MODIFICATION REQUEST COVER SHEET

Name of Filer	LINDA C.J. LEE
Reporting Period	☑ Annual report – calendar year 2017☐ Candidate/Appointee report
Type of Request	 □ New ☑ Renewal with No Change – <u>original granted on August 28, 2008</u> ☑ Full Commission Approval – <u>May 28, 2015</u> □ Renewal with Change
Office Held/Sought & Term	Appeals Court Judge, Division 2 Current term expires December, 2018
Application Rule(s)	 □ Income & Ownership Interest: WAC 390-28-100(b) ☑ Personal Residence: WAC 390-28-100(d) □ Attorney: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(i)) □ Judge / Judicial Candidate: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(ii)) ☑ Spousal: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(iv)) □ Other: WAC 390-28-100(1)(a)(c)
Explanation of Rule(s)	Personal residence - Real property. Regarding reporting the information otherwise required by RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(h) through (k): (i) Under WAC 390-24-200, the filer shall list the street address of each parcel, the assessor's parcel number, the abbreviated legal description appearing on property tax statements, or the complete legal description. Each property description shall be followed by the name of the county in which the property is located. (ii) No modification will be necessary if the filer describes the real property using one of the alternatives in WAC 390-24-200, plus the name of the county. (iii) A modification will be required if the filer seeks some other means to describe reportable real property including the personal residence of the filer. The commission may consider a modification, for example, when the filer or his or her immediate family member has received a threat, has a no contact order, or presents a similar personal safety concern. A prospective modification to allow nondisclosure of a residential address may be granted if the applicant or an immediate family member has received a threat, been issued a no contact order or presents a similar personal safety concern. Applicants whose spouse or registered domestic partner creates a reporting obligation for the applicant. When an applicant is required to report the activities of an entity solely because the applicant's spouse or registered domestic partner held an office, directorship, general partnership or ownership interest in the entity and the applicant does not have direct knowledge of the information that must be reported, the applicant may be allowed to satisfy the disclosure requirements of RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(g)(ii) has been received as follows: (A) All payments made by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office to the entity; (B) The business and other governmental customers or clients of the applicant's spouse/domestic partner and of the entity of which the applicant is aware; and

	(C) Any other business and other governmental customers or clients of the entity whose identities are known to the applicant and whose interests are significantly affected by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office. The commission may apply (e)(i) through (iii) of this subsection when the applicant's spouse/domestic partner is a lawyer, judge, or motor vehicle dealer.
Supporting Documents (attached)	☑ Current F-1 (filed April 14, 2018)☑ Modification Application☑ Prior order (if renewal) – August 23, 2017
Reason(s) for Modification (as stated by filer)	 Judge Lee is requesting renewal of a reporting modification that exempts her from disclosing the business and other governmental customers that paid \$12,000 or more in 2017 to the law firm, Vandeberg Johnson & Gandara, LLP.
	 Judge Lee's spouse is a director and an attorney of Vandeberg Johnson, a Tacoma law firm that employs 20 non-attorney employees. Her spouse's ownership interest in the firm is less than 10%.
	 Judge Lee said that Vandeberg Johnson operates in a partnership capacity with the Seattle law firm of Cowan Gandara, and together the two separate firms operate as Vandeberg Johnson & Gandara. Her spouse is a director with Vandeberg Johnson (the Tacoma firm) and not the collective partnership.
	 Judge Lee stated that she has no involvement with Vandeberg Johnson and Gandara. She said that she has no knowledge of or access to any information about the customers of the firm.
	 Judge Lee is also requesting a renewal of a reporting modification that would exempt her from disclosing her personal residential address information, including street address, parcel number, or legal description, on her Personal Financial Affairs Statement for 2017.
	• Judge Lee stated that as a past Pierce County Superior Court Judge, she heard cases that deal with civil matters (e.g., contract disputes, personal injury claims, real property disputes, dissolution, probate proceedings, dependencies, and other civil matters) and criminal matters (e.g., adults and juvenile criminal matters).
	 Judge Lee stated that disclosure of her residential address puts herself and her family at risk of physical harm as a result of her current and past judicial decisions. She stated that she has had threats against her personal safety during her judicial service and specifically cited a 2014 instance where a defendant was sentenced after making numerous death threats against her.
Other Issues	Judge Lee disclosed the creditor information, payment terms, security given, and the mortgage and assessed values for the property she owns.