

TO: Lynn Mounsey, Executive Director, Spokane County Bar Association
FROM: David C. Brody, Professor
RE: 2017 Spokane County Bar Association, Judicial Candidate Bar Poll
Date: July 3, 2017

The following results can be reported for the 2017 Judicial Candidate Bar Poll. A total of 543 attorneys accessed the survey, with 278 submitting questionnaires rating two candidates for a seat on the Spokane County Superior Court and one candidate for the Spokane Municipal Court.¹ Members of the bar were asked to evaluate each candidate with respect to the following five criteria.

Legal Ability Analytical ability, an interest in legal scholarship, qualities of wisdom, intellect, common sense, knowledge of rules and procedures, and a commitment to keeping up with changes in the law constitute important criteria.

Judicial Temperament Respect for the judicial process, ability to work with others, ability to be respectful to all counsel and litigants, and the ability to treat all participants with dignity and fairness.

Integrity Free from impropriety and favoritism, disregard of possible public criticism, fair and open-minded, committed to equal justice under the law, and does not engage in unethical or unprofessional conduct.

Relevant Legal Experience The candidate possesses appropriate prior courtroom experience.

Suitability Is this candidate qualified for the position for which they seek?

¹ Two candidates, Jocelyn Cook and Adam Papini opted not to participate in the Bar Poll.

For each criterion candidates were rated along the following four-point scale:

- 1 Not Qualified
- 2 Qualified
- 3 Well Qualified
- 4 Exceptionally Well Qualified

Each question provided attorneys with the option of responding that they possessed “insufficient information” about a candidate to respond, thereby allowing respondents to avoid rating candidates with whom they are not sufficiently familiar.

The results reported below consist of a) average ratings for each candidate for the five stated categories, and b) specific responses received for each candidate under each criterion.

Average Ratings Received in Each Category

Average scores, ranging from 1 through 4, received by the candidates for each of the five categories are reported below. Responses of “insufficient information” were not included in calculating average ratings.

	Legal Ability	Judicial Temperament	Integrity	Relevant Legal Experience	Suitability
<u>Superior Court Department 6</u>					
Anthony D. Hazel	3.26	3.48	3.47	3.23	3.33
J. Scott Miller	2.43	2.44	2.65	2.64	2.44
<u>Municipal Court</u>					
Tracy A. Staab	3.31	3.29	3.43	3.32	3.34

Detailed Results Obtained by Anthony D. Hazel

Legal Ability Average = 3.26

Not Qualified	12	5.0%
Qualified	36	15.1%
Well Qualified	69	28.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	122	51.0%
Insufficient Information	28	
Total Providing Ratings	239	

Judicial Temperament Average = 3.48

Not Qualified	6	1.8%
Qualified	22	9.6%
Well Qualified	58	25.2%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	144	62.6%
Insufficient Information	29	
Total Providing Ratings	230	

Integrity Average = 3.47

Not Qualified	11	4.9%
Qualified	21	9.4%
Well Qualified	43	19.2%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	149	66.5%
Insufficient Information	26	
Total Providing Ratings	224	

Detailed Results Obtained by Anthony D. Hazel cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 3.23

Not Qualified	12	5.2%
Qualified	38	16.4%
Well Qualified	67	28.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	115	49.6%
Insufficient Information	19	
Total Providing Ratings	232	

Suitability Average = 3.33

Not Qualified	12	5.3%
Qualified	31	13.7%
Well Qualified	54	23.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	129	57.1%
Insufficient Information	23	
Total Providing Ratings	226	

Detailed Results Obtained by J. Scott Miller

Legal Ability Average = 2.43

Not Qualified	43	23.0%
Qualified	57	30.5%
Well Qualified	50	26.7%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	37	19.8%
Insufficient Information	76	
Total Providing Ratings	187	

Judicial Temperament Average = 2.44

Not Qualified	42	25.1%
Qualified	48	28.7%
Well Qualified	39	23.4%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	38	22.8%
Insufficient Information	84	
Total Providing Ratings	167	

Integrity Average = 2.65

Not Qualified	34	21.5%
Qualified	35	22.2%
Well Qualified	41	25.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	48	30.4%
Insufficient Information	88	
Total Providing Ratings	158	

Detailed Results Obtained by J. Scott Miller cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 2.64

Not Qualified	23	12.6%
Qualified	60	33.3%
Well Qualified	58	31.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	41	22.5%
Insufficient Information	59	
Total Providing Ratings	182	

Suitability Average = 2.44

Not Qualified	42	23.5%
Qualified	51	28.5%
Well Qualified	52	29.1%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	34	19.0%
Insufficient Information	66	
Total Providing Ratings	179	

Detailed Results Obtained by Tracy A. Staab

Legal Ability Average = 3.31

Not Qualified	3	1.8%
Qualified	27	16.2%
Well Qualified	53	31.7%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	84	50.3%
Insufficient Information	94	
Total Providing Ratings	167	

Judicial Temperament Average = 3.29

Not Qualified	6	3.8%
Qualified	22	13.8%
Well Qualified	51	32.1%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	80	50.3%
Insufficient Information	98	
Total Providing Ratings	159	

Integrity Average = 3.43

Not Qualified	5	3.2%
Qualified	18	11.4%
Well Qualified	39	24.7%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	96	60.8%
Insufficient Information	91	
Total Providing Ratings	158	

Detailed Results Obtained by Tracy A. Staab cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 3.32

Not Qualified	4	2.4%
Qualified	27	16.5%
Well Qualified	45	27.4%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	88	53.7%
Insufficient Information	83	
Total Providing Ratings	164	

Suitability Average = 3.34

Not Qualified	4	2.5%
Qualified	23	14.2%
Well Qualified	49	30.2%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	86	53.1%
Insufficient Information	86	
Total Providing Ratings	162	