



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees**

### **Technical Report**

Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional  
Rosylind Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional

*March 4,, 2022*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[www.iseralaska.org](http://www.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
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 5: Judge Bethany Harbison: Description of Respondents .....	10
Table 6: Judge Bethany Harbison: Detailed Responses .....	10
Table 7: Judge Amy Gurton Mead: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	11
Table 8: Judge Amy Gurton Mead: Detailed Responses.....	11
Table 9: Judge Jude Pate: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	12
Table 10: Judge Jude Pate: Detailed Responses .....	12
Table 11: Judge Daniel Schally: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	13
Table 12: Judge Daniel Schally: Detailed Responses.....	13
Table 13: Judge Kirsten Swanson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	14
Table 14: Judge Kirsten Swanson: Detailed Responses .....	14
Table 15: Judge John C. Cagle: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	15
Table 16: Judge John C. Cagle: Detailed Responses.....	15
Table 17: Judge Catherine M. Easter: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 18: Judge Catherine M. Easter: Detailed Responses .....	16
Table 19: Judge Una Sonia Gandbhir: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	17
Table 20: Judge Una Sonia Gandbhir: Detailed Responses .....	17
Table 21: Judge Josie Garton: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	18
Table 22: Judge Josie Garton: Detailed Responses .....	18
Table 23: Judge Jason Gist: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	19
Table 24: Judge Jason Gist: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 25: Judge Lance Joanis: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	20
Table 26: Judge Lance Joanis: Detailed Responses.....	20
Table 27: Judge Kari Kristiansen: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	21
Table 28: Judge Kari Kristiansen: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 29: Judge Erin B. Marston: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	22
Table 30: Judge Erin B. Marston: Detailed Responses .....	22
Table 31: Judge Thomas A. Matthews: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	23
Table 32: Judge Thomas A. Matthews: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 33: Judge Andrew Peterson: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	24
Table 34: Judge Andrew Peterson: Detailed Responses.....	24
Table 35: Judge Peter Ramgren: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	25
Table 36: Judge Peter Ramgren: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 37: Judge Kevin M. Saxby: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	26
Table 38: Judge Kevin M. Saxby: Detailed Responses .....	26
Table 39: Judge Kristen C. Stohler: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	27
Table 40: Judge Kristen C. Stohler: Detailed Responses .....	27
Table 41: Judge Stephen B. Wallace: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	28
Table 42: Judge Stephen B. Wallace: Detailed Responses.....	28
Table 43: Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	29

Table 44: Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung: Detailed Responses .....29  
Table 45: Judge Brian K. Clark: Description of Respondents' Experience .....30  
Table 46: Judge Brian K. Clark: Detailed Responses.....30  
Table 47: Judge Martin C. Fallon: Description of Respondents' Experience .....31  
Table 48: Judge Martin C. Fallon: Detailed Responses.....31  
Table 49: Judge Tom V. Jamgochian: Description of Respondents' Experience .....32  
Table 50: Judge Tom V. Jamgochian: Detailed Responses.....32  
Table 51: Judge David A. Nesbett: Description of Respondents' Experience .....33  
Table 52: Judge David A. Nesbett: Detailed Responses .....33  
Table 53: Judge Shawn Traini: Description of Respondents' Experience .....34  
Table 54: Judge Shawn Traini: Detailed Responses.....34  
Table 55: Judge Brent Bennett: Description of Respondents' Experience.....35  
Table 56: Judge Brent Bennett: Detailed Responses .....35  
Table 57: Judge Terrence Haas: Description of Respondents' Experience.....36  
Table 58: Judge Terrence Haas: Detailed Responses .....36  
Table 59: Judge Earl Peterson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....37  
Table 60: Judge Earl Peterson: Detailed Responses .....37  
Table 61: Judge Thomas Temple: Description of Respondents' Experience.....38  
Table 62: Judge Thomas Temple: Detailed Responses .....38  
Table 63: Judge Ben Seekins: Description of Respondents' Experience .....39  
Table 64: Judge Ben Seekins: Detailed Responses .....39

## *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 2022 survey included 30 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. Throughout this report, appellate judges appear first, followed by trial court judges who are grouped by judicial district and, within judicial districts, by superior and district courts.

**Table 1**  
**Mean Ratings of Judges**

	<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>
<b>Judge Bethany Harbison</b>	29	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
<b>Judge Amy Gurton Mead</b>	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6
<b>Judge Jude Pate</b>	24	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Daniel Schally</b>	29	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.7	4.6
<b>Judge Kirsten Swanson</b>	18	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
<b>Judge John C. Cagle</b>	24	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9
<b>Judge Catherine M. Easter</b>	24	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Judge Una Sonia Gandhir</b>	28	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Josie Garton</b>	20	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Jason Gist</b>	20	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.7
<b>Judge Lance Joanis</b>	20	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7
<b>Judge Kari Kristiansen</b>	23	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.5
<b>Judge Erin B. Marston</b>	19	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Thomas A. Matthews</b>	20	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
<b>Judge Andrew Peterson</b>	15	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
<b>Judge Peter Ramgren</b>	20	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
<b>Judge Kevin M. Saxby</b>	18	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Kristen C. Stohler</b>	21	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Stephen B. Wallace</b>	12	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.7
<b>Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung</b>	21	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
<b>Judge Brian K. Clark</b>	21	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9
<b>Judge Martin C. Fallon</b>	20	4.4	4.4	4.6	3.7	3.9
<b>Judge Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	22	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5
<b>Judge David A. Nesbett</b>	16	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
<b>Judge Shawn Traini</b>	20	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
<b>Judge Brent Bennett</b>	26	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3
<b>Judge Terrence Haas</b>	21	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
<b>Judge Earl Peterson</b>	23	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5
<b>Judge Thomas Temple</b>	22	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7
<b>Judge Ben Seekins</b>	26	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7

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

# 2022 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 2022 retention survey for court employees included 30 judges eligible for retention.

## ***Methodology***

Alaska court employees, including law clerks, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of the 593 total employees invited via email to participate, 263 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 44.4%. Of the 263 initiated surveys, 67 did not rate any of the judges; 196 (74.5%) 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 only be used once and only accessed 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*

In the tables that follow, responses to the survey questions are shown in a variety of ways. Table 2 shows survey respondents’ level of experience with each judge, with options of direct professional experience, professional reputation, and other personal contacts. Table 3 compares all judges to those with direct professional experience and includes the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*) in addition to number of respondents (*n*) and mean (*M*). Table 4 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item among respondents who indicated direct professional experience. Note that appellate judges appear first, followed by trial court judges who are grouped by judicial district and, within judicial districts, by superior and district courts.

The remaining tables (5 - 64) provide a summary of respondents' experience with each judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience. Throughout this report, results based on small numbers of respondents within the cross-tabulations should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.



**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
<b>Judge Bethany Harbison</b>	38	14.4	76.3	21.1	2.6
<b>Judge Amy Gurton Mead</b>	33	12.5	90.9	6.1	3.0
<b>Judge Jude Pate</b>	26	9.8	92.3	3.8	3.8
<b>Judge Daniel Schally</b>	30	11.4	96.7	3.3	-
<b>Judge Kirsten Swanson</b>	20	7.6	90.0	10.0	-
<b>Judge John C. Cagle</b>	26	9.8	92.3	3.8	3.8
<b>Judge Catherine M. Easter</b>	27	10.2	88.9	11.1	-
<b>Judge Una Sonia Gandbhir</b>	34	12.9	82.4	14.7	2.9
<b>Judge Josie Garton</b>	27	10.2	74.1	25.9	-
<b>Judge Jason Gist</b>	23	8.7	87.0	13.0	-
<b>Judge Lance Joanis</b>	23	8.7	87.0	13.0	-
<b>Judge Kari Kristiansen</b>	23	8.7	100.0	-	-
<b>Judge Erin B. Marston</b>	24	9.1	79.2	16.7	4.2
<b>Judge Thomas A. Matthews</b>	24	9.1	83.3	16.7	-
<b>Judge Andrew Peterson</b>	17	6.4	88.2	11.8	-
<b>Judge Peter Ramgren</b>	23	8.7	87.0	13.0	-
<b>Judge Kevin M. Saxby</b>	20	7.6	90.0	10.0	-
<b>Judge Kristen C. Stohler</b>	21	8.0	100.0	-	-
<b>Judge Stephen B. Wallace</b>	14	5.3	85.7	14.3	-
<b>Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung</b>	24	9.1	87.5	12.5	-
<b>Judge Brian K. Clark</b>	25	9.5	84.0	12.0	4.0
<b>Judge Martin C. Fallon</b>	21	8.0	95.2	-	4.8
<b>Judge Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	22	8.3	100.0	-	-
<b>Judge David A. Nesbett</b>	20	7.6	80.0	20.0	-
<b>Judge Shawn Traini</b>	20	7.6	100.0	-	-
<b>Judge Brent Bennett</b>	27	10.3	96.3	3.7	-
<b>Judge Terrence Haas</b>	25	9.5	84.0	16.0	-
<b>Judge Earl Peterson</b>	25	9.5	92.0	8.0	-
<b>Judge Thomas Temple</b>	24	9.1	91.7	8.3	-
<b>Judge Ben Seekins</b>	30	11.4	86.7	10.0	3.3

**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>
<b>Judge Bethany Harbison</b>	36	4.8	5.0	0.6	28	4.9	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Amy Gurton Mead</b>	31	4.5	5.0	0.9	28	4.6	5.0	0.8
<b>Judge Jude Pate</b>	26	4.7	5.0	0.5	24	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Daniel Schally</b>	29	4.6	5.0	0.8	28	4.6	5.0	0.8
<b>Judge Kirsten Swanson</b>	20	4.2	4.5	1.1	18	4.3	5.0	1.1
<b>Judge John C. Cagle</b>	25	4.8	5.0	0.5	23	4.9	5.0	0.3
<b>Judge Catherine M. Easter</b>	25	4.5	5.0	0.9	22	4.5	5.0	0.9
<b>Judge Una Sonia Gandbhir</b>	34	4.7	5.0	0.6	28	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Josie Garton</b>	27	4.7	5.0	0.5	20	4.8	5.0	0.6
<b>Judge Jason Gist</b>	23	4.6	5.0	0.7	20	4.7	5.0	0.7
<b>Judge Lance Joanis</b>	22	4.7	5.0	0.6	19	4.7	5.0	0.6
<b>Judge Kari Kristiansen</b>	22	4.5	5.0	0.7	22	4.5	5.0	0.7
<b>Judge Erin B. Marston</b>	23	4.7	5.0	0.6	18	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Thomas A. Matthews</b>	24	4.7	5.0	0.5	20	4.7	5.0	0.5
<b>Judge Andrew Peterson</b>	17	4.6	5.0	0.7	15	4.7	5.0	0.6
<b>Judge Peter Ramgren</b>	23	4.7	5.0	0.7	20	4.9	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Kevin M. Saxby</b>	20	4.8	5.0	0.4	18	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Kristen C. Stohler</b>	21	4.8	5.0	0.4	21	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b>Judge Stephen B. Wallace</b>	11	4.5	5.0	0.8	9	4.7	5.0	0.7
<b>Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung</b>	24	4.8	5.0	0.6	21	5.0	5.0	0.2
<b>Judge Brian K. Clark</b>	25	4.8	5.0	0.6	21	4.9	5.0	0.3
<b>Judge Martin C. Fallon</b>	19	3.9	5.0	1.4	19	3.9	5.0	1.4
<b>Judge Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	22	4.5	5.0	0.9	22	4.5	5.0	0.9
<b>Judge David A. Nesbett</b>	20	4.9	5.0	0.3	16	4.9	5.0	0.3
<b>Judge Shawn Traini</b>	20	4.9	5.0	0.3	20	4.9	5.0	0.3
<b>Judge Brent Bennett</b>	25	4.3	5.0	0.9	24	4.3	5.0	0.9
<b>Judge Terrence Haas</b>	22	4.6	5.0	0.7	18	4.8	5.0	0.5
<b>Judge Earl Peterson</b>	25	4.4	5.0	0.8	23	4.5	5.0	0.8
<b>Judge Thomas Temple</b>	24	4.7	5.0	0.6	22	4.7	5.0	0.6
<b>Judge Ben Seekins</b>	29	4.7	5.0	0.5	26	4.7	5.0	0.5

**Table 4**  
***Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating***

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Judge Bethany Harbison</b>	28	-	-	-	-	1	3.6	2	7.1	25	89.3
<b>Judge Amy Gurton Mead</b>	28	1	3.6	-	-	-	-	8	28.6	19	67.9
<b>Judge Jude Pate</b>	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	16.7	20	83.3
<b>Judge Daniel Schally</b>	28	-	-	1	3.6	2	7.1	3	10.7	22	78.6
<b>Judge Kirsten Swanson</b>	18	1	5.6	-	-	2	11.1	5	27.8	10	55.6
<b>Judge John C. Cagle</b>	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	13.0	20	87.0
<b>Judge Catherine M. Easter</b>	22	1	4.5	-	-	-	-	7	31.8	14	63.6
<b>Judge Una Sonia Gandbhir</b>	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	17.9	23	82.1
<b>Judge Josie Garton</b>	20	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	3	15.0	16	80.0
<b>Judge Jason Gist</b>	20	-	-	-	-	2	10.0	3	15.0	15	75.0
<b>Judge Lance Joanis</b>	19	-	-	-	-	1	5.3	4	21.1	14	73.7
<b>Judge Kari Kristiansen</b>	22	-	-	-	-	3	13.6	4	18.2	15	68.2
<b>Judge Erin B. Marston</b>	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	22.2	14	77.8
<b>Judge Thomas A. Matthews</b>	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	35.0	13	65.0
<b>Judge Andrew Peterson</b>	15	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	2	13.3	12	80.0
<b>Judge Peter Ramgren</b>	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	15.0	17	85.0
<b>Judge Kevin M. Saxby</b>	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	22.2	14	77.8
<b>Judge Kristen C. Stohler</b>	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	23.8	16	76.2
<b>Judge Stephen B. Wallace</b>	9	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8

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>	%
<b>Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung</b>	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4.8	20	95.2
<b>Judge Brian K. Clark</b>	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	9.5	19	90.5
<b>Judge Martin C. Fallon</b>	19	1	5.3	4	21.1	1	5.3	2	10.5	11	57.9
<b>Judge Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	22	-	-	1	4.5	3	13.6	3	13.6	15	68.2
<b>Judge David A. Nesbett</b>	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	12.5	14	87.5
<b>Judge Shawn Traini</b>	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	10.0	18	90.0
<b>Judge Brent Bennett</b>	24	-	-	1	4.2	4	16.7	5	20.8	14	58.3
<b>Judge Terrence Haas</b>	18	-	-	-	-	1	5.6	2	11.1	15	83.3
<b>Judge Earl Peterson</b>	23	-	-	1	4.3	1	4.3	7	30.4	14	60.9
<b>Judge Thomas Temple</b>	22	-	-	-	-	2	9.1	2	9.1	18	81.8
<b>Judge Ben Seekins</b>	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	30.8	18	69.2

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

**Table 5**  
**Judge Bethany Harbison**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	29	76.3
Professional reputation	8	21.1
Other personal contacts	1	2.6
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	96.6
Substantial amount of experience	7	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	35.7
Limited amount of experience	11	39.3

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

**Table 6**  
**Judge Bethany Harbison**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	38	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
Professional reputation	8	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.4
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 7**  
**Judge Amy Gurton Mead**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	30	90.9
Professional reputation	2	6.1
Other personal contacts	1	3.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	36.7
Moderate amount of experience	11	36.7
Limited amount of experience	8	26.7

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

**Table 8**  
**Judge Amy Gurton Mead**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Limited amount of experience	8	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.5
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	-	-	-	4.0

**Table 9**  
**Judge Jude Pate**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	24	92.3
Professional reputation	1	3.8
Other personal contacts	1	3.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	91.7
Substantial amount of experience	8	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	37.5
Limited amount of experience	6	25.0

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

**Table 10**  
**Judge Jude Pate**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	26	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	22	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	5.0	5.0	4.6	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	-	-	-	4.0

**Table 11**  
**Judge Daniel Schally**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	29	96.7
Professional reputation	1	3.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	96.6
Substantial amount of experience	13	44.8
Moderate amount of experience	5	17.2
Limited amount of experience	11	37.9

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

**Table 12**  
**Judge Daniel Schally**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	30	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.7	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.4	4.4	3.6	4.8	4.6
Limited amount of experience	11	4.8	4.6	4.1	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-



**Table 13**  
**Judge Kirsten Swanson**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	18	90.0
Professional reputation	2	10.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	94.4
Substantial amount of experience	8	44.4
Moderate amount of experience	4	22.2
Limited amount of experience	6	33.3

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

**Table 14**  
**Judge Kirsten Swanson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	17	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.5	4.4	3.8	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	6	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.5
Professional reputation	2	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 15**  
**Judge John C. Cagle**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	24	92.3
Professional reputation	1	3.8
Other personal contacts	1	3.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	37.5
Moderate amount of experience	8	33.3
Limited amount of experience	7	29.2

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

**Table 16**  
**Judge John C. Cagle**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	26	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9
Limited amount of experience	7	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.7
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 17**  
**Judge Catherine M. Easter**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	24	88.9
Professional reputation	3	11.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	91.7
Substantial amount of experience	1	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	11	45.8
Limited amount of experience	12	50.0

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

**Table 18**  
**Judge Catherine M. Easter**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	22	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	12	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 19**  
**Judge Una Sonia Gandhir**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	28	82.4
Professional reputation	5	14.7
Other personal contacts	1	2.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	21.4
Moderate amount of experience	13	46.4
Limited amount of experience	9	32.1

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

**Table 20**  
**Judge Una Sonia Gandhir**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	34	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
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	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.2
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Table 21**  
**Judge Josie Garton**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	74.1
Professional reputation	7	25.9
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	30.0
Limited amount of experience	9	45.0

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

**Table 22**  
**Judge Josie Garton**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
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	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	9	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 23**  
**Judge Jason Gist**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	87.0
Professional reputation	3	13.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	30.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	50.0
Limited amount of experience	4	20.0

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

**Table 24**  
**Judge Jason Gist**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.7	4.6
Limited amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.8
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 25**  
**Judge Lance Joanis**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	87.0
Professional reputation	3	13.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	95.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	30.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	40.0
Limited amount of experience	6	30.0

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

**Table 26**  
**Judge Lance Joanis**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
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	8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	6	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	3	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.7	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 27**  
**Judge Kari Kristiansen**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	23	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	34.8
Moderate amount of experience	9	39.1
Limited amount of experience	6	26.1

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

**Table 28**  
**Judge Kari Kristiansen**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.9	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2
Limited amount of experience	6	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.7	4.8
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-



**Table 29**  
**Judge Erin B. Marston**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	19	79.2
Professional reputation	4	16.7
Other personal contacts	1	4.2
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	21.1
Moderate amount of experience	9	47.4
Limited amount of experience	6	31.6

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

**Table 30**  
**Judge Erin B. Marston**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	24	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9
Limited amount of experience	6	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 31**  
**Judge Thomas A. Matthews**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	83.3
Professional reputation	4	16.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	10.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	40.0
Limited amount of experience	10	50.0

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

**Table 32**  
**Judge Thomas A. Matthews**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	24	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
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	8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	10	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 33**  
**Judge Andrew Peterson**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	15	88.2
Professional reputation	2	11.8
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	15	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	13.3
Moderate amount of experience	7	46.7
Limited amount of experience	6	40.0

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

**Table 34**  
**Judge Andrew Peterson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	17	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	15	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 35**  
**Judge Peter Ramgren**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	87.0
Professional reputation	3	13.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	15.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	40.0
Limited amount of experience	9	45.0

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

**Table 36**  
**Judge Peter Ramgren**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	3	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 37**  
**Judge Kevin M. Saxby**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	18	90.0
Professional reputation	2	10.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	22.2
Moderate amount of experience	8	44.4
Limited amount of experience	6	33.3

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

**Table 38**  
**Judge Kevin M. Saxby**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 39**  
**Judge Kristen C. Stohler**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	21	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	95.2
Substantial amount of experience	6	28.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	42.9
Limited amount of experience	6	28.6

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

**Table 40**  
**Judge Kristen C. Stohler**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
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	9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
Limited amount of experience	6	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.7
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 41**  
**Judge Stephen B. Wallace**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	12	85.7
Professional reputation	2	14.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	12	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	1	8.3
Limited amount of experience	7	58.3

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

**Table 42**  
**Judge Stephen B. Wallace**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	14	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	12	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Limited amount of experience	7	4.8	4.8	4.1	4.5	4.8
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 43**  
**Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	21	87.5
Professional reputation	3	12.5
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	95.2
Substantial amount of experience	2	9.5
Moderate amount of experience	7	33.3
Limited amount of experience	12	57.1

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

**Table 44**  
**Judge Jo-Ann M. Chung**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	24	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	12	4.9	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-



**Table 45**  
**Judge Brian K. Clark**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	21	84.0
Professional reputation	3	12.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	90.5
Substantial amount of experience	3	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	8	38.1
Limited amount of experience	10	47.6

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

**Table 46**  
**Judge Brian K. Clark**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	25	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	2	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0
Limited amount of experience	10	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0

**Table 47**  
**Judge Martin C. Fallon**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	95.2
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	4.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	45.0
Moderate amount of experience	7	35.0
Limited amount of experience	4	20.0

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

**Table 48**  
**Judge Martin C. Fallon**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.4	4.4	4.6	3.7	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.4	4.4	4.6	3.7	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.0	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.3
Limited amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 49**  
**Judge Tom V. Jamgochian**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	22	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	22.7
Moderate amount of experience	11	50.0
Limited amount of experience	6	27.3

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

**Table 50**  
**Judge Tom V. Jamgochian**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	22	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	22	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.6	4.3
Limited amount of experience	6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 51**  
**Judge David A. Nesbett**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	16	80.0
Professional reputation	4	20.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	15	93.8
Substantial amount of experience	4	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	37.5
Limited amount of experience	6	37.5

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

**Table 52**  
**Judge David A. Nesbett**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	15	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Limited amount of experience	6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.7
Professional reputation	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 53**  
**Judge Shawn Traini**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	20	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	95.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	35.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	50.0
Limited amount of experience	3	15.0

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

**Table 54**  
**Judge Shawn Traini**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 55**  
**Judge Brent Bennett**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	26	96.3
Professional reputation	1	3.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	19.2
Moderate amount of experience	14	53.8
Limited amount of experience	7	26.9

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

**Table 56**  
**Judge Brent Bennett**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.6	4.2	4.7	4.0	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.4	3.8	4.5	3.5	3.8
Limited amount of experience	7	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 57**  
**Judge Terrence Haas**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	21	84.0
Professional reputation	4	16.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	19.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	28.6
Limited amount of experience	11	52.4

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

**Table 58**  
**Judge Terrence Haas**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	25	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	4	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 59**  
**Judge Earl Peterson**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	23	92.0
Professional reputation	2	8.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	30.4
Moderate amount of experience	9	39.1
Limited amount of experience	7	30.4

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

**Table 60**  
**Judge Earl Peterson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	25	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.3
Limited amount of experience	7	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-



**Table 61**  
**Judge Thomas Temple**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	22	91.7
Professional reputation	2	8.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	95.5
Substantial amount of experience	5	22.7
Moderate amount of experience	7	31.8
Limited amount of experience	10	45.5

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

**Table 62**  
**Judge Thomas Temple**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	24	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.4
Limited amount of experience	10	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Table 63**  
**Judge Ben Seekins**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	26	86.7
Professional reputation	3	10.0
Other personal contacts	1	3.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	96.2
Substantial amount of experience	10	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	10	38.5
Limited amount of experience	6	23.1

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

**Table 64**  
**Judge Ben Seekins**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	30	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.7	4.9	4.6	5.0	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	3	4.0	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.7
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-