



UAA Institute of Social
and Economic Research
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Evaluation Survey

Pro Tem Judges

Technical Report

Ashley Schroeder, MPH, Research Professional
Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional

April 28, 2023

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	5
Data Management	6
Results.....	7
Table 3: Level of Experience with Judges.....	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
Table 11: Joel H. Bolger: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Joel H. Bolger: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Steve Cole: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Steve Cole: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Robert Eastaugh: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Robert Eastaugh: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Dana Fabe: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Dana Fabe: Detailed Responses	23
Table 19: Greg Heath: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Greg Heath: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: David Mannheimer: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	26
Table 22: David Mannheimer: Detailed Responses	27
Table 23: Warren Matthews: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: Warren Matthews: Detailed Responses.....	29
Table 25: Michael P. McConahy: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	30
Table 26: Michael P. McConahy: Detailed Responses.....	31
Table 27: Patrick McKay: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	32
Table 28: Patrick McKay: Detailed Responses	33
Table 29: Anna Moran: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	34
Table 30: Anna Moran: Detailed Responses	35
Table 31: Nancy Nolan: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	36
Table 32: Nancy Nolan: Detailed Responses	37
Table 33: Eric Smith: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	38
Table 34: Eric Smith: Detailed Responses	39
Table 35: Michael Spaan: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	40
Table 36: Michael Spaan: Detailed Responses.....	41
Table 37: Michael L. Wolverton: Demographic Description of Respondents	42
Table 38: Michael L. Wolverton: Detailed Responses	43
Table 39: Mark I. Wood: Demographic Description of Respondents	44
Table 40: Mark I. Wood: Detailed Responses.....	45

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members about the judicial performance of 15 retired pro tem judges. The 15 retired pro tem judges were (presented in alphabetical order): Joel H. Bolger, Steve Cole, Robert Eastaugh, Dana Fabe, Greg Heath, David Mannheimer, Warren Matthews, Michael P. McConahy, Patrick McKay, Anna Moran, Nancy Nolan, Eric Smith, Michael Spaan, Michael L. Wolverton, and Mark I. Wood.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked bar members to evaluate the judges on six characteristics: *Legal Ability*, *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each judge by respondents with direct professional experience on all six characteristics.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Judges

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
Joel H. Bolger	124	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Steve Cole	31	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	91	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Dana Fabe	185	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Greg Heath	41	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5
David Mannheimer	74	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4
Warren Matthews	96	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	49	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.2
Patrick McKay	97	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Anna Moran	55	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2
Nancy Nolan	71	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Eric Smith	63	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Michael Spaan	70	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	106	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4
Mark I. Wood	41	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

2023 Judicial Pro Tem Survey

Introduction

The Alaska Judicial Council (“Council”) evaluates the performance of retired pro tem judges every two years at the request of the Alaska Court System. The Chief Justice uses the Council’s evaluations to determine eligibility for continued service as a retired judge pro tem pursuant to Administrative Rule 23(c). To evaluate the retired judges pro tem, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska Bar Association members and asked them to rate judges on six characteristics: *Legal Ability*, *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. ISER was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Council but returned directly to ISER for processing, data entry, and analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

This survey was conducted among Alaska Bar Association members about the judicial performance of 15 retired pro tem judges. The 15 retired pro tem judges were (presented in alphabetical order): Joel H. Bolger, Steve Cole, Robert Eastaugh, Dana Fabe, Greg Heath, David Mannheimer, Warren Matthews, Michael P. McConahy, Patrick McKay, Anna Moran, Nancy Nolan, Eric Smith, Michael Spaan, Michael L. Wolverton, and Mark I. Wood.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this pro tem evaluation survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,690 individuals invited to participate, the vast majority of individuals (3,677) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Thirteen individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 799 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered “No” to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; eight surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; and nine surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online surveys were returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 782 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned five paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper surveys were excluded because they were unsigned. Two paper surveys were excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. One paper survey was excluded because the respondent could not be identified. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, two paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 782 online surveys and two paper surveys, for a total of 784 surveys and a survey return rate of 21.2%. Of the 784 returned surveys, 367 (46.8%) did not rate any of the 15 judges; 417 respondents evaluated one or more judges. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Judge	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	784	100	417	100
Type of Practice				
No response	4	0.5	2	0.5
Private, solo	168	21.4	82	19.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	82	10.5	47	11.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	89	11.4	51	12.2
Private, corporate employee	15	1.9	10	2.4
Judge or judicial officer	59	7.5	43	10.3
Government	192	24.5	97	23.3
Public service agency or organization	36	4.6	19	4.6
Retired	126	16.1	59	14.1
Other	13	1.7	7	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	101	12.9	51	12.2
5 years or fewer	79	10.1	33	7.9
6 to 10 years	77	9.8	37	8.9
11 to 15 years	81	10.3	45	10.8
16 to 20 years	81	10.3	33	7.9
More than 20 years	365	46.6	218	52.3
Cases Handled				
No response	7	0.9	2	0.5
Prosecution	51	6.5	31	7.4
Criminal	67	8.5	34	8.2
Mixed criminal & civil	190	24.2	112	26.9
Civil	415	52.9	210	50.4
Other	54	6.9	28	6.7
Location of Practice				
No response	10	1.3	3	0.7
First District	87	11.1	33	7.9
Second District	14	1.8	6	1.4
Third District	554	70.7	319	76.5
Fourth District	88	11.2	43	10.3
Outside Alaska	31	4.0	13	3.1
Gender				
No response	11	1.4	7	1.7
Male	448	57.1	245	58.8
Female	319	40.7	161	38.6
Another identity	6	0.8	4	1.0

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the judges being evaluated, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each judge, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each judge. Both electronic and paper versions of the survey required a certification by the respondent that they had rated the judges truthfully as required by the bar's Professional Rule 8.2.

Respondents evaluated judges in six areas of performance included in the survey using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from Poor (1) to Excellent (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided for each of the performance areas.

Respondents evaluated judges in six areas of performance. Detailed instructions for each domain were provided:

Legal Ability: Please evaluate the judge's legal and factual analysis including the judge's knowledge of substantive law, evidence, and procedure, and the judge's writing clarity and precision.

Impartiality/Fairness: Please evaluate the judge's sense of basic fairness and justice and whether the judge treats all parties equally.

Integrity: Please evaluate whether the judge's conduct is free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety and whether the judge makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.

Judicial Temperament: Please evaluate the judge's courtesy and freedom from arrogance and whether the judge manifests human understanding and compassion.

Diligence: Please evaluate whether the judge is prepared for court proceedings, works diligently, and is reasonably prompt in making decisions.

Overall Evaluation: Please provide your overall assessment of the judge's performance.

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement from the Alaska Judicial Council that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial evaluation survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a secure data storage room. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

To ensure that as few duplicates or invalid surveys as possible were received, clear instructions were provided to potential paper survey respondents regarding how to handle the survey booklets:

"A postage-paid business reply envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluations. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked "Confidential," and seal the envelope. Then use the business reply envelope, being sure to sign in the space provided. The return envelope MUST BE SIGNED in order for your survey to be counted."

Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. For the surveys returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. One paper survey was returned that had an illegible signature on the outside of the envelope and had no signed comments. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis and was not

reflected in the total number of valid surveys received. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual's unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once, and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. After merging online and entered paper data, ISER analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. No duplicate surveys were identified. Had any duplicates been identified, the most complete survey data would have been retained and the duplicate removed, ensuring that only one survey per respondent was used in the data analysis.

Data Management

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper surveys were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents' level of experience with each judge is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the judges. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Judge

All respondents were asked to describe the basis of their evaluation for each judge they rated, with options of direct professional experience, professional reputation, and other personal contacts.

Table 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

Ratings of Judges

In the tables that follow, responses to the rating questions are shown in a variety of ways. Most tables show the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*). Tables 4-10 present detail on the *Overall* item. Table 4 compares all judge ratings to those from respondents with direct professional experience and includes the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*) in addition to number of respondents and average. Tables 5-10 present data only from those respondents who indicated direct professional experience. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item. Table 6 provides judges' mean scores broken down by respondents' type of practice. Table 7 provides judges' mean scores broken down by respondents' length of Alaska practice. Table 8 provides judges' mean scores broken down by respondents' type of caseload handled. Table 9 provides judges' mean scores broken down by location of practice. Table 10 provides judges' mean scores broken down by respondents' gender.

For each individual judge, Tables 11-40 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Joel H. Bolger	178	22.7	69.7	23.6	6.7
Steve Cole	39	5.0	79.5	10.3	10.3
Robert Eastaugh	119	15.2	76.5	15.1	8.4
Dana Fabe	235	30.0	78.7	17.9	3.4
Greg Heath	43	5.5	95.3	4.7	-
David Mannheimer	112	14.3	66.1	30.4	3.6
Warren Matthews	129	16.5	74.4	20.9	4.7
Michael P. McConahy	60	7.7	81.7	11.7	6.7
Patrick McKay	114	14.5	85.1	9.6	5.3
Anna Moran	67	8.5	82.1	11.9	6.0
Nancy Nolan	94	12.0	75.5	19.1	5.3
Eric Smith	81	10.3	77.8	17.3	4.9
Michael Spaan	81	10.3	86.4	9.9	3.7
Michael L. Wolverton	122	15.6	86.9	12.3	0.8
Mark I. Wood	45	5.7	91.1	4.4	4.4

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Joel H. Bolger	175	4.8	5.0	0.6	122	4.7	5.0	0.7
Steve Cole	39	4.2	4.0	1.0	31	4.0	4.0	1.0
Robert Eastaugh	118	4.8	5.0	0.5	90	4.8	5.0	0.5
Dana Fabe	233	4.7	5.0	0.7	184	4.7	5.0	0.8
Greg Heath	43	4.5	5.0	0.9	41	4.5	5.0	0.9
David Mannheimer	112	4.5	5.0	1.0	74	4.4	5.0	1.0
Warren Matthews	127	4.6	5.0	0.7	95	4.6	5.0	0.7
Michael P. McConahy	59	4.1	4.0	1.1	49	4.2	4.0	1.0
Patrick McKay	113	4.4	5.0	0.8	97	4.4	5.0	0.8
Anna Moran	66	4.2	5.0	1.0	54	4.2	4.5	1.0
Nancy Nolan	93	4.8	5.0	0.5	70	4.8	5.0	0.5
Eric Smith	81	4.2	5.0	1.2	63	4.1	5.0	1.3
Michael Spaan	80	4.4	5.0	0.9	70	4.4	5.0	0.9
Michael L. Wolverton	122	4.5	5.0	0.8	106	4.4	5.0	0.9
Mark I. Wood	45	4.6	5.0	0.8	41	4.6	5.0	0.7

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Joel H. Bolger	122	1	0.8	2	1.6	5	4.1	12	9.8	102	83.6
Steve Cole	31	1	3.2	1	3.2	7	22.6	10	32.3	12	38.7
Robert Eastaugh	90	-	-	1	1.1	2	2.2	7	7.8	80	88.9
Dana Fabe	184	1	0.5	5	2.7	11	6.0	18	9.8	149	81.0
Greg Heath	41	-	-	3	7.3	3	7.3	7	17.1	28	68.3
David Mannheimer	74	2	2.7	3	4.1	6	8.1	13	17.6	50	67.6
Warren Matthews	95	-	-	2	2.1	7	7.4	17	17.9	69	72.6
Michael P. McConahy	49	1	2.0	2	4.1	8	16.3	14	28.6	24	49.0
Patrick McKay	97	-	-	3	3.1	8	8.2	33	34.0	53	54.6
Anna Moran	54	1	1.9	4	7.4	7	13.0	15	27.8	27	50.0
Nancy Nolan	70	-	-	1	1.4	1	1.4	10	14.3	58	82.9
Eric Smith	63	4	6.3	6	9.5	7	11.1	10	15.9	36	57.1
Michael Spaan	70	-	-	3	4.3	9	12.9	15	21.4	43	61.4
Michael L. Wolverton	106	1	0.9	2	1.9	14	13.2	22	20.8	67	63.2
Mark I. Wood	41	-	-	1	2.4	3	7.3	8	19.5	29	70.7

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Joel H. Bolger	23	4.6	7	4.6	15	4.6	-	-	21	5.0	30	4.7	5	5.0	19	4.8	1	5.0	4.7
Steve Cole	6	3.8	2	3.5	-	-	-	-	5	4.4	9	3.7	-	-	8	4.5	-	-	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	18	4.8	6	4.8	9	4.8	3	5.0	9	5.0	20	4.8	3	5.0	18	4.8	3	5.0	4.8
Dana Fabe	42	4.6	19	4.5	29	4.8	6	4.8	16	4.6	22	4.5	7	5.0	37	4.8	5	5.0	4.7
Greg Heath	11	4.7	3	3.7	-	-	-	-	5	5.0	17	4.3	-	-	4	4.3	1	5.0	4.5
David Mannheimer	9	4.8	6	4.2	5	4.0	2	5.0	9	4.8	22	4.4	4	4.3	15	4.3	1	5.0	4.4
Warren Matthews	18	4.9	7	4.7	14	4.6	3	5.0	8	4.8	19	4.4	2	3.0	22	4.6	1	5.0	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	7	4.0	7	4.0	7	4.0	-	-	6	4.7	13	4.2	3	3.7	6	4.5	-	-	4.2
Patrick McKay	17	4.5	13	4.4	10	4.6	1	4.0	17	4.6	24	4.1	2	4.5	11	4.5	2	4.5	4.4
Anna Moran	6	3.5	8	3.9	1	4.0	-	-	13	4.7	17	4.0	2	4.5	7	4.4	-	-	4.2
Nancy Nolan	16	4.8	7	5.0	5	5.0	1	5.0	14	4.9	14	4.3	1	4.0	11	5.0	1	5.0	4.8
Eric Smith	16	3.9	6	4.3	4	4.8	1	5.0	7	4.6	16	3.4	2	4.0	10	4.4	1	5.0	4.1
Michael Spaan	10	4.2	2	3.0	6	4.7	3	5.0	7	4.9	21	4.3	4	4.3	15	4.5	1	4.0	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	14	4.4	6	4.7	9	4.9	1	3.0	14	4.7	39	4.3	3	4.0	19	4.4	1	5.0	4.4
Mark I. Wood	9	4.7	8	4.5	3	4.3	-	-	4	5.0	7	4.4	1	5.0	9	4.6	-	-	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Joel H. Bolger	6	4.7	8	5.0	11	4.7	7	5.0	80	4.7	4.7
Steve Cole	3	3.0	2	4.0	2	4.5	4	4.0	19	4.1	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	1	5.0	3	5.0	7	4.9	3	5.0	66	4.8	4.8
Dana Fabe	3	5.0	12	4.8	11	4.9	8	4.6	121	4.7	4.7
Greg Heath	2	4.5	5	4.4	3	4.0	8	4.5	17	4.6	4.5
David Mannheimer	4	4.0	4	4.5	5	4.2	3	4.7	46	4.5	4.4
Warren Matthews	1	5.0	3	5.0	9	4.3	3	3.7	67	4.6	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	4	4.5	6	4.3	4	4.0	4	4.5	27	4.1	4.2
Patrick McKay	6	4.0	7	4.6	11	4.8	8	4.4	53	4.4	4.4
Anna Moran	4	4.5	3	4.7	6	3.8	12	4.5	25	4.0	4.2
Nancy Nolan	2	5.0	2	3.0	5	5.0	5	4.8	47	4.8	4.8
Eric Smith	-	-	3	2.7	4	2.8	9	4.0	36	4.4	4.1
Michael Spaan	1	4.0	7	4.4	6	4.3	6	4.3	40	4.4	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	12	4.6	6	4.5	7	4.9	10	4.6	58	4.3	4.4
Mark I. Wood	1	3.0	-	-	2	4.5	2	5.0	32	4.6	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Joel H. Bolger	8	5.0	13	4.8	34	4.7	60	4.7	6	4.7	4.7
Steve Cole	4	3.5	7	3.7	10	4.4	8	3.9	2	4.5	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	3	5.0	3	5.0	20	5.0	57	4.8	6	4.7	4.8
Dana Fabe	4	4.8	9	4.9	38	4.7	121	4.7	11	4.4	4.7
Greg Heath	4	4.0	8	4.3	13	4.5	11	4.5	5	5.0	4.5
David Mannheimer	9	4.4	12	4.4	28	4.4	22	4.5	3	4.3	4.4
Warren Matthews	2	3.5	6	4.8	24	4.7	55	4.7	7	4.1	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	5	4.4	3	4.7	19	4.0	17	4.3	5	4.0	4.2
Patrick McKay	7	4.6	10	3.9	28	4.5	49	4.4	3	4.0	4.4
Anna Moran	7	4.6	6	3.8	22	4.3	16	4.0	3	3.7	4.2
Nancy Nolan	5	4.6	9	4.8	29	4.8	24	4.8	3	5.0	4.8
Eric Smith	3	4.7	7	3.4	20	4.3	29	4.1	4	4.0	4.1
Michael Spaan	11	4.6	10	4.4	21	4.5	23	4.3	4	4.0	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	16	4.3	20	4.2	36	4.6	29	4.4	5	4.6	4.4
Mark I. Wood	-	-	5	4.2	15	4.7	17	4.7	4	4.3	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Joel H. Bolger	9	4.9	-	-	101	4.8	8	3.9	3	5.0	4.7
Steve Cole	1	2.0	-	-	27	4.1	3	3.7	-	-	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	5	4.8	1	5.0	77	4.9	4	4.8	2	5.0	4.8
Dana Fabe	15	4.7	2	5.0	145	4.7	14	4.4	6	5.0	4.7
Greg Heath	1	3.0	-	-	36	4.6	3	2.7	1	5.0	4.5
David Mannheimer	2	5.0	-	-	60	4.5	8	3.5	4	5.0	4.4
Warren Matthews	6	4.8	1	5.0	79	4.6	6	4.5	2	5.0	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	4	4.8	-	-	16	4.6	29	3.9	-	-	4.2
Patrick McKay	1	5.0	1	5.0	91	4.4	3	3.7	1	5.0	4.4
Anna Moran	4	4.8	1	5.0	46	4.1	3	3.7	-	-	4.2
Nancy Nolan	-	-	-	-	65	4.8	3	4.0	1	5.0	4.8
Eric Smith	2	2.0	1	5.0	53	4.3	4	2.5	3	4.0	4.1
Michael Spaan	1	4.0	-	-	62	4.4	4	4.0	1	5.0	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	4	4.3			94	4.4	4	3.8	3	5.0	4.4
Mark I. Wood	-	-	-	-	17	4.9	23	4.4	1	4.0	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	
Joel H. Bolger	81	4.7	36	4.8	+	+	4.7
Steve Cole	19	4.1	12	3.9	-	-	4.0
Robert Eastaugh	63	4.9	24	5.0	-	-	4.8
Dana Fabe	123	4.7	57	4.7	+	+	4.7
Greg Heath	24	4.6	17	4.3	-	-	4.5
David Mannheimer	49	4.3	25	4.7	-	-	4.4
Warren Matthews	66	4.6	26	4.7	-	-	4.6
Michael P. McConahy	25	4.2	23	4.2	+	+	4.2
Patrick McKay	60	4.5	35	4.2	+	+	4.4
Anna Moran	25	3.9	26	4.3	+	+	4.2
Nancy Nolan	49	4.8	21	4.9	-	-	4.8
Eric Smith	33	4.0	27	4.2	+	+	4.1
Michael Spaan	47	4.4	21	4.3	-	-	4.4
Michael L. Wolverton	70	4.4	33	4.6	+	+	4.4
Mark I. Wood	29	4.6	12	4.6	-	-	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 11
Joel H. Bolger
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	178	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	124	69.7
Professional reputation	42	23.6
Other personal contacts	12	6.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	76	61.3
Substantial amount of experience	31	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	43	34.7
Limited amount of experience	50	40.3
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
Private, solo	31	17.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	5.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	11.8
Private, corporate employee	2	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	27	15.2
Government	41	23.0
Public service agency or organization	10	5.6
Retired	34	19.1
Other	2	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	22	12.4
5 years or fewer	8	4.5
6 to 10 years	14	7.9
11 to 15 years	14	7.9
16 to 20 years	10	5.6
More than 20 years	110	61.8
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.1
Prosecution	13	7.3
Criminal	16	9.0
Mixed criminal & civil	49	27.5
Civil	87	48.9
Other	11	6.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
First District	15	8.4
Second District	3	1.7
Third District	145	81.5
Fourth District	10	5.6
Outside Alaska	4	2.2
Gender		
No response	4	2.2
Male	114	64.0
Female	59	33.1
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 12
Joel H. Bolger
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	178	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	124	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	76	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	48	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Substantial amount of experience	31	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	43	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	50	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	42	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Other personal contacts	12	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	23	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	15	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	21	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Government	31	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7
Public service agency or organization	5	4.6	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Retired	20	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	9	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
11 to 15 years	11	4.6	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7
16 to 20 years	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
More than 20 years	81	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Criminal	13	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	35	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Civil	60	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Other	7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	10	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Second District	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	101	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Fourth District	8	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.9
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	82	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Female	37	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 13
Steve Cole
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	39	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	31	79.5
Professional reputation	4	10.3
Other personal contacts	4	10.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	67.7
Substantial amount of experience	10	32.3
Moderate amount of experience	14	45.2
Limited amount of experience	7	22.6
Type of Practice		
No response	1	2.6
Private, solo	8	20.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	5.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	12.8
Government	11	28.2
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	10	25.6
Other	1	2.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	7.7
5 years or fewer	3	7.7
6 to 10 years	2	5.1
11 to 15 years	3	7.7
16 to 20 years	5	12.8
More than 20 years	23	59.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	5	12.8
Criminal	7	17.9
Mixed criminal & civil	13	33.3
Civil	11	28.2
Other	3	7.7
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	2.6
Second District	1	2.6
Third District	33	84.6
Fourth District	3	7.7
Outside Alaska	1	2.6
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	25	64.1
Female	14	35.9
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 14
Steve Cole
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	39	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	31	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.3	3.9	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	10	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	10	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.5
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.0	4.2
Limited amount of experience	7	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.8
Other personal contacts	4	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	3.7	4.0	4.5	4.2	3.5	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	4.2	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.2	4.4
Government	9	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.7
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	3.3	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.0
6 to 10 years	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5
16 to 20 years	4	4.3	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	19	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	3.8	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.0	3.5
Criminal	7	3.6	3.9	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.7
Mixed criminal & civil	10	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Civil	8	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.9
Other	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	27	4.0	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.1
Fourth District	3	4.0	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	19	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.1
Female	12	3.8	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 15
Robert Eastaugh
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	119	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	91	76.5
Professional reputation	18	15.1
Other personal contacts	10	8.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	23.1
Substantial amount of experience	24	26.4
Moderate amount of experience	38	41.8
Limited amount of experience	29	31.9
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	24	20.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	5.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	10.1
Private, corporate employee	6	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	11	9.2
Government	23	19.3
Public service agency or organization	4	3.4
Retired	27	22.7
Other	4	3.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	16	13.4
5 years or fewer	1	0.8
6 to 10 years	3	2.5
11 to 15 years	8	6.7
16 to 20 years	3	2.5
More than 20 years	88	73.9
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.8
Prosecution	3	2.5
Criminal	7	5.9
Mixed criminal & civil	25	21.0
Civil	76	63.9
Other	7	5.9
Location of Practice		
No response	2	1.7
First District	8	6.7
Second District	1	0.8
Third District	98	82.4
Fourth District	7	5.9
Outside Alaska	3	2.5
Gender		
No response	3	2.5
Male	83	69.7
Female	33	27.7
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 16
Robert Eastaugh
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	119	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	91	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	70	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Substantial amount of experience	24	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	29	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	18	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	10	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	18	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.8	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8
Private, corporate employee	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	9	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Government	20	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.8
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	18	4.8	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.8
Other	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
11 to 15 years	7	5.0	4.4	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9
16 to 20 years	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
More than 20 years	67	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Criminal	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	20	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Civil	58	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Other	6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.8
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	78	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Fourth District	4	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.8
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	64	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Female	24	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 17
Dana Fabe
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	235	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	185	78.7
Professional reputation	42	17.9
Other personal contacts	8	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	72	39.1
Substantial amount of experience	48	26.1
Moderate amount of experience	74	40.2
Limited amount of experience	62	33.7
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.4
Private, solo	53	22.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	22	9.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	33	14.0
Private, corporate employee	9	3.8
Judge or judicial officer	20	8.5
Government	36	15.3
Public service agency or organization	12	5.1
Retired	44	18.7
Other	5	2.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	35	14.9
5 years or fewer	7	3.0
6 to 10 years	17	7.2
11 to 15 years	17	7.2
16 to 20 years	11	4.7
More than 20 years	148	63.0
Cases Handled		
No response	2	0.9
Prosecution	6	2.6
Criminal	15	6.4
Mixed criminal & civil	47	20.0
Civil	149	63.4
Other	16	6.8
Location of Practice		
No response	3	1.3
First District	23	9.8
Second District	2	0.9
Third District	182	77.4
Fourth District	16	6.8
Outside Alaska	9	3.8
Gender		
No response	4	1.7
Male	145	61.7
Female	85	36.2
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 18
Dana Fabe
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	235	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	185	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	72	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	112	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	48	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	74	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	62	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6
Professional reputation	42	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Other personal contacts	8	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	43	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	19	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	29	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8
Private, corporate employee	6	4.7	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8
Judge or judicial officer	16	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6
Government	22	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5
Public service agency or organization	7	4.6	4.7	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Retired	37	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Other	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	12	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8
11 to 15 years	11	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9
16 to 20 years	8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6
More than 20 years	122	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	5.0	3.8	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8
Criminal	9	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	39	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Civil	121	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Other	11	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
Location of Practice*							
First District	15	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	145	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Fourth District	14	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.4
Outside Alaska	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	123	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
Female	57	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 19
Greg Heath
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	43	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	41	95.3
Professional reputation	2	4.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	13	31.7
Substantial amount of experience	19	46.3
Moderate amount of experience	12	29.3
Limited amount of experience	10	24.4
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	12	27.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	7.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	11.6
Government	18	41.9
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	4	9.3
Other	1	2.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	16.3
5 years or fewer	2	4.7
6 to 10 years	5	11.6
11 to 15 years	3	7.0
16 to 20 years	8	18.6
More than 20 years	18	41.9
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	4	9.3
Criminal	8	18.6
Mixed criminal & civil	14	32.6
Civil	12	27.9
Other	5	11.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	2.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	38	88.4
Fourth District	3	7.0
Outside Alaska	1	2.3
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	24	55.8
Female	19	44.2
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 20
Greg Heath
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	43	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	41	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	13	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	28	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.3	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	12	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.1
Limited amount of experience	10	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	11	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	5.0
Government	17	3.9	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	5	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
11 to 15 years	3	4.0	4.0	4.7	4.7	3.3	4.0
16 to 20 years	8	4.0	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.1	4.5
More than 20 years	17	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	3.5	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Criminal	8	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	13	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.5
Civil	11	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Other	5	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	36	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
Fourth District	3	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	24	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
Female	17	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 21
David Mannheimer
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	112	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	74	66.1
Professional reputation	34	30.4
Other personal contacts	4	3.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	47.3
Substantial amount of experience	31	41.9
Moderate amount of experience	26	35.1
Limited amount of experience	17	23.0
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.9
Private, solo	13	11.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	9.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	8.9
Private, corporate employee	4	3.6
Judge or judicial officer	12	10.7
Government	29	25.9
Public service agency or organization	5	4.5
Retired	25	22.3
Other	2	1.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	17	15.2
5 years or fewer	6	5.4
6 to 10 years	7	6.3
11 to 15 years	8	7.1
16 to 20 years	3	2.7
More than 20 years	71	63.4
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.9
Prosecution	10	8.9
Criminal	17	15.2
Mixed criminal & civil	32	28.6
Civil	45	40.2
Other	7	6.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	3.6
Second District	-	-
Third District	88	78.6
Fourth District	12	10.7
Outside Alaska	8	7.1
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	69	61.6
Female	42	37.5
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 22
David Mannheimer
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	112	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	74	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	39	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	31	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	26	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.5
Limited amount of experience	17	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	34	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.3	3.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.6	3.8	4.0
Private, corporate employee	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.4	4.9	4.8
Government	22	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.4
Public service agency or organization	4	4.3	3.5	4.3	3.8	5.0	4.3
Retired	15	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.3
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.3	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.0
6 to 10 years	4	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.0	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	5	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.2	5.0	4.2
16 to 20 years	3	5.0	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7
More than 20 years	46	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	5.0	4.4	4.7	4.1	4.3	4.4
Criminal	12	4.6	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Civil	22	4.6	4.5	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.5
Other	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	60	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.5
Fourth District	8	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.5
Outside Alaska	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	49	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3
Female	25	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.8	4.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 23
Warren Matthews
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	129	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	96	74.4
Professional reputation	27	20.9
Other personal contacts	6	4.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	25.0
Substantial amount of experience	33	34.4
Moderate amount of experience	30	31.3
Limited amount of experience	33	34.4
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	28	21.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	7.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	17	13.2
Private, corporate employee	5	3.9
Judge or judicial officer	9	7.0
Government	25	19.4
Public service agency or organization	2	1.6
Retired	30	23.3
Other	3	2.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	20	15.5
5 years or fewer	2	1.6
6 to 10 years	5	3.9
11 to 15 years	10	7.8
16 to 20 years	3	2.3
More than 20 years	89	69.0
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.6
Prosecution	2	1.6
Criminal	9	7.0
Mixed criminal & civil	29	22.5
Civil	79	61.2
Other	8	6.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
First District	13	10.1
Second District	1	0.8
Third District	103	79.8
Fourth District	8	6.2
Outside Alaska	3	2.3
Gender		
No response	3	2.3
Male	88	68.2
Female	38	29.5
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 24
Warren Matthews
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	129	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	96	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	72	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	33	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	30	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	33	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Professional reputation	27	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Other personal contacts	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	19	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	5.0	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.6	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Private, corporate employee	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.8
Government	19	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0
Retired	22	4.9	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.6
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
11 to 15 years	9	4.7	4.1	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.3
16 to 20 years	3	4.0	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.0	3.7
More than 20 years	68	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	2	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Criminal	6	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	24	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Civil	56	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7
Other	7	4.7	4.1	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.1
Location of Practice*							
First District	7	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	79	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6
Fourth District	6	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.5
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	67	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Female	26	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 25
Michael P. McConahy
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	60	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	49	81.7
Professional reputation	7	11.7
Other personal contacts	4	6.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	55.1
Substantial amount of experience	18	36.7
Moderate amount of experience	15	30.6
Limited amount of experience	16	32.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	16.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	13.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	11.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	11.7
Government	17	28.3
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0
Retired	8	13.3
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	10.0
5 years or fewer	5	8.3
6 to 10 years	9	15.0
11 to 15 years	5	8.3
16 to 20 years	4	6.7
More than 20 years	31	51.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	10.0
Criminal	4	6.7
Mixed criminal & civil	24	40.0
Civil	21	35.0
Other	5	8.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	6.7
Second District	-	-
Third District	18	30.0
Fourth District	36	60.0
Outside Alaska	2	3.3
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	32	53.3
Female	27	45.0
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 26
Michael P. McConahy
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	60	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	49	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	22	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	18	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.3
Limited amount of experience	16	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	7	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	3.9	4.0	4.6	3.9	3.9	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.7	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	6	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.7
Government	13	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7
Retired	6	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.5
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.5
6 to 10 years	6	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.3
11 to 15 years	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
16 to 20 years	4	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.3	4.5	4.5
More than 20 years	27	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	4.5	4.6	5.0	4.2	4.6	4.4
Criminal	3	4.3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	19	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0
Civil	17	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.3
Other	5	3.8	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	16	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.6
Fourth District	29	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	25	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2
Female	23	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.2
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 27
Patrick McKay
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	114	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	97	85.1
Professional reputation	11	9.6
Other personal contacts	6	5.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	35.1
Substantial amount of experience	33	34.0
Moderate amount of experience	35	36.1
Limited amount of experience	29	29.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	23	20.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	13.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	10.5
Private, corporate employee	2	1.8
Judge or judicial officer	19	16.7
Government	25	21.9
Public service agency or organization	2	1.8
Retired	13	11.4
Other	3	2.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	14	12.3
5 years or fewer	6	5.3
6 to 10 years	7	6.1
11 to 15 years	12	10.5
16 to 20 years	8	7.0
More than 20 years	67	58.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	7	6.1
Criminal	10	8.8
Mixed criminal & civil	32	28.1
Civil	62	54.4
Other	3	2.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	2	1.8
Second District	1	0.9
Third District	105	92.1
Fourth District	3	2.6
Outside Alaska	3	2.6
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	73	64.0
Female	39	34.2
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 28
Patrick McKay
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	114	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	97	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	63	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	33	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	35	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	29	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	11	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	6	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.8	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	17	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.6
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Government	24	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Retired	11	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.5
Other	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	7	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	11	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.8
16 to 20 years	8	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.4
More than 20 years	53	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	7	4.0	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.6
Criminal	10	4.0	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.0	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Civil	49	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Other	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Third District	91	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	3	3.7	4.0	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	60	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Female	35	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 29
Anna Moran
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	67	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	55	82.1
Professional reputation	8	11.9
Other personal contacts	4	6.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	58.2
Substantial amount of experience	22	40.0
Moderate amount of experience	19	34.5
Limited amount of experience	14	25.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	10.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	14.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	1.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	22.4
Government	20	29.9
Public service agency or organization	2	3.0
Retired	11	16.4
Other	1	1.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	10.4
5 years or fewer	5	7.5
6 to 10 years	4	6.0
11 to 15 years	7	10.4
16 to 20 years	13	19.4
More than 20 years	31	46.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	11.9
Criminal	6	9.0
Mixed criminal & civil	28	41.8
Civil	20	29.9
Other	5	7.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	6.0
Second District	2	3.0
Third District	57	85.1
Fourth District	4	6.0
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	2	3.0
Male	31	46.3
Female	33	49.3
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 30
Anna Moran
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	67	4.2	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	55	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	32	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	23	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	22	4.1	4.0	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.8
Limited amount of experience	14	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6
Professional reputation	8	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.9
Other personal contacts	4	3.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	3.5	3.3	4.0	3.2	3.7	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.1	3.8	4.4	4.0	4.4	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Government	17	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Retired	7	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	4	4.7	4.3	5.0	4.3	4.7	4.7
11 to 15 years	6	3.8	3.7	4.2	3.8	4.6	3.8
16 to 20 years	12	4.3	4.1	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5
More than 20 years	25	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	7	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Criminal	6	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	23	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3
Civil	16	4.2	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.0
Other	3	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	47	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.1
Fourth District	3	4.0	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	25	4.0	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.1	3.9
Female	27	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 31
Nancy Nolan
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	94	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	71	75.5
Professional reputation	18	19.1
Other personal contacts	5	5.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	40.8
Substantial amount of experience	21	29.6
Moderate amount of experience	28	39.4
Limited amount of experience	22	31.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	21	22.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	9.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	6.4
Private, corporate employee	2	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	19	20.2
Government	18	19.1
Public service agency or organization	2	2.1
Retired	16	17.0
Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	14	14.9
5 years or fewer	3	3.2
6 to 10 years	2	2.1
11 to 15 years	7	7.4
16 to 20 years	7	7.4
More than 20 years	61	64.9
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	8.5
Criminal	11	11.7
Mixed criminal & civil	36	38.3
Civil	36	38.3
Other	3	3.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	1	1.1
Second District	-	-
Third District	87	92.6
Fourth District	4	4.3
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	65	69.1
Female	29	30.9
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 32
Nancy Nolan
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	94	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	71	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	42	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.8
Substantial amount of experience	21	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	28	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9
Limited amount of experience	22	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7
Professional reputation	18	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Other personal contacts	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6	5.0
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.9
Government	15	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	11	4.7	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.8	5.0
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
11 to 15 years	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	5.0
16 to 20 years	5	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.8
More than 20 years	47	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.6
Criminal	9	4.4	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	29	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Civil	24	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Other	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	66	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Fourth District	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	50	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8
Female	21	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 33
Eric Smith
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	81	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	63	77.8
Professional reputation	14	17.3
Other personal contacts	4	4.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	25.4
Substantial amount of experience	20	31.7
Moderate amount of experience	23	36.5
Limited amount of experience	20	31.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	18	22.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	7.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	7.4
Private, corporate employee	3	3.7
Judge or judicial officer	10	12.3
Government	20	24.7
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7
Retired	13	16.0
Other	2	2.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	14	17.3
5 years or fewer	3	3.7
6 to 10 years	7	8.6
11 to 15 years	10	12.3
16 to 20 years	47	58.0
More than 20 years	3	3.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	3	3.7
Criminal	8	9.9
Mixed criminal & civil	24	29.6
Civil	42	51.9
Other	4	4.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.7
Second District	2	2.5
Third District	66	81.5
Fourth District	6	7.4
Outside Alaska	4	4.9
Gender		
No response	2	2.5
Male	44	54.3
Female	34	42.0
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 34
Eric Smith
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	81	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	63	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	47	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.1	3.8
Moderate amount of experience	23	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4
Limited amount of experience	20	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1
Professional reputation	14	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	3.8	3.5	3.8	4.3	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.8
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6
Government	16	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.4
Public service agency or organization	2	5.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.5	4.0
Retired	10	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.4
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	3	3.7	2.3	2.3	2.3	3.7	2.7
11 to 15 years	4	3.5	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.5	2.8
16 to 20 years	9	4.4	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0
More than 20 years	36	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7
Criminal	7	4.0	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.9	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	20	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Civil	29	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1
Other	4	4.5	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.5	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	53	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Fourth District	4	3.5	2.3	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5
Outside Alaska	3	4.3	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0
Gender*							
Male	33	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.0
Female	27	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 35
Michael Spaan
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	81	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	70	86.4
Professional reputation	8	9.9
Other personal contacts	3	3.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	25.7
Substantial amount of experience	26	37.1
Moderate amount of experience	25	35.7
Limited amount of experience	19	27.1
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.2
Private, solo	12	14.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	2.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	9.9
Private, corporate employee	4	4.9
Judge or judicial officer	7	8.6
Government	22	27.2
Public service agency or organization	4	4.9
Retired	20	24.7
Other	1	1.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	13	16.0
5 years or fewer	1	1.2
6 to 10 years	7	8.6
11 to 15 years	6	7.4
16 to 20 years	6	7.4
More than 20 years	48	59.3
Cases Handled		
No response	2	2.5
Prosecution	11	13.6
Criminal	11	13.6
Mixed criminal & civil	22	27.2
Civil	29	35.8
Other	6	7.4
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.5
First District	2	2.5
Second District	-	-
Third District	71	87.7
Fourth District	4	4.9
Outside Alaska	2	2.5
Gender		
No response	2	2.5
Male	56	69.1
Female	23	28.4
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 36
Michael Spaan
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	81	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	70	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	52	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	26	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	25	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	19	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Professional reputation	8	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.1
Other personal contacts	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9
Government	21	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	4	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.8	4.0	4.3
Retired	15	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Other	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	7	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
11 to 15 years	6	4.5	4.2	4.7	3.7	4.2	4.3
16 to 20 years	6	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.5	4.3
More than 20 years	40	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	11	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.6
Criminal	10	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	21	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
Civil	23	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other	4	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	62	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4
Fourth District	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	47	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Female	21	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.2	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 37
Michael L. Wolverton
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	122	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	106	86.9
Professional reputation	15	12.3
Other personal contacts	1	0.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	47	44.3
Substantial amount of experience	43	40.6
Moderate amount of experience	37	34.9
Limited amount of experience	26	24.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	13.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	6.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	8.2
Private, corporate employee	2	1.6
Judge or judicial officer	16	13.1
Government	40	32.8
Public service agency or organization	3	2.5
Retired	24	19.7
Other	2	1.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	15	12.3
5 years or fewer	12	9.8
6 to 10 years	6	4.9
11 to 15 years	8	6.6
16 to 20 years	11	9.0
More than 20 years	70	57.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	16	13.1
Criminal	21	17.2
Mixed criminal & civil	39	32.0
Civil	41	33.6
Other	5	4.1
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
First District	6	4.9
Second District	-	-
Third District	107	87.7
Fourth District	5	4.1
Outside Alaska	3	2.5
Gender		
No response	2	1.6
Male	82	67.2
Female	37	30.3
Another identity	+	+

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 38
Michael L. Wolverton
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	122	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	106	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	47	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	59	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	43	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	37	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	26	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	15	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	14	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.3	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.4	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.9
Private, corporate employee	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.7
Government	39	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.3
Public service agency or organization	3	4.0	4.0	4.7	4.0	3.3	4.0
Retired	19	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.4
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	12	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.6
6 to 10 years	6	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	7	4.9	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9
16 to 20 years	10	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.2	4.6
More than 20 years	58	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	16	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.3
Criminal	20	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	36	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Civil	29	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.4
Other	5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	94	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	4	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	70	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.1	4.4
Female	33	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 39
Mark I. Wood
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	45	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	41	91.1
Professional reputation	2	4.4
Other personal contacts	2	4.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	8	19.5
Substantial amount of experience	12	29.3
Moderate amount of experience	21	51.2
Limited amount of experience	8	19.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	9	20.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	17.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	6.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	4	8.9
Government	9	20.0
Public service agency or organization	1	2.2
Retired	11	24.4
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	11.1
5 years or fewer	1	2.2
6 to 10 years	1	2.2
11 to 15 years	2	4.4
16 to 20 years	2	4.4
More than 20 years	34	75.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	5	11.1
Mixed criminal & civil	16	35.6
Civil	20	44.4
Other	4	8.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	18	40.0
Fourth District	26	57.8
Outside Alaska	1	2.2
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	32	71.1
Female	13	28.9
Another identity	-	-

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 40
Mark I. Wood
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Legal Ability <i>M</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	45	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	41	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	33	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	21	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7
Limited amount of experience	8	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Professional reputation	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	4.5	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	4	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Government	7	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	9	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5
16 to 20 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
More than 20 years	32	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	5	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	15	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Civil	17	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.7
Other	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	17	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Fourth District	23	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	29	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	12	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.