

---

**From:** Bob Butler <bob@butlerbeschenlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 25, 2021 8:49 AM  
**To:** Cathy Halka  
**Cc:** Philip Buri (philip@burifunston.com)  
**Subject:** Whatcom County Judicial Evaluation Committee  
**Attachments:** WCJEC Rating Standard.pdf

Cathy and Phil,  
The Whatcom County Bar Association's Judicial Evaluation Committee, pursuant to the rules and procedures provided, have rated the following individuals as follows:

Lisa Keeler	Qualified
Shoshana Paige	Well Qualified
Royce Buckingham	Well Qualified
Melissa Nelson	Well Qualified
Angela Anderson	Exceptionally Well Qualified

**Bob Butler, Attorney (pronouns: he/him/his)**

***BUTLER BESCHEN LAW PLLC***

103 E Holly # 512  
Bellingham, WA 98225

Ph. 360-734-3448  
Fax 360-734-7975

Web: [www.butlerbeschenlaw.com](http://www.butlerbeschenlaw.com)  
Email: [bob@butlerbeschenlaw.com](mailto:bob@butlerbeschenlaw.com)

[Follow on Facebook](#)  
Profile on [AVVO](#)

---

*This is a private and confidential communication for the sole viewing and use of the intended recipient. It is intended to constitute an electronic communication within the meaning of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510. Any review or distribution to other recipients is not intended and does not constitute a loss of the confidential or privileged nature of the communication. Any review or distribution by other recipients is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of the communication please contact the sender by return electronic mail and delete and destroy all copies of this communication. Thanks!*

---

**From:** Philip Buri  
**To:** Cathy Halka; Bob Butler  
**Subject:** RE: Whatcom County Judicial Evaluation Committee  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 4, 2021 2:37:00 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Dear Cathy:

Jeffrey Lustick has withdrawn from the ratings process and the Judicial Evaluation Committee will not provide a rating.

That should complete the Judicial Evaluation Committee's work and the WCBA is pleased to have participated in the Council's process,

Phil

Philip Buri  
Buri Funston Mumford & Furlong, PLLC  
1601 F. Street  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
(360) 752-1500

---

9. **Rating Criteria, Categories, and Procedures.**

9.1 **Unified Rating System for Candidates.** The ratings categories for candidates for election and applicants for appointment are identical: “Exceptionally Well Qualified,” “Well Qualified,” “Qualified,” and “Not Qualified

9.2 **Ratings of Candidates.**

9.2.1 **“Qualified.”** A Candidate may be rated “Qualified” if the Candidate has satisfied the basic criteria—consisting of the following factors, which are not listed in any order of priority—to a degree sufficient to consider the Candidate minimally qualified for the judicial position sought:

(a) maturity, integrity, courtesy, intellectual honesty, fairness, good judgment, curiosity, and common sense;

(b) a demonstrated commitment to equal justice under the law, and fairness and open-mindedness with sensitivity to and respect for all persons, regardless of race, color, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, religion, political ideology, creed, age, marital status, or physical or mental handicap, disability, or impairment. This commitment and sensitivity can be evidenced by the individual’s involvement in community affairs and activities, professional practice, and personal and professional background;

(c) the courage and ability to make difficult decisions under stress;

(d) the competence, ability, and experience to manage pretrial and trial proceedings, including administrative proceedings, arbitrations, settlement conferences, and commissioner or magistrate responsibilities. It should include an ability to address diverse issues, weigh conflicting testimony, apply the law to the facts, understand the dynamics of the trial or conflict resolution process, and command respect from attorneys, litigants, and other participants in the process;

(e) the ability to work with a wide variety of subject matters;

(f) demonstrated excellence in legal ability and practice;

(g) demonstrated capacity for hard work;

(h) the potential for ongoing professional development and demonstrated

leadership in the profession;

(i) the ability to communicate clearly and effectively, orally and in writing, with all participants in the judicial process and other branches of government;

(j) interest and commitment to Whatcom County with other judges, court administrators, and other branches of government to improve the administration of justice; and

(k) a demeanor conducive to all participants in legal proceedings before the Candidate being treated with fairness and respect, and receiving an opportunity to be heard fairly and without prejudice.

9.2.2 **“Well Qualified.”** A Candidate may be rated “Well Qualified” if the Candidate demonstrates a level of skill, experience, sound judgment, and excellence in his or her professional or judicial career, or both, that will sustain or improve the quality of the bench of the judicial position sought. These Qualifications may be demonstrated by satisfying some or all of the criteria used to support a “Qualified” rating.

9.2.3 **“Exceptionally Well Qualified.”** A Candidate may be rated “Exceptionally Well Qualified” if the Candidate fulfills the requirements necessary for a “Well Qualified” rating and, in addition, demonstrates outstanding accomplishments as reflected by some or all of the following:

(a) singular accomplishments in professional practice, academic training, judicial career, or contributions to the profession;

(b) exceptional litigation, judicial, or administrative experience;

(c) outstanding personal and professional integrity and commitment to fairness in the administration of justice;

(d) significant public service; and

(e) excellence in the criteria which support a “Well Qualified” rating.

9.2.4 **“Not Qualified.”** A Candidate may be rated “Not Qualified” if the Candidate does not demonstrate qualifications sufficient to receive a rating of “Qualified”.

9.2.5 **“Insufficient Information to Rate.”** If a Candidate has been provided with a full and complete opportunity to provide information and, despite that opportunity, the Committee concludes by majority vote that it does not have sufficient information to rate the Candidate, the Committee shall not rate the Candidate and shall place the Candidate in the category “Insufficient Information to Rate.” This rating shall not be used if a Candidate has declined or refused to participate in the rating process.

9.2.6 **“Refused to Cooperate in the Judicial Candidate Evaluation Process.”** If a Candidate has declined or refused to participate in the rating process, the