****JUDICIAL CANDIDATES RATINGS ANNOUNCED****

The Ventura County Bar Association has released ratings of the candidates in the contested judicial elections for Judicial Office No. 2 and Judicial Office No. 8 to be held on March 3, 2020.

The ratings are established by the Bar Association's 11-member Judicial Evaluations Committee, which investigates, interviews and evaluates judicial candidates in contested elections, and those seeking appointment by the Governor.

The overall rating assigned can either be Exceptionally Well Qualified, Well Qualified, Qualified or Not Qualified. Candidates are also rated in the categories of Professional Ability, Professional Experience, Judicial Temperament, Professional Reputation and Work Ethic/Resource Management, and receive a rating in each category on the following performance scale: Outstanding, Very Good, Satisfactory, Below Average, Unsatisfactory or Unknown.

For Judicial Office No. 2, the two candidates are Martin Zaehringer and Catherine Voelker. For Judicial Office No. 8, the two candidates are Commissioner Paul Baelly and Steven Pell.

Martin Zaehringer has been rated as Exceptionally Well Qualified for the office of Superior Court Judge. Mr. Zaehringer received a rating of Outstanding in all the categories of Professional Ability, Professional Experience, Judicial Temperament, Professional Reputation and Work Ethic/Resource Management.

Catherine Voelker has been rated as Well Qualified for the office of Superior Court Judge. Ms. Voelker received a rating of Outstanding in the categories of Professional Ability and Work Ethic/Resource Management and a rating of Very Good in the categories of Professional Experience, Judicial Temperament and Professional Reputation.

Commissioner Paul Baelly has been rated as Well Qualified for the office of Superior Court Judge. Commission Baelly received a rating of Outstanding in the categories of Judicial Temperament and Professional Reputation and a rating of Very Good in the categories of Professional Ability, Professional Experience and Work Ethic/Resource Management.

Steven Pell has been rated as Not Qualified for the office of Superior Court Judge. Mr. Pell received a rating of Satisfactory in the categories of Professional Experience and Judicial Temperament and a rating of Unsatisfactory in the categories of Professional Ability, Professional Reputation and Work Ethic/Resource Management.

A rating of Exceptionally Well Qualified means the candidate's performance in each rating category is remarkably or extraordinarily superior, so that, without real doubt, the candidate is fit to perform in judicial office with distinction.

A rating of Well Qualified means that the candidate's performance in each rating

category is indicative of superior fitness to perform in the judicial office with a high degree of skill and effectiveness.

A rating of Qualified means that the candidate's performance in each rating category is indicative of fitness to perform the judicial function satisfactorily.

A rating of Not Qualified means that the candidate's performance in one or more of the rating categories indicates a lack of fitness to perform satisfactorily in the judicial office.

The Committee establishes a rating based upon confidential comment forms provided by lawyers and judges, active or retired, who are reasonably likely to have knowledge of the candidate's qualifications. Comment forms are provided to lawyers and judges whose names are provided to the Committee by the candidate. The Committee also seeks comment from a broad cross-section of lawyers and judges in the counties and the areas of law in which the candidate practices or serves as a judicial officer.

In addition to the confidential comment forms, each candidate is asked to provide the Committee with a personal data questionnaire that provides professional and personal background information related to the candidate's ability to serve as a judicial officer. Each candidate is also personally interviewed by the Committee, which provides the candidate with an opportunity to respond to adverse information and present any additional information that may support the candidate's qualifications for judicial office.