99%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

ESCHER, PATRICIA
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Juvenile
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 14 Surveys Returned: 11*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 84 Surveys Returned: 22*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 137 Surveys Returned: 25*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**94%**	**98%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**88%**	**93%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**90%**	**91%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**87%**	**94%**	**99%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**83%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FIELDS, RICHARD S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal; Assoc. Presiding
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 35*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 43*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 60*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 62 Surveys Returned: 54*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**99%**	**100%**	**95%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**98%**	**99%**	**95%**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

HANTMAN, HOWARD
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1994

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 42*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 38*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 79*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**86%**	**96%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**68%**	**97%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**99%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**83%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

KEARNEY, JAN E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Judge
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed:100 Surveys Returned: 54*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 19 Surveys Returned: 7*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 3*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**96%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**97%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

KELLY, VIRGINIA C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2002

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 108 Surveys Returned: 30*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 254 Surveys Returned: 75*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**93%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

LEE, KENNETH
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 119 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 249 Surveys Returned: 30*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**85%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**95%**	**84%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**86%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

LEONARDO, JOHN S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1993

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 121 Surveys Returned: 46*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 116 Surveys Returned: 100*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**91%**	**95%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**80%**	**96%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**97%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**72%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MILLER, LESLIE B.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1985

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 48*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 24 Surveys Returned: 7*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 7*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**100%**	**82%**
Communication Skills	**91%**	**92%**	**85%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**100%**	**84%**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**100%**	**86%**
Settlement Activities	**79%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

MILLER, MICHAEL O.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2002

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 212 Surveys Returned: 73*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 11*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 26 Surveys Returned:17*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MUNGER, CLARK W.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil; Presiding Probate
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 3 Surveys Returned: 1*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 165 Surveys Returned: 56*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 2*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**95%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**95%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**85%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**77%**	**50%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**96%**	**83%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**83%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

SABALOS, CHARLES S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1993

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 103 Surveys Returned: 28*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 402 Surveys Returned: 95*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**96%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**94%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

SIMMONS, SARAH R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Family
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2006

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Note: Judge Simmons is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on her own performance finding.

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 10*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 64 Surveys Returned: 28*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 221 Surveys Returned: 29*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	95%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	98%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	98%	94%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	96%	N/A	N/A	N/A

TANG, PAUL E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 202 Surveys Returned: 64*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 22 Surveys Returned: 8*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	92%	89%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

VILLARREAL, STEPHEN C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 188 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 108 Surveys Returned: 53*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 63*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	89%	98%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

WARNER, NANETTE
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1986

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 195* *Surveys Returned: 51*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 314* *Surveys Returned: 74*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 31* *Surveys Returned:16*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**97%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**96%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**97%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**89%**	**96%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**92%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

McClennen, Crane

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Abrams, Helene F.
Akers, Linda A.
Araneta, Louis A.
Arellano, Silvia R.
Baca, Anna M.
Ballinger, Jr., Eddward P.
Blakey II, A. Craig
Buttrick, John A.
Cohen, Bruce R.
Contes, Connie C.
Davis, Glenn M.
Ditsworth, John R.
Dunevant III, Thomas
Flores, Lisa Daniel
Garcia, Jeanne M.
Gentry-Lewis, Jo Lynn
Gordon, Michael D.
Hannah, Jr. John R.
Harrison, Cari A.
Hilliard, Ruth H.
Hoffman, Kristin
Katz, Paul A.
Kemp, Michael W.
Klein, Andrew G.
Mahoney, Margaret R.
McMurdie, Paul J.
McNally, Colleen A.
McVey, Michael R.
Miles, Linda H.
Miles, Robert E.
Oberbillig, Robert H.
Padilla, Jose S.
Potts, Karen A.
Ryan, Timothy J.
Sanders, Teresa A.
Steinle, III, Roland J.
Stephens, Sherry K.
Trujillo, Richard J.
Udall, David K.
Whitten, Christopher T.

MARICOPA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS

ABRAMS, HELENE F.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 175 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 9*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 105 Surveys Returned: 36*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**97%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**98%**	**97%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**100%**	**92%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**80%**	**96%**
Administrative Performance	**97%**	**93%**	**93%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

AKERS, LINDA A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 246 Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 63 Surveys Returned: 7*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 3*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	92%	88%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	83%	100%
Judicial Temperament	73%	81%	100%
Administrative Performance	94%	95%	100%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

ARANETA, LOUIS A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1993

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 92 Surveys Returned: 24*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 330 Surveys Returned: 43*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	85%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	89%	89%	N/A
Administrative Performance	82%	93%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

ARELLANO, SILVIA R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1990

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 200 Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 8*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 71 Surveys Returned: 22*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

BACA, ANNA M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1994

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 19*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 23 Surveys Returned: 3*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned:10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	100%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	100%	89%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	91%	N/A	N/A	N/A

BALLINGER, JR., EDDWARD P.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family; NE Presiding
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1998

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 12 Surveys Returned: 4*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 135 Surveys Returned: 33*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 160 Surveys Returned: 24*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	99%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

BLAKEY, II, A. CRAIG
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2002

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 353 Surveys Returned: 70*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 32 Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 4*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	83%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	86%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

BUTTRICK, JOHN A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 266 Surveys Returned: 64*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 13*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**93%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

COHEN, BRUCE R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 123 Surveys Returned: 53*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 316 Surveys Returned: 45*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

CONTES, CONNIE C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2002

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 167 Surveys Returned: 40*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 6 Surveys Returned: 2*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed:105 Surveys Returned: 29*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**84%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**0%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**94%**	**25%**	**95%**
Judicial Temperament	**97%**	**11%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**70%**	**50%**	**94%**
Settlement Activities	**87%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

DAVIS, GLENN M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 244 Surveys Returned: 68*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 89 Surveys Returned: 17*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 34 Surveys Returned: 27*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**93%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**92%**	**91%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**95%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**94%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

DITSWORTH, JOHN R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 104 Surveys Returned: 9*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 52 Surveys Returned: 16*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 17*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**88%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**99%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**86%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**91%**	**97%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**0%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

DUNEVANT, III, THOMAS
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil; Presiding Tax
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1989

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 10*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 249 Surveys Returned: 73*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 66 Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 5*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**94%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**83%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

FLORES, LISA DANIEL
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 191* *Surveys Returned: 48*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 362* *Surveys Returned: 43*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	87%	N/A
Communication Skills	91%	89%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	90%	79%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	87%	N/A
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

GARCIA, JEANNE M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 171* *Surveys Returned: 17*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 42* *Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 45* *Surveys Returned: 23*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	70%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	95%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	87%	98%
Judicial Temperament	94%	92%	99%
Administrative Performance	82%	97%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

GENTRY-LEWIS, JO LYNN
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

23 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
6 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 150* *Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 246* *Surveys Returned: 43*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	78%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	81%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	89%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	82%	94%	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

GORDON, MICHAEL D.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 218 Surveys Returned: 43*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 55 Surveys Returned: 1*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 62 Surveys Returned: 25*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	99%
Administrative Performance	83%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HANNAH, JR., JOHN R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 144 Surveys Returned: 43*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 114 Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	92%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	86%	90%	N/A
Administrative Performance	78%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	80%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HARRISON, CARI A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 209 Surveys Returned: 34*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 29 Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 55 Surveys Returned: 44*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	92%	97%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

HILLIARD, RUTH H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1986

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 53*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 304 Surveys Returned: 19*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	83%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	71%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	71%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HOFFMAN, KRISTIN
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 541 Surveys Returned: 161*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 70 Surveys Returned: 16*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 59 Surveys Returned: 34*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

KATZ, PAUL A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1989

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 248 Surveys Returned: 72*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 62 Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 26 Surveys Returned: 20*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

KEMP, MICHAEL W.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 137* *Surveys Returned: 38*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 88* *Surveys Returned: 15*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**97%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**83%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

KLEIN, ANDREW G.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 88* *Surveys Returned: 19*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 93* *Surveys Returned: 17*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 44* *Surveys Returned: 22*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MAHONEY, MARGARET R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2002

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 283* *Surveys Returned: 60*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 90* *Surveys Returned: 3*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 98* *Surveys Returned: 36*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**100%**	**98%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**100%**	**98%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

MCCLENNEN, CRANE
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1997

10 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
17 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"
2 Commissioners Voted "Not Voting"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 135 Surveys Returned: 44*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 162 Surveys Returned: 12*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**89%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**84%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**78%**	**80%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**60%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**70%**	**86%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**80%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MCMURDIE, PAUL J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 287 Surveys Returned: 45*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 85*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 94*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**99%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**96%**	**96%**	**99%**
Judicial Temperament	**95%**	**99%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**98%**	**99%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MCNALLY, COLLEEN A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 37 Surveys Returned: 21*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 12*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 189 Surveys Returned: 15*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**N/A**	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**94%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**92%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**92%**	**89%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**91%**	**85%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**N/A**	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

MCVEY, MICHAEL R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1993

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 199 Surveys Returned: 77*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 464 Surveys Returned: 32*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**86%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**92%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MILES, LINDA H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 222 Surveys Returned: 28*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**95%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**93%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**92%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**88%**	**87%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**94%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

MILES, ROBERT E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 405 Surveys Returned: 109*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 14*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 34*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**95%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

OBERBILLIG, ROBERT H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1998

25 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
4 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 100 Surveys Returned: 31*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 11*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**94%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**85%**	**89%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**79%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

PADILLA, JOSE S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 408 Surveys Returned: 27*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**88%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**95%**	**74%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**85%**	**60%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**90%**	**64%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**91%**	**75%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**90%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

POTTS, KAREN A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 144 Surveys Returned: 51*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 357 Surveys Returned: 34*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**81%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**86%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

RYAN, TIMOTHY J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Assoc. Presiding Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 16*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 296 Surveys Returned: 74*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 6*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	97%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	90%	92%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	93%	95%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	95%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A

SANDERS, TERESA A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 28*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 45 Surveys Returned: 9*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 82 Surveys Returned: 57*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	99%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

STEINLE, III, ROLAND J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

25 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
4 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 292 Surveys Returned: 64*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 21 Surveys Returned: 17*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 124 Surveys Returned: 89*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	83%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	71%	100%	98%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	99%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

STEPHENS, SHERRY K.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 153 Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 111 Surveys Returned: 23*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	95%	N/A
Communication Skills	89%	86%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	83%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	89%	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

TRUJILLO, RICHARD J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 258 Surveys Returned: 77*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 85 Surveys Returned: 14*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 60 Surveys Returned: 40*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	83%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	83%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	81%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	76%	98%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

UDALL, DAVID K.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 251 Surveys Returned: 54*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 107 Surveys Returned: 23*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 77 Surveys Returned: 45*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

WHITTEN, CHRISTOPHER T.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 221* *Surveys Returned: 74*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 35* *Surveys Returned: 4*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 33* *Surveys Returned: 27*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**89%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**88%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**93%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**89%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON
JPR
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW JUDGE CHECKLIST

This page is provided to assist you when voting on the judges and justices standing for retention. Remove the sheet from your pamphlet, mark your vote on the checklist, and take the checklist with you when voting.

Arizona Supreme Court
(All Voters)

Bales, Scott	Yes____	No____

Court of Appeals Division I
(Maricopa County Voters)

Johnsen, Diane M.	Yes____	No____
Scott Timmer, Ann A.	Yes____	No____

Court of Appeals, Division I
(Apache/Coconino/La Paz/Mohave/Navajo/ Yavapai/Yuma County Voters)

Orozco, Patricia A.	Yes____	No____
Weisberg, Sheldon H.	Yes____	No____

Court of Appeals, Division II
(Cochise/Gila/Graham/Greenlee/Pinal/ Santa Cruz County Voters)

Vasquez, Garye L.	Yes____	No____

Pima County Superior Court
(Pima County Voters)

Acuña, Edgar B.	Yes____	No____
Aragón, Jr., Gustavo	Yes____	No____
Bernini, Deborah	Yes____	No____
Cornelio, Carmine	Yes____	No____
Eikleberry, Jane, L.	Yes____	No____
Escher, Patricia	Yes____	No____
Fields, Richard S.	Yes____	No____
Hantman, Howard	Yes____	No____
Kearney, Jan E.	Yes____	No____
Kelly, Virginia C.	Yes____	No____
Lee, Kenneth	Yes____	No____
Leonardo, John S.	Yes____	No____
Miller, Leslie B.	Yes____	No____
Miller, Michael O.	Yes____	No____
Munger, Clark W.	Yes____	No____
Sabalos, Charles S.	Yes____	No____
Simmons, Sarah R.	Yes____	No____
Tang, Paul E.	Yes____	No____
Villarreal, Stephen C.	Yes____	No____
Warner, Nanette	Yes____	No____

Maricopa County Superior Court
(Maricopa County Voters)

Abrams, Helene F.	Yes____	No____
Akers, Linda A.	Yes____	No____
Araneta, Louis A.	Yes____	No____
Arellano, Silvia R.	Yes____	No____
Baca, Anna M.	Yes____	No____
Ballinger, Jr., Eddward P.	Yes____	No____
Blakey, II, A. Craig	Yes____	No____
Buttrick, John A.	Yes____	No____
Cohen, Bruce A.	Yes____	No____
Contes, Connie C.	Yes____	No____
Davis, Glenn M.	Yes____	No____
Ditsworth, John R.	Yes____	No____
Dunevant, III, Thomas	Yes____	No____
Flores, Lisa Daniel	Yes____	No____
Garcia, Jeanne M.	Yes____	No____
Gentry-Lewis, Jo Lynn	Yes____	No____
Gordon, Michael D.	Yes____	No____
Hannah, Jr., John R.	Yes____	No____
Harrison, Cari A.	Yes____	No____
Hilliard, Ruth H.	Yes____	No____
Hoffman, Kristin	Yes____	No____
Katz, Paul A.	Yes____	No____
Kemp, Michael W.	Yes____	No____
Klein, Andrew G.	Yes____	No____
Mahoney, Margaret R.	Yes____	No____
McClennen, Crane	Yes____	No____
McMurdie, Paul J.	Yes____	No____
McNally, Colleen A.	Yes____	No____
McVey, Michael R.	Yes____	No____
Miles, Linda H.	Yes____	No____
Miles, Robert E.	Yes____	No____
Oberbillig, Robert H.	Yes____	No____
Padilla, Jose S.	Yes____	No____
Potts, Karen A.	Yes____	No____
Ryan, Timothy J.	Yes____	No____
Sanders, Teresa A.	Yes____	No____
Steinle, III, Roland J.	Yes____	No____
Stephens, Sherry K.	Yes____	No____
Trujillo, Richard J.	Yes____	No____
Udall, David K.	Yes____	No____
Whitten, Christopher T.	Yes____	No____