



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Anchorage District Court

Technical Report

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

May 20-25, 2024

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	6
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
Table 11: Marika Athens: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Marika Athens: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Chris Darnall: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Chris Darnall: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Monica Elkinton: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Monica Elkinton: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: Lindsay Ingaldson: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Lindsay Ingaldson: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Larry Monsma: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Larry Monsma: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 21: Sam Vandergaw: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Sam Vandergaw: Detailed Responses	27

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Anchorage District Court created by the appointment of Judge David A. Nesbett to the Anchorage Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of six applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Marika Athens, Chris Darnall, Monica Elkinton, Lindsay Ingaldson, Larry Monsma, and Sam Vandergaw.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked bar members to evaluate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence, Integrity, Fairness, Judicial Temperament, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each applicant by respondents with direct professional experience.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
Marika Athens	119	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Chris Darnall	98	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.7
Monica Elkinton	27	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	81	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.3
Larry Monsma	113	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	74	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7

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

2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Anchorage District Court

Introduction

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate all applicants for a judicial vacancy. The Council nominates the two or more most qualified applicants to the governor who must appoint from the Council's list. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska Bar Association members and asked them to rate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence*, *Integrity*, *Fairness*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Palmer Superior Court and Anchorage District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Anchorage District Court, created by the appointment of Judge David A. Nesbett to the Anchorage Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of six applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Marika Athens, Chris Darnall, Monica Elkinton, Lindsay Ingaldson, Larry Monsma, and Sam Vandergaw.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,723 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,709) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 14 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 705 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; ten surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; four surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 691 online surveys qualified for analysis.

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

The final analysis included 691 online surveys and four paper surveys, for a total of 695 surveys and a survey return rate of 18.7%. Of the 695 returned surveys, 328 (47.2%) did not rate any of the applicants (four Palmer

Superior Court applicants and six Anchorage District Court applicants); 367 (52.8%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

		All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents		695	100	367	52.8
Type of Practice					
	No response	4	0.6	2	0.5
	Private, solo	130	18.7	51	13.9
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	64	9.2	28	7.6
	Private, 6+ attorneys	98	14.1	42	11.4
	Private, corporate employee	11	1.6	-	-
	Judge or judicial officer	63	9.1	60	16.3
	Government	187	26.9	137	37.3
	Public service agency or organization	27	3.9	19	5.2
	Retired	102	14.7	27	7.4
	Other	9	1.3	1	0.3
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	30	4.3	8	2.2
	5 years or fewer	63	9.1	64	17.4
	6 to 10 years	70	10.1	47	12.8
	11 to 15 years	84	12.1	52	14.2
	16 to 20 years	350	50.4	56	15.3
	More than 20 years	98	14.1	140	38.1
Cases Handled					
	No response	4	0.6	1	0.3
	Prosecution	54	7.8	47	12.8
	Criminal	69	9.9	62	16.9
	Mixed criminal & civil	171	24.6	117	31.9
	Civil	353	50.8	127	34.6
	Other	44	6.3	13	3.5
Location of Practice					
	No response	4	0.6	1	0.3
	First District	69	9.9	21	5.7
	Second District	10	1.4	7	1.9
	Third District	520	74.8	300	81.7
	Fourth District	60	8.6	32	8.7
	Outside Alaska	32	4.6	6	1.6
Gender					
	No response	8	1.2	1	0.3
	Male	394	56.7	200	54.5
	Female	290	41.7	165	45.0
	Another identity	3	0.4	1	0.3

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant.

Both versions of the survey required a certification by the respondent that they had rated the applicants as required by the bar’s Professional Rule 8.2. Specific instructions regarding the certification were provided:

“Please refer to Professional Conduct Rule 8.2 concerning your obligation to provide truthful and candid opinions on the qualifications or integrity of these applicants.”

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

“Please rate the applicant on each of the following qualities by selecting the number that best represents your evaluation. Applicants should be evaluated on each quality separately. Use the ends of the scales as well as the middle. The tendency to rate an applicant “excellent” or “poor” on every trait should be avoided since each person has strengths and weaknesses. If you cannot rate the applicant on any one quality, leave that one blank.”

	(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
<i>Professional Competence</i>	Lacking in knowledge and/or effectiveness	Below-average performance occasionally	Possesses sufficient knowledge and required skills	Usually knowledgeable and effective	Meets the highest standards for knowledge and effectiveness
<i>Integrity</i>	Unconcerned with propriety and/or appearance, or acts in violation of codes of professional conduct	Appears lacking in knowledge of professional codes of conduct and/or unconcerned with propriety or appearance at times	Follows codes of professional conduct, respects propriety and appearance of propriety at all times	Above-average awareness of ethics, holds self to higher standard than most	Outstanding integrity and highest standards of conduct
<i>Fairness</i>	Often shows strong bias for or against some person or groups	Displays, verbally or otherwise, some bias for or against groups or persons	Free of substantial bias or prejudice against groups or persons	Above-average ability to treat all persons and groups impartially	Unusually fair and impartial to all groups
<i>Judicial Temperament</i>	Often lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Sometimes lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Possesses appropriate compassion, humility, and courtesy	Above-average compassion, humility, and courtesy	Outstanding compassion, humility, and courtesy
<i>Suitability of Experience</i>	Has little or no suitable experience	Has less than suitable experience	Has suitable experience	Has highly suitable experience	Has the most suitable experience for this position
<i>Overall Rating</i>	Has few qualifications for this position	Has insufficient qualifications for this position	Has suitable qualifications for this position	Has highly suitable qualifications for this position	Has exceptionally high qualifications for this position

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 selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a locked office. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. For the surveys returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

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

Data Management

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

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-22 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Marika Athens	166	23.9	71.7	12.0	16.3
Chris Darnall	117	16.8	83.8	13.7	2.6
Monica Elkinton	162	23.3	78.4	9.9	11.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	103	14.8	81.6	12.6	5.8
Larry Monsma	130	18.7	86.9	11.5	1.5
Sam Vandergaw	97	14.0	76.3	19.6	4.1

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Marika Athens	164	4.5	5.0	0.9	119	4.4	5.0	0.9
Chris Darnall	116	3.7	4.0	1.1	97	3.7	4.0	1.1
Monica Elkinton	159	3.7	4.0	1.3	126	3.7	4.0	1.3
Lindsay Ingaldson	101	3.2	3.0	1.2	84	3.3	3.0	1.2
Larry Monsma	127	2.4	2.0	1.3	112	2.4	2.0	1.4
Sam Vandergaw	95	3.6	4.0	1.3	74	3.7	4.0	1.4

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Marika Athens	119	-	-	7	5.9	10	8.4	27	22.7	75	63.0
Chris Darnall	97	2	2.1	16	16.5	19	19.6	30	30.9	30	30.9
Monica Elkinton	126	7	5.6	22	17.5	24	19.0	28	22.2	45	35.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	84	6	7.1	19	22.6	22	26.2	20	23.8	17	20.2
Larry Monsma	112	32	28.6	42	37.5	14	12.5	7	6.3	17	15.2
Sam Vandergaw	74	7	9.5	8	10.8	18	24.3	11	14.9	30	40.5

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Marika Athens	11	4.4	9	4.1	12	4.4	-	-	38	4.7	40	4.2	4	4.8	5	4.8	-	-	4.4
Chris Darnall	9	3.4	1	2.0	9	3.6	-	-	19	3.6	52	3.9	5	3.6	2	4.5	-	-	3.7
Monica Elkinton	12	3.6	9	3.4	19	3.1	-	-	26	3.9	45	3.8	6	3.5	7	4.3	1	4.0	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	6	4.0	4	3.0	8	4.1	-	-	14	3.6	45	3.0	4	3.0	3	3.7	-	-	3.3
Larry Monsma	8	2.6	10	1.7	15	2.1	-	-	22	3.0	48	2.3	4	2.5	4	3.0	-	-	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	5	3.6	3	2.7	7	4.1	-	-	10	4.0	43	3.7	3	2.3	3	4.0	-	-	3.7

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Marika Athens	9	4.1	12	4.4	17	4.2	19	4.6	60	4.5	4.4
Chris Darnall	20	3.7	18	3.6	16	3.7	13	3.2	27	4.1	3.7
Monica Elkinton	19	3.8	9	4.1	19	3.4	23	3.7	54	3.6	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	16	3.4	12	2.7	10	2.4	10	2.8	33	3.8	3.3
Larry Monsma	18	2.1	14	2.3	20	1.8	20	2.0	36	3.2	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	15	4.0	12	3.8	12	2.7	12	3.4	20	4.0	3.7

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Marika Athens	8	4.1	20	4.2	47	4.4	41	4.6	3	4.3	4.4
Chris Darnall	29	4.3	24	3.5	32	3.5	11	3.6	1	1.0	3.7
Monica Elkinton	17	3.8	25	2.8	45	3.9	33	3.9	6	3.8	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	23	3.0	24	3.0	28	3.4	8	4.4	1	1.0	3.3
Larry Monsma	28	2.3	24	2.3	42	2.7	15	1.9	2	2.5	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	24	4.7	18	3.1	24	3.2	7	3.7	1	1.0	3.7

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Marika Athens	2	5.0	1	4.0	108	4.4	8	4.6	-	-	4.4
Chris Darnall	8	3.6	3	3.3	72	3.7	13	3.8	1	5.0	3.7
Monica Elkinton	3	4.0	2	4.5	120	3.6			1	5.0	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	1	5.0	2	3.0	71	3.2	10	3.6	-	-	3.3
Larry Monsma	4	1.8	2	1.5	100	2.4	5	2.8	-	-	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	2	1.5	4	3.5	59	3.7	9	4.1	-	-	3.7

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Marika Athens	66	4.4	53	4.5	-	-	4.4
Chris Darnall	55	3.6	42	3.8	-	-	3.7
Monica Elkinton	74	3.6	52	3.7	-	-	3.7
Lindsay Ingaldson	53	3.4	31	3.0	-	-	3.3
Larry Monsma	63	2.4	48	2.4	-	-	2.4
Sam Vandergaw	41	3.6	33	3.7	-	-	3.7

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

Table 11
Marika Athens
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	166	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	119	71.7
Professional reputation	20	12.0
Other personal contacts	27	16.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	92	77.3
Substantial amount of experience	43	36.1
Moderate amount of experience	48	40.3
Limited amount of experience	28	23.5
Type of Practice		
No response		
Private, solo	12	7.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	6.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	22	13.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	43	25.9
Government	59	35.5
Public service agency or organization	8	4.8
Retired	12	7.2
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.2
5 years or fewer	12	7.2
6 to 10 years	19	11.4
11 to 15 years	31	18.7
16 to 20 years	30	18.1
More than 20 years	72	43.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	12	7.2
Criminal	28	16.9
Mixed criminal & civil	62	37.3
Civil	59	35.5
Other	5	3.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	5	3.0
Second District	2	1.2
Third District	146	88.0
Fourth District	13	7.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	84	50.6
Female	82	49.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Marika Athens
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	166	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	119	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	92	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	27	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	43	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	48	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	28	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	20	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5
Other personal contacts	27	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	11	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	38	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7
Government	40	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	4	4.8	4.8	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.8
Retired	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.1	4.6	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1
6 to 10 years	12	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	17	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2
16 to 20 years	19	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
More than 20 years	60	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Criminal	20	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	47	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Civil	41	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.6
Other	3	4.3	5.0	4.3	4.3	5.0	4.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Third District	108	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Fourth District	8	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	66	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Female	53	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Chris Darnall
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	117	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	98	83.8
Professional reputation	16	13.7
Other personal contacts	3	2.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	94	95.9
Substantial amount of experience	32	32.7
Moderate amount of experience	44	44.9
Limited amount of experience	22	22.4
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.7
Private, solo	10	8.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	9.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	18.8
Government	62	53.0
Public service agency or organization	6	5.1
Retired	2	1.7
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.6
5 years or fewer	25	21.4
6 to 10 years	20	17.1
11 to 15 years	19	16.2
16 to 20 years	16	13.7
More than 20 years	34	29.1
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	31	26.5
Criminal	28	23.9
Mixed criminal & civil	42	35.9
Civil	15	12.8
Other	1	0.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	9	7.7
Second District	3	2.6
Third District	89	76.1
Fourth District	15	12.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	68	58.1
Female	49	41.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Chris Darnall
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	117	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	98	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	94	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	32	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	44	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.7
Limited amount of experience	22	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	16	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.4
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.3	3.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	19	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.6
Government	52	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.9
Public service agency or organization	5	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6
Retired	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	20	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7
6 to 10 years	18	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.6
11 to 15 years	16	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7
16 to 20 years	13	3.5	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.2	3.2
More than 20 years	28	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	29	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.3
Criminal	25	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	32	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.4	3.5
Civil	11	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.6
Other	1	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	3.9	4.4	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.6
Second District	3	3.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.3
Third District	73	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.7
Fourth District	13	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.7	3.8
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	55	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.6
Female	43	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Monica Elkinton
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	162	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	127	78.4
Professional reputation	16	9.9
Other personal contacts	19	11.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	102	80.3
Substantial amount of experience	53	41.7
Moderate amount of experience	42	33.1
Limited amount of experience	32	25.2
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
Private, solo	17	10.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	8.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	25	15.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	28	17.3
Government	62	38.3
Public service agency or organization	7	4.3
Retired	8	4.9
Other	1	0.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	1.9
5 years or fewer	22	13.6
6 to 10 years	13	8.0
11 to 15 years	27	16.7
16 to 20 years	31	19.1
More than 20 years	66	40.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	21	13.0
Criminal	27	16.7
Mixed criminal & civil	54	33.3
Civil	52	32.1
Other	8	4.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	1.9
Second District	2	1.2
Third District	153	94.4
Fourth District	2	1.2
Outside Alaska	2	1.2
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	86	53.1
Female	76	46.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Monica Elkinton
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	162	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	127	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	102	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	25	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	53	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	42	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Limited amount of experience	32	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	16	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.6
Other personal contacts	19	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	12	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9
Government	46	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8
Public service agency or organization	6	3.7	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.5
Retired	7	4.1	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3
Other	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	19	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8
6 to 10 years	9	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1
11 to 15 years	19	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.4
16 to 20 years	24	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7
More than 20 years	54	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	18	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.8
Criminal	25	3.0	3.2	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8
Mixed criminal & civil	45	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9
Civil	33	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9
Other	6	4.2	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.0
Second District	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.5
Third District	121	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	75	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6
Female	52	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Lindsay Ingaldson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	103	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	84	81.6
Professional reputation	13	12.6
Other personal contacts	6	5.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	81	96.4
Substantial amount of experience	33	39.3
Moderate amount of experience	32	38.1
Limited amount of experience	19	22.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	9.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	12.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	19	18.4
Government	48	46.6
Public service agency or organization	4	3.9
Retired	4	3.9
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.9
5 years or fewer	20	19.4
6 to 10 years	13	12.6
11 to 15 years	12	11.7
16 to 20 years	13	12.6
More than 20 years	42	40.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	25	24.3
Criminal	25	24.3
Mixed criminal & civil	32	31.1
Civil	20	19.4
Other	1	1.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.0
Second District	3	2.9
Third District	88	85.4
Fourth District	11	10.7
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	64	62.1
Female	39	37.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
Lindsay Ingaldson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	103	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.1	3.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	84	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	81	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.2	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	3	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	33	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	32	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.3
Limited amount of experience	19	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.2	3.4
Professional reputation	13	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.6	2.6
Other personal contacts	6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.4	3.6
Government	45	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.4	2.8	3.0
Public service agency or organization	4	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.0
Retired	3	3.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	16	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.1	3.4
6 to 10 years	12	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.6	2.7
11 to 15 years	10	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.1	2.3	2.4
16 to 20 years	10	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.6	2.4	2.8
More than 20 years	33	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	23	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.6	2.8	3.0
Criminal	24	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	28	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.4
Civil	8	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.4
Other	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	2	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
Third District	71	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.2
Fourth District	10	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.3	3.4	3.6
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	53	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.4
Female	31	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 19
Larry Monsma
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	130	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	113	86.9
Professional reputation	15	11.5
Other personal contacts	2	1.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	95	84.1
Substantial amount of experience	61	54.0
Moderate amount of experience	35	31.0
Limited amount of experience	17	15.0
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	8	6.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	8.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	12.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	23	17.7
Government	61	46.9
Public service agency or organization	6	4.6
Retired	4	3.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	3.1
5 years or fewer	24	18.5
6 to 10 years	17	13.1
11 to 15 years	22	16.9
16 to 20 years	23	17.7
More than 20 years	40	30.8
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.8
Prosecution	30	23.1
Criminal	30	23.1
Mixed criminal & civil	46	35.4
Civil	20	15.4
Other	3	2.3
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
First District	4	3.1
Second District	2	1.5
Third District	116	89.2
Fourth District	7	5.4
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	0.8
Male	74	56.9
Female	54	41.5
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 20
Larry Monsma
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	130	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	113	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.4
Experience within last 5 years	95	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.4
Experience not within last 5 years	18	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.3
Substantial amount of experience	61	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.4
Moderate amount of experience	35	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.3
Limited amount of experience	17	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.7
Professional reputation	15	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.5
Other personal contacts	2	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	1.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	2.5	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	2.0	2.3	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	15	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.3	2.2	2.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.0
Government	48	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.3
Public service agency or organization	5	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.5
Retired	4	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	18	2.4	2.2	2.9	2.3	2.4	2.1
6 to 10 years	14	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.4	2.3
11 to 15 years	20	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.3	1.8
16 to 20 years	21	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.4	2.0
More than 20 years	36	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	28	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.3
Criminal	25	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.3
Mixed criminal & civil	42	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.7
Civil	15	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.1	1.9
Other	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.8
Second District	2	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.5	1.5
Third District	101	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.4
Fourth District	5	2.6	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	64	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.4
Female	48	2.7	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 21
Sam Vandergaw
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	97	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	74	76.3
Professional reputation	19	19.6
Other personal contacts	4	4.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	71	95.9
Substantial amount of experience	32	43.2
Moderate amount of experience	28	37.8
Limited amount of experience	14	18.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	8	8.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	5.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	8.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	15.5
Government	53	54.6
Public service agency or organization	5	5.2
Retired	3	3.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	3.1
5 years or fewer	21	21.6
6 to 10 years	14	14.4
11 to 15 years	18	18.6
16 to 20 years	14	14.4
More than 20 years	27	27.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	26	26.8
Criminal	24	24.7
Mixed criminal & civil	33	34.0
Civil	13	13.4
Other	1	1.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	4.1
Second District	4	4.1
Third District	79	81.4
Fourth District	10	10.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	54	55.7
Female	43	44.3
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Sam Vandergaw
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	97	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	74	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	71	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	3	2.3	2.3	2.7	3.0	2.0	2.3
Substantial amount of experience	32	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	28	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4
Limited amount of experience	14	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1
Professional reputation	19	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.5
Other personal contacts	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	3.7	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0
Government	43	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Public service agency or organization	3	2.7	2.3	2.7	3.0	2.3	2.3
Retired	3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	15	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	12	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
11 to 15 years	12	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7
16 to 20 years	12	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4
More than 20 years	20	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	24	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7
Criminal	18	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.1
Mixed criminal & civil	24	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2
Civil	7	3.9	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7
Other	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5
Second District	4	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.5
Third District	59	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7
Fourth District	9	3.6	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.1
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	41	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
Female	33	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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