



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Technical Report

Alliana Salanguit, BA, Research Professional
Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional
Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional
Rosyland Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional

May 17-21, 2020

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

<https://iseralaska.org/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Instrumentation	4
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	4
Results.....	4
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 2: Level of Experience with Judges.....	6
Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings	7
Table 4: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	8
Table 4 (cont.): Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating.....	9
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 5: Justice Susan Carney: Description of Respondents' Experience	10
Table 6: Justice Susan Carney: Detailed Responses.....	10
Table 7: Judge Tracey Wollenberg: Description of Respondents' Experience	11
Table 8: Judge Tracey Wollenberg: Detailed Responses	11
Table 9: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto: Description of Respondents' Experience	12
Table 10: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto: Detailed Responses.....	12
Table 11: Judge Paul A. Roetman: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	13
Table 12: Judge Paul A. Roetman: Detailed Responses.....	13
Table 13: Judge Dani Crosby: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	14
Table 14: Judge Dani Crosby: Detailed Responses	14
Table 15: Judge Andrew Guidi: Description of Respondents' Experience	15
Table 16: Judge Andrew Guidi: Detailed Responses	15
Table 17: Judge Jennifer S. Henderson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 18: Judge Jennifer S. Henderson: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 19: Judge Yvonne Lamoureux: Description of Respondents' Experience	17
Table 20: Judge Yvonne Lamoureux: Detailed Responses	17
Table 21: Judge Gregory Miller: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	18
Table 22: Judge Gregory Miller: Detailed Responses	18
Table 23: Judge Christina Reigh: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	19
Table 24: Judge Christina Reigh: Detailed Responses	19
Table 25: Judge Jennifer K. Wells: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	20
Table 26: Judge Jennifer K. Wells: Detailed Responses	20
Table 27: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Description of Respondents' Experience	21
Table 28: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 29: Judge Leslie Dickson: Description of Respondents' Experience	22
Table 30: Judge Leslie Dickson: Detailed Responses	22
Table 31: Judge Michael Franciosi: Description of Respondents' Experience	23
Table 32: Judge Michael Franciosi: Detailed Responses	23
Table 33: Judge J. Patrick Hanley: Description of Respondents' Experience	24
Table 34: Judge J. Patrick Hanley: Detailed Responses	24
Table 35: Judge Michael Logue: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	25
Table 36: Judge Michael Logue: Detailed Responses	25
Table 37: Judge Kari L. McCrea: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	26
Table 38: Judge Kari L. McCrea: Detailed Responses.....	26
Table 39: Judge David R. Wallace: Description of Respondents' Experience	27
Table 40: Judge David R. Wallace: Detailed Responses.....	27

Table 41: Judge Pamela S. Washington: Description of Respondents' Experience.....28
Table 42: Judge Pamela S. Washington: Detailed Responses28
Table 43: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Description of Respondents' Experience.....29
Table 44: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Detailed Responses29
Table 45: Judge Matthew Christian: Description of Respondents' Experience30
Table 46: Judge Matthew Christian: Detailed Responses30
Table 47: Judge William T. Montgomery: Description of Respondents' Experience.....31
Table 48: Judge William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses31

Executive Summary

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska court employees to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2020 survey included one justice and 21 judges eligible for retention.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked court employees to evaluate the judges on five characteristics: *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 five characteristics. The two appellate judges appear first. Then the trial judges appear by judicial district. Within each judicial district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges. Note that no judges from the First Judicial District are eligible to stand for retention in 2020.

Table 1
Mean Ratings

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall Evaluation <i>M</i>
Justice Susan Carney	29	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6
Judge Tracey Wollenberg	17	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	22	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
Judge Paul A. Roetman	18	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Judge Dani Crosby	30	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Judge Andrew Guidi	27	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.6
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	34	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	24	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Judge Gregory Miller	26	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5
Judge Christina Reigh	10	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	18	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	26	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Judge Leslie Dickson	18	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.6
Judge Michael Franciosi	21	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	25	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Judge Michael Logue	16	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.1
Judge Kari L. McCrea	20	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Judge David R. Wallace	24	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7
Judge Pamela S. Washington	21	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge Nathaniel Peters	7	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Judge Matthew Christian	29	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Judge William T. Montgomery	8	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6

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

2020 Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Introduction

Alaska statutes require that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate judges standing for retention in an election year. The Council makes a recommendation to the State's voters to either retain or not retain each judge. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska court employees and asked them to rate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, and Overall*.

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 for the survey as well as data analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

This 2020 retention survey for court employees included one justice and 21 trial court judges eligible for retention.

Methodology

Alaska court employees, including law clerks who were not members of the Alaska Bar, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of the 667 total employees invited via email to participate, 253 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 37.9%. Of the 253 returned surveys, 71 did not rate any of the judges; 182 (71.9%) respondents evaluated one or more judges.

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the judges eligible for retention, five evaluation items for each judge, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each judge.

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

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.

Respondents assigned ratings for each domain 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:

(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court	Meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court	Consistently exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement 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 retention survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. All data are maintained on a secure server.

Each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could be used only once and accessed only from the e-mail address to which it was sent. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis.

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.

In the tables, judges appear in order based on judicial district. The Supreme Court justice and Court of Appeals judge are listed first. Then, within each judicial district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges.

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 2 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

Ratings of Judges

Table 3 presents results on the *Overall* item by comparing all respondents to those with direct professional experience; the table presents the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*) as well as the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*). Table 4 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item among respondents who indicated direct professional experience.

For each individual judge, Tables 5-48 provide a summary of respondents' experience with each judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience.

Table 2
Respondents' Level of Experience with Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Justice Susan Carney	39	15.4	74.4	10.3	15.4
Judge Tracey Wollenberg	25	9.9	68.0	8.0	24.0
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	24	9.5	91.7	4.2	4.2
Judge Paul A. Roetman	20	7.9	90.0	-	10.0
Judge Dani Crosby	36	14.2	83.3	16.7	-
Judge Andrew Guidi	31	12.3	87.1	9.7	3.2
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	41	16.2	82.9	9.8	7.3
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	28	11.1	85.7	10.7	3.6
Judge Gregory Miller	34	13.4	76.5	20.6	2.9
Judge Christina Reigh	12	4.7	83.3	8.3	8.3
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	20	7.9	90.0	10.0	-
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	29	11.5	89.7	3.4	6.9
Judge Leslie Dickson	24	9.5	75.0	12.5	12.5
Judge Michael Franciosi	26	10.3	80.8	7.7	11.5
Judge Patrick J. Hanley	30	11.9	83.3	6.7	10.0
Judge Michael Logue	22	8.7	72.7	18.2	9.1
Judge Kari L. McCrea	25	9.9	80.0	8.0	12.0
Judge David R. Wallace	27	10.7	88.9	11.1	-
Judge Pamela S. Washington	30	11.9	70.0	13.3	16.7
Judge Nathaniel Peters	10	4.0	70.0	-	30.0
Judge Matthew Christian	30	11.9	96.7	-	3.3
Judge William T. Montgomery	10	4.0	80.0	10.0	10.0

Table 3
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>
Justice Susan Carney	37	4.6	5.0	0.8	29	4.6	5.0	0.9
Judge Tracey Wollenberg	21	4.8	5.0	0.7	16	4.9	5.0	0.3
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	23	4.5	5.0	0.8	21	4.5	5.0	0.8
Judge Paul A. Roetman	19	4.6	5.0	0.6	17	4.5	5.0	0.6
Judge Dani Crosby	34	4.7	5.0	0.5	29	4.7	5.0	0.5
Judge Andrew Guidi	30	4.6	5.0	0.7	27	4.6	5.0	0.7
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	40	4.9	5.0	0.4	33	4.9	5.0	0.7
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	28	4.9	5.0	0.3	24	4.9	5.0	0.3
Judge Gregory Miller	31	4.4	5.0	0.8	24	4.5	5.0	0.8
Judge Christina Reigh	12	4.8	5.0	0.5	10	4.8	8.0	0.4
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	20	5.0	5.0	0.2	18	5.0	5.0	0.0
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	28	4.8	5.0	0.5	25	4.8	5.0	0.5
Judge Leslie Dickson	24	4.5	5.0	0.7	18	4.6	5.0	0.7
Judge Michael Franciosi	25	4.8	5.0	0.4	20	4.9	5.0	0.3
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	29	4.9	5.0	0.4	24	4.9	5.0	0.3
Judge Michael Logue	21	4.2	4.0	0.9	16	4.1	4.0	1.0
Judge Kari L. McCrea	25	4.8	5.0	0.5	20	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge David R. Wallace	27	4.7	5.0	0.6	24	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge Pamela S. Washington	29	3.8	4.0	1.3	21	4.0	4.0	1.1
Judge Nathaniel Peters	9	4.9	5.0	0.3	7	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge Matthew Christian	30	4.7	5.0	0.6	29	4.7	5.0	0.6
Judge William T. Montgomery	9	4.7	5.0	0.7	8	4.6	5.0	0.7

Table 4
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>	%
Justice Susan Carney	29	-	-	2	6.9	1	3.4	4	13.8	22	75.9
Judge Tracey Wollenberg	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.3	15	93.8
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	21	-	-	-	-	4	19.0	3	14.3	14	66.7
Judge Paul A. Roetman	17	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	6	35.3	10	58.8
Judge Dani Crosby	29	-	-	-	-	1	3.4	7	24.1	21	72.4
Judge Andrew Guidi	27	-	-	-	-	3	11.1	5	18.5	19	70.4
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	33	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	12.1	29	87.9
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8.3	22	91.7
Judge Gregory Miller	24	-	-	-	-	4	16.7	5	20.8	15	62.5
Judge Christina Reigh	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	8	80.0
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	100.0
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	25	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	2	8.0	22	88.0
Judge Leslie Dickson	18	-	-	-	-	2	11.1	4	22.2	12	66.7
Judge Michael Franciosi	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	10.0	18	90.0
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	12.5	21	87.5
Judge Michael Logue	16	-	-	1	6.3	4	25.0	4	25.0	7	43.8
Judge Kari L. McCrea	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	15.0	17	85.0
Judge David R. Wallace	24	-	-	-	-	2	8.3	4	16.7	18	75.0
Judge Pamela S. Washington	21	-	-	3	14.3	3	14.3	5	23.8	10	47.6

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

*Table 4 (cont.)
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>	%
Judge Nathaniel Peters	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14.3	6	85.7
Judge Matthew Christian	29	-	-	-	-	2	6.9	5	17.2	22	75.9
Judge William T. Montgomery	8	-	-	-	-	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0

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

Table 5
Justice Susan Carney
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	39	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	74.4
Professional reputation	4	10.3
Other personal contacts	6	15.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	96.6
Substantial amount of experience	8	27.6
Moderate amount of experience	6	20.7
Limited amount of experience	15	51.7

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

Table 6
Justice Susan Carney
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	39	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	4	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0
Other personal contacts	6	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.0	4.8

Table 7
Judge Tracey Wollenberg
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	25	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	17	68.0
Professional reputation	2	8.0
Other personal contacts	6	24.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	100
Substantial amount of experience	7	41.2
Moderate amount of experience	5	29.4
Limited amount of experience	5	29.4

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

Table 8
Judge Tracey Wollenberg
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	25	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	17	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	17	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	5	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	-
Other personal contacts	6	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.2

Table 9
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	24	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	22	91.7
Professional reputation	1	4.2
Other personal contacts	1	4.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	95.5
Substantial amount of experience	6	28.6
Moderate amount of experience	6	28.6
Limited amount of experience	9	42.9

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

Table 10
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	24	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	22	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	9	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.4	4.3
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 11
Judge Paul A. Roetman
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	20	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	90.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	10.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	94.4
Substantial amount of experience	6	35.3
Moderate amount of experience	2	11.8
Limited amount of experience	9	52.9

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

Table 12
Judge Paul A. Roetman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	20	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	17	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	9	4.0	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.1
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 13
Judge Dani Crosby
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	36	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	83.3
Professional reputation	6	16.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100
Substantial amount of experience	3	10.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	50.0
Limited amount of experience	12	40.0

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

Table 14
Judge Dani Crosby
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	36	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	12	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5
Professional reputation	6	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15
Judge Andrew Guidi
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	31	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	27	87.1
Professional reputation	3	9.7
Other personal contacts	1	3.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100
Substantial amount of experience	5	18.5
Moderate amount of experience	10	37.0
Limited amount of experience	12	44.4

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

Table 16
Judge Andrew Guidi
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	31	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	27	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	12	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.4
Professional reputation	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	-	-	-

Table 17
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	34	82.9
Professional reputation	4	9.8
Other personal contacts	3	7.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	100
Substantial amount of experience	8	23.5
Moderate amount of experience	15	44.1
Limited amount of experience	11	32.4

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

Table 18
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	41	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	34	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	32	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	11	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.8
Professional reputation	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3

Table 19
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	28	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	24	85.7
Professional reputation	3	10.7
Other personal contacts	1	3.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	100
Substantial amount of experience	2	8.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	37.5
Limited amount of experience	13	54.2

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

Table 20
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	28	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	24	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9
Professional reputation	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 21
Judge Gregory Miller
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	34	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	26	76.5
Professional reputation	7	20.6
Other personal contacts	1	2.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	100
Substantial amount of experience	3	11.5
Moderate amount of experience	9	34.6
Limited amount of experience	14	53.8

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

Table 22
Judge Gregory Miller
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	34	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	26	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.8	4.9	4.3	4.7	4.6
Limited amount of experience	14	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.4	4.5
Professional reputation	7	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.1
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	-	-	-

Table 23
Judge Christina Reigh
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	12	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	10	83.3
Professional reputation	1	8.3
Other personal contacts	1	8.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	9	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	50.0
Moderate amount of experience	1	10.0
Limited amount of experience	4	40.0

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

Table 24
Judge Christina Reigh
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	12	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	10	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	1	-	4.0	-	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	-	5.0	5.0

Table 25
Judge Jennifer K. Wells
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	20	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	90.0
Professional reputation	2	10.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100
Substantial amount of experience	10	55.6
Moderate amount of experience	4	22.2
Limited amount of experience	4	22.2

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

Table 26
Judge Jennifer K. Wells
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	20	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Limited amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 27
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	26	89.7
Professional reputation	1	3.4
Other personal contacts	2	6.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	100
Substantial amount of experience	11	42.3
Moderate amount of experience	12	46.2
Limited amount of experience	3	11.5

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

Table 28
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	29	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	26	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Limited amount of experience	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Professional reputation	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5

Table 29
Judge Leslie Dickson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	24	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	75.0
Professional reputation	3	12.5
Other personal contacts	3	12.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	10	55.6
Limited amount of experience	2	11.1

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

Table 30
Judge Leslie Dickson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	24	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	17	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4
Limited amount of experience	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	3	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.7

Table 31
Judge Michael Franciosi
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	26	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	21	80.8
Professional reputation	2	7.7
Other personal contacts	3	11.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	94.7
Substantial amount of experience	10	47.6
Moderate amount of experience	5	23.8
Limited amount of experience	6	28.6

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

Table 32
Judge Michael Franciosi
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	26	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	21	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0

Table 33
Judge J. Patrick Hanley
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	25	83.3
Professional reputation	2	6.7
Other personal contacts	3	10.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	24.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	60.0
Limited amount of experience	4	16.0

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

Table 34
Judge J. Patrick Hanley
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	30	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	25	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.7

Table 35
Judge Michael Logue
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	22	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	16	72.7
Professional reputation	4	18.2
Other personal contacts	2	9.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	37.5
Moderate amount of experience	7	43.8
Limited amount of experience	3	18.8

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

Table 36
Judge Michael Logue
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	22	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	16	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	3.7	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	4	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5

Table 37
Judge Kari L. McCrea
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	25	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	20	80.0
Professional reputation	2	8.0
Other personal contacts	3	12.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100
Substantial amount of experience	8	40.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	40.0
Limited amount of experience	4	20.0

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

Table 38
Judge Kari L. McCrea
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	25	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	20	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3

Table 39
Judge David R. Wallace
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	27	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	24	88.9
Professional reputation	3	11.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	100
Substantial amount of experience	8	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	14	58.3
Limited amount of experience	2	8.3

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

Table 40
Judge David R. Wallace
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	27	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	24	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 41
Judge Pamela S. Washington
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	21	70.0
Professional reputation	4	13.3
Other personal contacts	5	16.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	100
Substantial amount of experience	8	38.1
Moderate amount of experience	10	47.6
Limited amount of experience	3	14.3

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

Table 42
Judge Pamela S. Washington
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	30	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	21	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.1
Limited amount of experience	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.0
Professional reputation	4	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Other personal contacts	5	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.8

Table 43
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	10	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	7	70.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	3	30.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	7	100
Substantial amount of experience	3	42.9
Moderate amount of experience	1	14.3
Limited amount of experience	3	42.9

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

Table 44
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	10	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	7	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	7	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 45
Judge Matthew Christian
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	96.7
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	3.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	96.6
Substantial amount of experience	12	41.4
Moderate amount of experience	14	48.3
Limited amount of experience	3	10.3

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

Table 46
Judge Matthew Christian
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	30	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	3	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 47
Judge William T. Montgomery
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	10	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	8	80.0
Professional reputation	1	10.0
Other personal contacts	1	10.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	8	100
Substantial amount of experience	3	37.5
Moderate amount of experience	2	25.0
Limited amount of experience	3	37.5

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

Table 48
Judge William T. Montgomery
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</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	10	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	8	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	8	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.7	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	1	-	4.0	-	4.0	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0