NSBA

Contact: Liz Neeley, Executive Director 402-742-8129

News Release – ***For Immediate Release*** ***402-742-8129***

July 28, 2024

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Lawyers Give High Marks to State's Judges

LINCOLN – The Nebraska State Bar Association (NSBA) today released results of its 2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation. Lawyers responding to the poll recommend that 99% of the 142 judges evaluated be retained on the bench. Fifty-four percent of the judges evaluated were given a 90% or higher retention approval. Thirty-two percent of the judges received an 80-89% retention approval, and eight percent of the judges received an 70-79% retention approval.

The NSBA first used the Judicial Evaluation Poll in 1984. It is conducted biennially. "The poll provides an important way to provide feedback to the judiciary and to help the public better understand Nebraska's merit system for the selection and retention of judges by providing information useful in making an informed decision about judges standing for retention." said Hon. Tricia Freeman, President of the NSBA.

An electronic survey was sent to 5,307 active NSBA members residing in Nebraska, Council Bluffs and Sioux City, Iowa and Yankton, South Dakota. Attorneys were instructed to evaluate only judges with whom they had recent, firsthand professional experience; or in the case of appeals court judges, with whose written opinions they were familiar. Ultimately, 1,022 members completed the evaluation. The American Bar Association Center for Bar Leadership, in Chicago, compiled the results. The results may be viewed at http://www.nebar.com.

2024 JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NEBRASKA
State Bar Association

Contents

Background Information 1
JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION IN 2024 3
Nebraska Supreme Court 5
Nebraska Court of Appeals 6
NE District Court – District 1 7
NE District Court – District 2 8
NE District Court – District 3 9
NE District Court – District 4 (part 1, judges 1-9) 10
NE District Court – District 4 (part 2, judges 10-16) 11
NE District Court – District 5 12
NE District Court – District 6 13
NE District Court – District 7 14
NE District Court – District 8 15
NE District Court – District 9 16
NE District Court – District 10 17
NE District Court – District 11 18
NE District Court – District 12 19
NE County Court – District 1 20
NE County Court – District 2 21
NE County Court – District 3 22
NE County Court – District 4 (part 1, judges 1-6) 23
NE County Court – District 4 (part 2, judges 7-11) 24
NE County Court – District 5 25
NE County Court – District 6 26
NE County Court – District 7 27
NE County Court – District 8 28
NE County Court – District 9 29
NE County Court – District 10 30
NE County Court – District 11 31
NE County Court – District 12 32
Workers' Compensation Court 33
NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 2 34
NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 3 35
NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 4 36

Social Security 37
US District Court – Chief Judge 38
US District Court – Lincoln 39
US District Court – Omaha 40
US District Court – Bankruptcy 41
Index 42

Background Information
2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation

Conducted by: The Nebraska State Bar Association
635 S. 14th St. #200
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402) 475-7091 Fax (402) 475-7098
Web page: www.nebar.com
For Interview: Liz Neeley, Executive Director, (402) 742-8129
For Information: Sam Clinch, Associate Executive Director, (402) 742-8125
E-mail: sclinch@nebar.com

Purpose: The 2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation is the 21st biennial evaluation of Nebraska judges by Nebraska lawyers. The evaluation's purpose is two-fold: to provide each judge with a continuing assessment of his or her strengths and weaknesses, thereby improving the overall quality of the judiciary; and to help the public better understand Nebraska's merit system for the selection and retention of judges by providing information useful in making an informed decision about judges standing for retention.

Procedures: The evaluation was disseminated in April to active licensed lawyers residing in Nebraska, Council Bluffs and Sioux City, Iowa and Yankton, South Dakota. Judicial members are ineligible to participate and did not receive the poll. Unless requested, judges with less than one year's tenure on the bench were not evaluated. A total of 5,307 evaluations were disseminated. The response deadline was May 24, 2024.

Instructions: The poll was disseminated to 5,307 attorneys. Attorneys were instructed to evaluate only judges with whom they had recent, first-hand professional experience; or in the case of appeals court judges, with whose written opinions they were familiar. Ultimately, 1,022 evaluations were completed. Attorneys were allowed to evaluate up to 54 District Court and 58 County Court judges, and any or all Supreme Court, Workers' Compensation Court, Juvenile Court and Federal Court judges.

Attorneys were asked to review characteristics carefully, and then assign each a numerical rating using a scale of "5" (excellent) to "1" (very poor). If they could not rate a judge on a particular characteristic, they were asked to mark "no opinion". Attorneys were also asked to indicate whether, in their opinion, the judge should be retained in office.

The evaluation is voluntary. Bar members have the opportunity to indicate their unwillingness to participate, or to decline to participate based on ineligibility (attorneys without a trial practice or who were recently admitted to the practice of law). All responses were confidential. No name, location or other identifying information was solicited or tabulated.

Results: The attached results represent an average score on each characteristic for each judge, using the 5-point scale noted on the top of each page. No attempt has been made to determine an overall rating for each judge, nor has any attempt been made to compare one judge's scores with those of any other judge. That is not the purpose of this evaluation and such a comparison would not be statistically valid.

No attempt has been made to verify the answers expressed by lawyers responding to the poll. The American Bar Association Center for Bar Leadership, based in Chicago, compiled the results. All specific characteristic questions were rounded to one decimal place, while all retention questions were rounded to two decimal places. The responses represent a collection of individual opinions, which have been gathered and tabulated solely for their informational value. The Judicial Performance Evaluation does not present scientifically accurate conclusions, nor does the poll constitute an official NSBA opinion or position. It is a collection of individual opinions gathered and tabulated solely for informational value.

How Nebraska Judges are Selected and Retained:

Judges of Nebraska courts are selected through merit selection or the "Missouri Plan." When a judicial vacancy occurs, individuals interested in being appointed to the bench submit their names for consideration.

Merit Selection judges are appointed by the governor, but the appointment is made after a politically balanced, nine-member commission reviews applicants, evaluates their qualifications, and holds public interviews. Comments from the public are encouraged and considered in the selection process. For each judicial vacancy, the commission selects at least two nominees whose names are sent to the governor for consideration and appointment.

In a retention election, voters decide whether a judge should be retained on the bench or removed from office.

A judge must run for retention in office in the first general election that occurs more than three (3) years after his or her appointment, and every six (6) years thereafter. When a judge runs for retention in office, the question presented on the voters' ballots states: "Shall Judge _____ be retained in office?" If there are more votes to retain a judge than to remove him or her, then the judge remains on the bench for an additional six (6) years.

Note: Judges are listed in order by judicial district. Refer to the enclosed alphabetical index to find the page on which a judge's name appears. Copies of previous survey results available upon request from Sam Clinch at the NSBA office, (402) 742-8125 or sclinch@nebar.com.

2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation
Nebraska State Bar Association

JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION IN 2024

Nebraska Supreme Court
Stephanie Stacy

NE District Court – District 3
Lori Maret
Ryan Post
Susan Strong

NE District Court – District 4
Tressa Alioth
J. Russell Derr
Todd Engleman
Jeffrey Lux
Leigh Ann Retelsdorf
Horacio Wheelock

NE District Court – District 5
Rachel Daugherty
James Stecker

NE District Court – District 7
James Kube

NE District Court – District 12
Derek Weimer

NE County Court – District 1
Linda Bauer
Jeffrey Gaertig

NE County Court – District 3
Holly Parsley
Thomas Zimmerman

NE County Court – District 4
Stephanie Hansen

NE County Court – District 5
Lynelle Homolka

NE County Court – District 6
Francis Barron III
Edward Matney

NE County Court – District 8
James Orr

NE County Court – District 9
Gerald Jorgensen
John Rademacher

NE County Court – District 10
Michael Mead

Workers' Compensation Court
Julie Martin

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 2
Jonathon Crosby

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 3
Shellie Sabata
Elise White

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 4
Candice Novak
Amy Schuchman
Mary Stevens

Nebraska Supreme Court

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Michael **Heavican**	William **Cassel**	John **Freudenburg**	Jeffrey **Funke**	Lindsey **Miller-Lerman**	Jonathan **Papik**	Stephanie **Stacy***
1	Legal Analysis	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.9
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1

8	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**						
		83.3%	79.88%	81.94%	83.65%	89.31%	83.66%	85.28%
		No						
		16.7%	20.12%	18.06%	16.35%	10.69%	16.34%	14.72%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

Nebraska Court of Appeals

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Michael **Pirtle**	David **Arterburn**	Riko **Bishop**	Frankie **Moore**	Francie **Riedmann**	Lawrence **Welch Jr.**
1	Legal Analysis	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.1	4.3	3.9
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.1
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.9
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.0
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.2
11	Trial Management	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.1

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**					
		89.66%	87.01%	88.76%	90.48%	87.78%	86.08%
		No					
		10.34%	12.99%	11.24%	9.52%	12.22%	13.92%

NE District Court – District 1

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	David **Bargen**	Rick **Schreiner**	Julie **Smith**
1	Legal Analysis	4.3	3.6	4.4
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.2	3.3	4.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.6	3.9	4.6
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.3	3.6	4.5
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.5	3.3	4.6
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.6	3.2	4.6
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.9	3.9	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.5	3.7	4.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.3	4.0	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.5	4.4	4.7
11	Trial Management	4.5	4.0	4.6

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		95.12%	72.22%	98.21%
		No		
		4.88%	27.78%	1.79%

NE District Court – District 2

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Nathan **Cox**	Stefanie **Martinez**	Michael **Smith**	George **Thompson**
1	Legal Analysis	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.2
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.2
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.6
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.4
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.5

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		90.20%	84.91%	87.50%	94.79%
		No			
		9.80%	15.09%	12.50%	5.21%

NE District Court – District 3

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Darla **Ideus**	Andrew **Jacobsen**	Lori **Maret***	Kevin **McManaman**	Matthew **Mellor**	Jodi **Nelson**	Ryan **Post***	Susan **Strong***
1	Legal Analysis	4.0	4.0	2.5	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.2
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.8	4.2	2.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.1	4.3	2.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.1	4.1	2.7	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.4	4.3	2.0	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.6	4.4
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.6	4.3	2.2	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.6	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.9	4.2	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.9	4.3	2.6	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.8	4.2	3.0	3.9	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	4.4	3.3	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4
11	Trial Management	3.9	4.4	3.0	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4

8	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**							
		81.42%	91.67%	34.88%	92.73%	95.12%	87.80%	93.75%	92.38%
		No							
		18.58%	8.33%	65.12%	7.27%	4.88%	12.20%	6.25%	7.62%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE District Court – District 4 (part 1, judges 1-9)

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Tressa **Alioth***	Peter **Bataillon**	Katie **Benson**	W. Russell **Bowie III**	Timothy **Burns**	J. Russell **Derr***	Duane **Dougherty**	Todd **Engleman***	Molly **Keane**
1	Legal Analysis	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.0
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.1
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.3	4.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.1	3.6	3.7	3.8	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.3
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.7	4.4	3.9	4.1	4.4	4.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.1	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.3
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.4	3.7	4.2	4.4	4.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.4
11	Trial Management	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.5	4.3

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**								
		85.82%	73.89%	85.47%	81.45%	93.84%	81.29%	93.65%	93.04%	94.50%
		No								
		14.18%	26.11%	14.53%	18.55%	6.16%	18.71%	6.35%	6.96%	5.50%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE District Court – District 4 (part 2, judges 10-16)

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Jeffrey **Lux***	James **Masteller**	Kimberly **Miller Pankonin**	Marlon **Polk**	Leigh Ann **Retelsdorf***	LeAnne **Srb**	Shelly **Stratman**	Horacio **Wheelock***
1	Legal Analysis	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.5	4.1	3.8	4.3	4.7
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.3	4.6
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.2	4.4	4.2	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.8
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.7
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.7
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.2	4.4	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.3	4.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.7
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.0	4.3	4.2	3.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.3	4.5	4.3	3.5	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.7
11	Trial Management	4.2	4.4	4.3	3.5	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.8

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**							
		92.00%	92.03%	92.80%	74.24%	87.41%	85.45%	94.49%	98.76%
		No							
		8.00%	7.97%	7.20%	25.76%	12.59%	14.55%	5.51%	1.24%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE District Court – District 5

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Jason **Bergevin**	Rachel **Daugherty***	Christina **Marroquin**	James **Stecker***
1	Legal Analysis	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.0
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.1
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.0
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.6	4.2	4.6	3.9
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.2
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.3
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.2
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.7	4.2	4.7	4.4
11	Trial Management	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.3

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		100.00%	91.94%	97.44%	89.83%
		No			
		0.00%	8.06%	2.56%	10.17%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE District Court – District 6

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Geoffrey **Hall**	Bryan **Meismer**
1	Legal Analysis	4.1	4.1
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.9	4.4
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.3	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.2	4.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.8	4.5
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.9	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.3	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.9	4.6
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.3	4.5
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.3	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.2	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**	
		86.36%	92.86%
		No	
		13.64%	7.14%

NE District Court – District 7

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Mark **Johnson**	James **Kube***
1	Legal Analysis	4.2	4.2
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.1	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.5	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.2	4.4
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.3	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.4	4.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.3	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.3	4.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.7	4.6
11	Trial Management	4.5	4.5

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**	
		92.68%	94.87%
		No	
		7.32%	5.13%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE District Court – District 8

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Mark **Kozisek**	Karin **Noakes**
1	Legal Analysis	4.3	3.4
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	3.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.4	4.0
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.3	3.6
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.5	3.7
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.8	3.8
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.4	4.0
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.3	4.1
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.4	3.9
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.6	4.3
11	Trial Management	4.4	3.8

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**	
		92.00%	80.43%
		No	
		8.00%	19.57%

NE District Court – District 9

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Andrew **Butler**	Ryan **Carson**	Patrick **Lee**	John **Marsh**
1	Legal Analysis	4.0	4.5	3.4	3.6
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.3	3.2	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.4	4.7	4.1	4.0
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.7
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.1	4.5	3.7	4.4
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	4.5	3.9	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.1
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.4	4.6	3.7	4.5
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.1
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4
11	Trial Management	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.2

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		92.68%	96.15%	69.57%	96.30%
		No			
		7.32%	3.85%	30.43%	3.70%

NE District Court – District 10

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Morgan **Farquhar**
1	Legal Analysis	3.1
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	3.6
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.6
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.6
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	3.6
11	Trial Management	3.6

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	Yes
		58.49%
		No
		41.51%

NE District Court – District 11

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Patrick **Heng**	Michael **Piccolo**	Cindy **Volkmer**
1	Legal Analysis	4.0	4.6	2.8
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.1	4.6	3.1
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.3	4.7	3.6
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.1	4.6	3.0
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.5	4.7	3.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.3	4.6	3.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.3	4.5	3.0
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.4	4.7	3.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.2	4.5	3.2
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.5	4.7	3.7
11	Trial Management	4.2	4.7	3.6

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		96.30%	100.00%	53.06%
		No		
		3.70%	0.00%	46.94%

NE District Court – District 12

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Leo **Dobrovolny**	Andrea **Miller**	Travis **O'Gorman**	Derek **Weimer***
1	Legal Analysis	3.5	3.9	4.4	4.5
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.5	4.3	4.3	4.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.8
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.6	4.0	4.5	4.5
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.2	4.3	4.5	4.7
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.3	4.3	4.5	4.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.6	4.0	4.6	4.6
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.7	4.2	4.5	4.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.9	4.1	4.5	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.8
11	Trial Management	3.8	4.0	4.6	4.7

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		82.76%	96.30%	97.62%	100.00%
		No			
		17.24%	3.70%	2.38%	0.00%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 1

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Linda **Bauer***	Jeffrey **Gaertig***	Richard **Smith**
1	Legal Analysis	4.6	4.1	4.7
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.8	3.9	4.7
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.8	4.4	4.7
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.6	4.2	4.7
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.9	4.4	4.8
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.9	4.3	4.8
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.8	4.0	4.8
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.8	4.5	4.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.7	4.0	4.8
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.9	4.1	4.8
11	Trial Management	4.8	4.1	4.7

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		93.33%	89.29%	95.45%
		No		
		6.67%	10.71%	4.55%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 2

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	PaTricia **Freeman**	Todd **Hutton**	S. Colin **Palm**	David **Partsch**
1	Legal Analysis	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.5
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.6
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.7
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.8	4.6	4.6	4.8
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.6
11	Trial Management	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.6

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		85.71%	98.15%	100.00%	100.00%
		No			
		14.29%	1.85%	0.00%	0.00%

NE County Court – District 3

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Matthew **Acton**	Joseph **Dalton**	Holly **Parsley***	Timothy **Phillips**	Rodney **Reuter**	Laurie **Yardley**	Thomas **Zimmerman***
1	Legal Analysis	4.6	3.5	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.1
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.1	3.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.5	3.7	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.6	3.6	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.5	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.1	3.3	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.5
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.3	3.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.6	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.6	4.4
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.3	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.5
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.6	4.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.5

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**						
		90.91%	71.70%	90.41%	89.83%	85.96%	96.43%	89.47%
		No						
		9.09%	28.30%	9.59%	10.17%	14.04%	3.57%	10.53%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 4 (part 1, judges 1-6)

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Grant **Forsberg**	Stephanie **Hansen***	Thomas **Harmon**	Marcena **Hendrix**	John **Huber**	Marcela **Keim**
1	Legal Analysis	3.6	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.6	4.1
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.7	4.4	4.3	3.8	3.5	4.0
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.0	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.6	4.1
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.7	4.3	4.2	3.8	3.6	4.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.3	3.6
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.5	3.9
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.9	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.8	4.2
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.0
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.8	4.2
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.2
11	Trial Management	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.8	4.2

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**					
		79.38%	92.45%	88.55%	89.72%	84.85%	87.27%
		No					
		20.62%	7.55%	11.45%	10.28%	15.15%	12.73%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 4 (part 2, judges 7-11)

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Sheryl **Lohaus**	Darryl **Lowe**	Jeff **Marcuzzo**	Craig **McDermott**	Stephanie **Shearer**
1	Legal Analysis	3.8	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.4
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.8	2.6	3.9	4.4	4.4
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	3.9	2.9	4.0	4.5	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.9	2.8	4.0	4.4	4.4
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.7	2.4	3.9	4.5	4.5
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.8	2.4	4.0	4.4	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.0	3.0	4.1	4.5	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.0	2.8	4.0	4.4	4.6
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.1	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	3.1	4.1	4.5	4.6
11	Trial Management	4.0	3.1	4.1	4.5	4.5

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**				
		84.47%	47.86%	85.29%	100.00%	97.20%
		No				
		15.53%	52.14%	14.71%	0.00%	2.80%

NE County Court – District 5

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Lynelle **Homolka***	Denise **Kracl**	Andrew **Lange**	C. Jo **Petersen**	Stephen **Twiss**
1	Legal Analysis	3.9	4.1	4.7	3.9	4.3
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.6	4.4	4.5	3.4	4.4
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.2	4.4	4.7	3.9	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	4.2	4.6	3.9	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.5	4.8	2.5	3.9
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.9	4.5	4.7	2.9	4.0
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.9	4.0	4.7	4.0	4.2
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.1	4.5	4.7	3.6	4.2
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.1	3.8	4.7	3.9	4.1
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.3	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.4	4.1	4.7	4.0	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**				
		81.58%	91.67%	100.00%	65.79%	85.71%
		No				
		18.42%	8.33%	0.00%	34.21%	14.29%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 6

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Francis **Barron III***	Sara **Bauer**	Thomas **Klein**	Edward **Matney***
1	Legal Analysis	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.2
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.4	4.5	4.5	4.2
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.0	4.6	4.7	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.0	4.7	4.7	4.4
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.2	4.7	4.4	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	3.8	4.4	4.5	4.4
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.6	4.7	4.6	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.9	4.6	4.0	4.5
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	3.9	4.7	4.3	4.6
11	Trial Management	4.1	4.7	4.3	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		76.32%	88.24%	100.00%	87.10%
		No			
		23.68%	11.76%	0.00%	12.90%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 7

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Michael **Long**	Ross **Stoffer**	Donna **Taylor**
1	Legal Analysis	4.5	3.8	4.0
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.9	3.8	4.2
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.5	4.4	4.3
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.5	4.0	4.1
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.2	4.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.0	4.1	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.5	3.9	4.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.0	4.1	4.5
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.4	3.7	4.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.5	4.0	4.3
11	Trial Management	4.6	4.1	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		92.31%	91.30%	96.00%
		No		
		7.69%	8.70%	4.00%

NE County Court – District 8

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Kale **Burdick**	James **Orr***	Tami **Schendt**
1	Legal Analysis	4.7	4.0	4.3
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.8	4.1	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.8	4.3	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.8	4.2	4.2
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.8	4.3	4.4
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.8	4.4	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.7	4.2	4.4
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7	4.3	4.5
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.7	4.3	4.2
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.7	4.3	4.4
11	Trial Management	4.8	4.5	4.3

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		100.00%	100.00%	93.10%
		No		
		0.00%	0.00%	6.90%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 9

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Alfred **Corey**	Gerald **Jorgensen***	Bryan **McQuay**	John **Rademacher***	Arthur **Wetzel**
1	Legal Analysis	3.2	4.1	4.3	4.6	3.7
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.4	3.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.2
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.5	4.1	4.4	4.5	3.8
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.9	4.6	4.6	4.1	3.4
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.4	3.6
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.1	3.5	4.4	4.6	4.1
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.5	3.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.6	3.7	4.2	4.5	3.9
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	3.2	4.6	4.6	4.1
11	Trial Management	3.7	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.3

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**				
		69.70%	100.00%	100.00%	98.00%	76.67%
		No				
		30.30%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%	23.33%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 10

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Michael **Burns**	Timothy **Hoeft**	Michael **Mead***
1	Legal Analysis	4.1	4.6	3.8
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.6	4.1
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.3	4.7	4.2
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.2	4.5	3.9
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.6	4.2
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.1	4.6	4.4
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.3	4.5	4.0
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.3	4.6	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.2	4.6	4.1
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.4	4.6	4.3
11	Trial Management	4.4	4.7	4.2

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**		
		89.80%	100.00%	93.48%
		No		
		10.20%	0.00%	6.52%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE County Court – District 11

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Joel **Jay**	Anne **Paine**	Tanya **Roberts-Connick**	Edward **Steenburg**	Jeffrey **Wightman**
1	Legal Analysis	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.6	4.4
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.4	4.3	3.4	4.3	4.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.6
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.7	4.5
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.4	4.5	3.7	4.4	4.5
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.5	4.5	3.6	4.4	4.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.5	4.5	3.9	4.6	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.5	4.5	3.7	4.7	4.5
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.7	4.8
11	Trial Management	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.6

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**				
		94.29%	91.89%	81.08%	96.77%	96.97%
		No				
		5.71%	8.11%	18.92%	3.23%	3.03%

NE County Court – District 12

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Aaron **Conn**	Kris **Mickey**	Randin **Roland**	Paul **Wess**	James **Worden**
1	Legal Analysis	3.6	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.3
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.8	3.2	4.5	4.5	4.0
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.1	4.2	4.7	4.6	4.2
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	4.0	4.7	4.4	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	3.9	3.5	4.5	4.6	4.2
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.8	3.5	4.5	4.7	4.2
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.0	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.2
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.9	3.7	4.7	4.7	4.3
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	3.7	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.3
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.0	4.0	4.8	4.5	4.4
11	Trial Management	3.7	4.1	4.8	4.6	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**				
		92.31%	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%	96.30%
		No				
		7.69%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%

Workers' Compensation Court

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Dirk **Block**	Daniel **Fridrich**	John **Hoffert**	Julie **Martin***	Thomas **Stine**
1	Legal Analysis	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.3
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.2	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.0
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.4
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.0
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.2
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.3
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.4
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.3

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	92.86%	100.00%	100.00%	91.67%	88.00%
		7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	12.00%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 2

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Jonathon **Crosby***	Sarah **Moore**
1	Legal Analysis	3.6	3.8
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.7	3.9
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.0	4.2
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.7	4.0
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.1	4.1
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	3.9	3.9
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.1	4.2
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	3.9	3.9
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.0	4.2
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.3	4.1
11	Trial Management	4.3	4.0

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**	
		78.26%	88.24%
		No	
		21.74%	11.76%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 3

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Roger **Heideman**	Reggie **Ryder**	Shellie **Sabata***	Elise **White***
1	Legal Analysis	4.5	4.0	3.7	4.2
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.4	3.6	3.5	4.3
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.7	3.8	3.9	4.6
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.7	3.7	3.6	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.7	4.3	3.3	4.5
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7	4.0	3.9	4.5
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.8	4.3	3.4	4.5
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8	4.4	3.3	4.5
11	Trial Management	4.7	4.3	3.6	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**			
		100.00%	84.21%	77.78%	94.74%
		No			
		0.00%	15.79%	22.22%	5.26%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

NE Separate Juvenile Court – District 4

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Chad **Brown**	Vernon **Daniels**	Matthew **Kahler**	Candice **Novak***	Amy **Schuchman***	Mary **Stevens***
1	Legal Analysis	3.8	4.1	4.2	3.5	4.0	4.1
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	3.9	4.1	4.2	3.4	3.9	4.1
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.4
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	3.9	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.2
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.2	3.7	4.4	3.2	4.2	4.5
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.0	4.2	4.3	3.4	4.2	4.3
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.0	3.6	4.3	3.4	4.4	4.0
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.2	4.3	4.3	3.6	4.3	4.4
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.1	3.4	4.4	3.5	4.3	4.1
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.1	3.8	4.5	3.1	4.3	4.4
11	Trial Management	4.1	3.7	4.4	3.4	4.3	4.4

12	In your opinion, should this judge be retained in office?	**Yes**					
		91.11%	82.00%	93.18%	76.32%	92.68%	91.49%
		No					
		8.89%	18.00%	6.82%	23.68%	7.32%	8.51%

*RETENTION DATE 11/5/2024

Social Security

Note: Fewer than 10 respondents evaluated the Judges listed on this page. Given the small number of respondents, please interpret the results with caution.

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Matthew **Bring**	David **Buell**	Matthew **Dawson**	David **DeLaittre**	Jan **Dutton**	Chris **Yokus**
1	Legal Analysis	4.8	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.0	2.7
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.6	4.0	4.3	4.5	2.8	2.0
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.5	3.1	3.0
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.0	4.7	4.3	4.5	3.4	3.3
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.8	2.6	2.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	2.7	2.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.0	4.7	4.7	4.8	3.4	3.3
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.2	4.3	4.7	4.5	3.0	1.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.3	4.0	5.0	4.7	3.1	3.0
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8	4.3	4.7	4.3	3.4	4.0
11	Trial Management	4.7	4.5	5.0	4.7	3.0	4.0

US District Court – Chief Judge

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Robert **Rossiter**
1	Legal Analysis	4.6
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.5
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.8
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.6
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.7
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.7
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.7
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.7
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8
11	Trial Management	4.7

US District Court – Lincoln

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Jacqueline **DeLuca**	John **Gerrard**
1	Legal Analysis	4.4	4.8
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.6	4.6
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.8	4.7
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.3	4.7
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.8	4.7
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.6	4.6
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.5	4.6
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.5	4.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.5	4.6
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.7	4.9
11	Trial Management	4.3	4.8

US District Court – Omaha

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Joseph **Bataillon**	Susan **Bazis**	Brian **Buescher**	F.A **Gossett III**	Michael **Nelson**
1	Legal Analysis	4.1	4.6	3.7	4.2	4.5
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.0	4.7	3.4	4.2	4.7
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.3	4.8	3.7	4.3	4.8
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.1	4.6	3.8	4.4	4.6
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.3	4.7	3.3	4.2	4.8
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.4	4.7	3.4	4.3	4.8
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.2	4.7	4.1	4.5	4.8
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.4	4.8	3.5	4.4	4.8
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.3	4.8	3.9	4.4	4.8
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.5	4.8	4.1	4.5	4.8
11	Trial Management	4.5	4.7	3.7	4.5	4.8

US District Court – Bankruptcy

Scale: 5 = Excellent (outstanding performance) | 4 = Good (above average performance) | 3 = Satisfactory (adequate performance) | 2 = Deficient (below average performance) | 1 = Very Poor (performance is well below average and unacceptable)

	Characteristics	Brian **Kruse**	Thomas **Saladino**
1	Legal Analysis	4.8	4.6
2	Impartiality: actions not affected by any outside influence or the nature of the case	4.6	4.4
3	Attentiveness: oral arguments	4.7	4.5
4	Opinions: quality and clarity of writing	4.8	4.6
5	Judicial Temperament & Demeanor	4.6	4.3
6	Appropriate Communication: absence of undue personal observations or criticisms of litigants, judges or lawyers; from the bench or in written opinions	4.6	4.5
7	Does the judge do their work in a prompt and timely manner?	4.8	4.8
8	Fairness: treats all equally, without regard to race, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation or economic status	4.7	4.7
9	Efficiency: Docket management and scheduling	4.8	4.8
10	Punctuality: attendance at court proceedings	4.8	4.9
11	Trial Management	4.8	4.8

2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation
Nebraska State Bar Association

INDEX

Legend

S - Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** - Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** - Nebraska District Court | **C** - Nebraska County Court | **J** - Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court | **W** - Workers Compensation Court | **F** - Federal Judges | **B** - Bankruptcy Court | **SS** - Social Security Administration Law Court

Retention Date 11/2024

Judge (Court)	Page
Acton, Matthew (C)	22
***Alioth, Tressa (D)**	10
Arterburn, David (A)	6
Bargen, David J.A. (D)	7
***Barron III, Francis (C)**	26
Bataillon, Joseph (F)	40
Bataillon, Peter (D)	10
***Bauer, Linda (C)**	20
Bauer, Sara (C)	26
Bazis, Susan (F)	40
Benson, Katie (D)	10
Bergevin, Jason (D)	12
Bishop, Riko (A)	6
Block, Dirk (W)	33
Bowie III, W. Russell (D)	10
Bring, Matthew (SS)	37
Brown, Chad (J)	36
Buell, David (SS)	37
Buescher, Brian (F)	40
Burdick, Kale (C)	28
Burns, Michael (C)	30
Burns, Timothy (D)	10
Butler, Andrew (D)	16
Carson, Ryan (D)	16
Cassel, William (S)	5
Conn, Aaron (C)	32
Corey III, Alfred (C)	29
Cox, Nathan (D)	8
***Crosby, Jonathon (J)**	34
Dalton, Joseph (C)	22

Judge (Court)	Page
Daniels, Vernon (J)	36
***Daugherty, Rachel (D)**	12
Dawson, Matthew (SS)	37
DeLaittre, David (SS)	37
DeLuca, Jacqueline (F)	39
***Derr, J. Russell (D)**	10
Dobrovolny, Leo (D)	19
Dougherty, Duane (D)	10
Dutton, Jan (SS)	37
***Engleman, Todd (D)**	10
Farquhar, Morgan (D)	17
Forsberg, Grant (C)	23
Freeman, PaTricia (C)	21
Freudenburg, John (S)	5
Fridrich, Daniel (W)	33
Funke, Jeffrey (S)	5
***Gaertig, Jeffrey (C)**	20
Gerrard, John (F)	39
Gossett III, F.A. (F)	40
Hall, Geoffrey (D)	13
***Hansen, Stephanie (C)**	23
Harmon, Thomas (C)	23
Heavican, Michael (S)	5
Heideman, Roger (J)	35
Hendrix, Marcena (C)	23
Heng, Patrick (D)	18
Hoeft, Timothy (C)	30
Hoffert, John (W)	33
***Homolka, Lynelle (C)**	25
Huber, John (C)	23

2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation
Nebraska State Bar Association

INDEX

Legend

S - Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** - Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** - Nebraska District Court | **C** - Nebraska County Court | **J** - Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court | **W** - Workers Compensation Court | **F** - Federal Judges | **B** - Bankruptcy Court | **SS** - Social Security Administration Law Court

Retention Date 11/2024

Judge (Court)	Page
Hutton, Todd (C)	21
Ideus, Darla (D)	9
Jacobsen, Andrew (D)	9
Jay, Joel (C)	31
Johnson, Mark (D)	14
***Jorgensen, Gerald (C)**	29
Kahler, Matthew (J)	36
Keane, Molly (D)	10
Keim, Marcela (C)	23
Klein, Thomas (C)	26
Kozisek, Mark (D)	15
Kracl, Denise (C)	25
Kruse, Brian (B)	41
***Kube, James (D)**	14
Lange, Andrew (C)	25
Lee, Patrick (D)	16
Lohaus, Sheryl (C)	24
Long, Michael (C)	27
Lowe, Darryl (C)	24
***Lux, Jeffrey (D)**	11
Marcuzzo, Jeff (C)	24
***Maret, Lori (D)**	9
Marroquin, Christina (D)	12
Marsh, John (D)	16
***Martin, Julie (W)**	33
Martinez, Stefanie (D)	8
Masteller, James (D)	11
***Matney, Edward (C)**	26
McDermott, Craig (C)	24
McManaman, Kevin (D)	9

Judge (Court)	Page
McQuay, Bryan (C)	29
***Mead, Michael (C)**	30
Meismer, Bryan (D)	13
Mellor, Matthew (D)	9
Mickey, Kris (C)	32
Miller Pankonin, Kimberly (D)	11
Miller, Andrea (D)	19
Miller-Lerman, Lindsey (S)	5
Moore, Frankie (A)	6
Moore, Sarah (J)	34
Nelson, Jodi (D)	9
Nelson, Michael (F)	40
Noakes, Karin (D)	15
***Novak, Candice (J)**	36
O'Gorman, Travis (D)	19
***Orr, James (C)**	28
Paine, Anne (C)	31
Palm, S. Colin (C)	21
Papik, Jonathan (S)	5
***Parsley, Holly (C)**	22
Partsch, David (C)	21
Petersen, C. Jo (C)	25
Phillips, Timothy (C)	22
Piccolo, Michael (D)	18
Pirtle,, Michael (A)	6
Polk, Marlon (D)	11
***Post, Ryan (D)**	9
***Rademacher, John (C)**	29
***Retelsdorf, Leigh Ann (D)**	11
Reuter, Rodney (C)	22

2024 Judicial Performance Evaluation
Nebraska State Bar Association

INDEX

Legend

S - Nebraska Supreme Court | **A** - Nebraska Court of Appeals | **D** - Nebraska District Court | **C** - Nebraska County Court | **J** - Nebraska Separate Juvenile Court | **W** - Workers Compensation Court | **F** - Federal Judges | **B** - Bankruptcy Court | **SS** - Social Security Administration Law Court

Retention Date 11/2024

Judge (Court)	Page
Riedmann, Francie (A)	6
Roberts-Connick, Tanya (C)	31
Roland, Randin (C)	32
Rossiter, Jr., Robert (F)	38
Ryder, Reggie (J)	35
***Sabata, Shellie (J)**	35
Saladino, Thomas (B)	41
Schendt, Tami (C)	28
Schreiner, Rick (D)	7
***Schuchman, Amy (J)**	36
Shearer, Stephanie (C)	24
Smith, Julie (D)	7
Smith, Michael (D)	8
Smith, Richard (C)	20
Srb, LeAnne (D)	11
***Stacy, Stephanie (S)**	5
***Stecker, James (D)**	12
Steenburg, Edward (C)	31
***Stevens, Mary M.Z. (J)**	36

Judge (Court)	Page
Stine, Thomas (W)	33
Stoffer, Ross (C)	27
Stratman, Shelly (D)	11
***Strong, Susan (D)**	9
Taylor, Donna (C)	27
Thompson, George (D)	8
Twiss, Stephen (C)	25
Volkmer, Cindy (D)	18
***Weimer, Derek (D)**	19
Welch, Jr., Lawrence (A)	6
Wess, Paul (C)	32
Wetzel, Arthur (C)	29
***Wheelock, Horacio (D)**	11
***White, Elise M.W. (J)**	35
Wightman, Jeffrey (C)	31
Worden, James (C)	32
Yardley, Laurie (C)	22
Yokus, Chris (SS)	37
***Zimmerman, Thomas (C)**	22