



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Anchorage Superior Court

Technical Report

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

May 19-23, 2025

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: Kate Demarest: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Kate Demarest: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Kari McCrea: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Kari McCrea: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Danée Lynn Pontious: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Danée Lynn Pontious: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 21: William A. Taylor: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: William A. Taylor: 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 Superior Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Kevin M. Saxby. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of six applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Marika Athens, Kate Demarest, Kari McCrea, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., Danée Lynn Pontious, and William A. Taylor.

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	89	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Kate Demarest	67	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Kari McCrea	112	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	71	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	49	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
William A. Taylor	43	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.3

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

2025 Judicial Selection Survey, Anchorage Superior 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: Anchorage Superior Court and Bethel District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Anchorage Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Kevin M. Saxby. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of six applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Marika Athens, Kate Demarest, Kari McCrea, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., Danée Lynn Pontious, and William A. Taylor.

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 3,808 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,795) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. One individual received only a paper version of the survey and 12 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 515 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; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; three 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, 506 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned two 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. One paper survey was signed and returned without a printed name or address on the return envelope. The signature on that survey had no discernable letters, and the respondent could not be identified. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis. Therefore, one paper survey qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 506 online surveys and one paper survey, for a total of 507 surveys and a survey return rate of 13.31%. Of the 507 returned surveys, 214 (42.2%) did not rate any of the nine applicants (six Anchorage Superior Court applicants and three Bethel District Court applicants); 293 (57.8%) 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	507	100	293	57.8
Type of Practice				
No response	3	0.6	2	0.7
Private, solo	78	15.4	25	8.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	58	11.4	25	8.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	70	13.8	39	13.3
Private, corporate employee	17	3.4	11	3.8
Judge or judicial officer	52	10.3	47	16.0
Government	118	23.3	91	31.1
Public service agency or organization	24	4.7	20	6.8
Retired	74	14.6	28	9.6
Other	13	2.6	5	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	26	5.1	9	3.1
5 years or fewer	55	10.8	32	10.9
6 to 10 years	45	8.9	30	10.2
11 to 15 years	56	11.0	46	15.7
16 to 20 years	45	8.9	32	10.9
More than 20 years	280	55.2	144	49.1
Cases Handled				
No response	9	1.8	2	0.7
Prosecution	32	6.3	28	9.6
Criminal	30	5.9	24	8.2
Mixed criminal & civil	124	24.5	87	29.7
Civil	276	54.4	139	47.4
Other	36	7.1	13	4.4
Location of Practice				
No response	5	1.0	1	0.3
First District	52	10.3	17	5.8
Second District	14	2.8	12	4.1
Third District	350	69.0	230	78.5
Fourth District	56	11.0	29	9.9
Outside Alaska	30	5.9	4	1.4
Gender				
No response	6	1.2	2	0.7
Male	288	56.8	153	52.2
Female	212	41.8	138	47.1
Another identity	1	0.2	-	-

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. One paper survey was signed and returned without a printed name or address on the return envelope. The signature on this survey had no discernable letters, and the respondent could not be identified. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis and was not reflected in the total number of valid surveys received. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once. 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 demographic 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	122	24.1	73.0	16.4	10.7
Kate Demarest	111	21.9	60.4	36.0	3.6
Kari McCrea	135	26.6	83.0	13.3	3.7
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	91	17.9	78.0	19.8	2.2
Danée Lynn Pontious	77	15.2	63.6	27.3	9.1
William A. Taylor	57	11.2	75.4	21.1	3.5

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	120	4.4	5.0	0.9	89	4.4	5.0	0.9
Kate Demarest	109	4.2	5.0	1.1	66	4.2	5.0	1.1
Kari McCrea	134	4.6	5.0	0.8	111	4.6	5.0	0.8
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	91	3.8	4.0	1.2	71	3.8	4.0	1.3
Danée Lynn Pontious	76	4.0	4.0	1.1	49	4.0	4.0	1.2
William A. Taylor	54	3.2	3.0	1.3	42	3.3	3.0	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	89	2	2.2	1	1.1	11	12.4	20	22.5	55	61.8
Kate Demarest	66	1	1.5	8	12.1	4	6.1	15	22.7	38	57.6
Kari McCrea	111	2	1.8	2	1.8	6	5.4	16	14.4	85	76.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	71	4	5.6	8	11.3	15	21.1	14	19.7	30	42.3
Danée Lynn Pontious	49	4	8.2	2	4.1	4	8.2	18	36.7	21	42.9
William A. Taylor	42	2	4.8	14	33.3	7	16.7	6	14.3	13	31.0

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	6	4.7	10	4.3	9	4.2	1	5.0	28	4.5	22	4.1	5	5.0	6	4.7	1	5.0	4.4
Kate Demarest	3	3.0	5	2.8	11	4.0	4	5.0	9	4.3	20	4.4	5	4.8	6	4.3	3	5.0	4.2
Kari McCrea	7	4.7	14	4.5	14	4.9	1	5.0	29	5.0	33	4.2	5	5.0	5	4.4	3	5.0	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	3	2.7	3	2.3	9	3.4	-	-	10	3.2	35	4.2	3	3.3	7	4.6	-	-	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	5	4.6	4	3.8	8	4.0	-	-	13	3.7	10	3.7	2	4.5	5	4.8	2	4.5	4.0
William A. Taylor	1	5.0	4	2.8	9	3.2	-	-	4	2.8	18	3.9	3	2.0	1	2.0	1	3.0	3.3

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	7	4.7	6	4.5	8	4.1	14	3.9	51	4.5	4.4
Kate Demarest	1	5.0	7	3.6	11	4.3	8	4.5	35	4.3	4.2
Kari McCrea	13	4.5	13	4.5	9	4.0	15	4.7	57	4.8	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	8	4.1	9	3.6	12	4.0	10	3.5	30	3.9	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	1	5.0	5	4.6	9	4.1	8	2.9	24	4.2	4.0
William A. Taylor	1	5.0	4	2.8	12	4.1	8	2.5	15	3.4	3.3

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	6	3.8	7	4.4	38	4.3	36	4.6	2	4.0	4.4
Kate Demarest	2	3.5	2	4.5	19	4.2	42	4.3	1	4.0	4.2
Kari McCrea	10	3.3	15	4.7	50	4.7	32	4.8	4	5.0	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	17	4.6	11	3.4	27	3.4	15	3.9	-	-	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	5	3.0	1	5.0	22	4.0	20	4.3	1	4.0	4.0
William A. Taylor	10	4.0	2	3.5	21	3.0	8	3.3	1	3.0	3.3

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	1	5.0	1	5.0	79	4.4	8	4.8	-	-	4.4
Kate Demarest	5	4.6	-	-	57	4.2	4	4.5	-	-	4.2
Kari McCrea	3	4.3	4	4.5	93	4.6	11	4.8	-	-	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	4	4.0	2	4.5	59	3.8	5	3.4	1	5.0	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	4	3.8	3	3.0	39	4.2	3	3.3	-	-	4.0
William A. Taylor	2	3.5	1	2.0	36	3.4	2	1.5	1	5.0	3.3

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	42	4.2	46	4.6	-	-	4.4
Kate Demarest	38	4.2	28	4.2	-	-	4.2
Kari McCrea	59	4.5	52	4.8	-	-	4.6
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	49	3.9	21	3.6	-	-	3.8
Danée Lynn Pontious	26	4.0	23	4.0	-	-	4.0
William A. Taylor	25	3.7	16	2.8	-	-	3.3

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	122	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	89	73.0
Professional reputation	20	16.4
Other personal contacts	13	10.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	72	80.9
Substantial amount of experience	26	29.2
Moderate amount of experience	38	42.7
Limited amount of experience	25	28.1
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	8	6.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	9.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	11.5
Private, corporate employee	2	1.6
Judge or judicial officer	33	27.0
Government	32	26.2
Public service agency or organization	9	7.4
Retired	10	8.2
Other	2	1.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.5
5 years or fewer	7	5.7
6 to 10 years	10	8.2
11 to 15 years	16	13.1
16 to 20 years	19	15.6
More than 20 years	67	54.9
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	8.2
Criminal	8	6.6
Mixed criminal & civil	51	41.8
Civil	49	40.2
Other	4	3.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	3.3
Second District	2	1.6
Third District	102	83.6
Fourth District	12	9.8
Outside Alaska	2	1.6
Gender		
No response	1	0.8
Male	58	47.5
Female	63	51.6
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	122	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	89	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	72	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	17	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	26	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	25	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
Professional reputation	20	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4
Other personal contacts	13	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.1	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.2
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	28	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Government	22	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
Retired	6	4.8	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	6	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.5
11 to 15 years	8	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.1
16 to 20 years	14	4.0	4.5	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.9
More than 20 years	51	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.3	3.8
Criminal	7	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	38	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3
Civil	36	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6
Other	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	79	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	8	4.5	4.9	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	42	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.2
Female	46	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Kate Demarest
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	111	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	67	60.4
Professional reputation	40	36.0
Other personal contacts	4	3.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	49	73.1
Substantial amount of experience	22	32.8
Moderate amount of experience	30	44.8
Limited amount of experience	15	22.4
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.9
Private, solo	5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	6.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	18	16.2
Private, corporate employee	7	6.3
Judge or judicial officer	14	12.6
Government	35	31.5
Public service agency or organization	9	8.1
Retired	11	9.9
Other	4	3.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	5.4
5 years or fewer	4	3.6
6 to 10 years	12	10.8
11 to 15 years	16	14.4
16 to 20 years	15	13.5
More than 20 years	58	52.3
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.9
Prosecution	7	6.3
Criminal	5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	32	28.8
Civil	63	56.8
Other	3	2.7
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.9
First District	9	8.1
Second District	2	1.8
Third District	90	81.1
Fourth District	8	7.2
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	59	53.2
Female	51	45.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Kate Demarest
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	111	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	67	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	49	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	22	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	30	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	15	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	40	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1
Other personal contacts	4	4.7	3.8	4.0	4.7	4.7	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	3	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, corporate employee	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.5	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.6	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.3
Government	20	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Retired	6	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.3
Other	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	8	4.1	4.0	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6
11 to 15 years	11	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3
16 to 20 years	8	4.8	4.6	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.5
More than 20 years	35	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.5
Criminal	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	19	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.2
Civil	43	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Other	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	58	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	4	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	38	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2
Female	29	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Kari McCrea
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	135	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	112	83.0
Professional reputation	18	13.3
Other personal contacts	5	3.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	95	85.6
Substantial amount of experience	46	41.4
Moderate amount of experience	44	39.6
Limited amount of experience	21	18.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	9	6.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	11.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	17	12.6
Private, corporate employee	2	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	35	25.9
Government	37	27.4
Public service agency or organization	6	4.4
Retired	10	7.4
Other	4	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	3.0
5 years or fewer	15	11.1
6 to 10 years	14	10.4
11 to 15 years	14	10.4
16 to 20 years	20	14.8
More than 20 years	68	50.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	11	8.1
Criminal	16	11.9
Mixed criminal & civil	59	43.7
Civil	43	31.9
Other	6	4.4
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	6	4.4
Second District	5	3.7
Third District	109	80.7
Fourth District	15	11.1
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	66	48.9
Female	69	51.1
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Kari McCrea
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	135	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	112	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	95	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	16	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	46	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	44	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	21	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	18	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6
Other personal contacts	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	4.7	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	30	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Government	33	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.4
Other	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	13	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.9	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	13	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
11 to 15 years	10	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.0
16 to 20 years	15	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
More than 20 years	57	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	3.6	3.9	3.0	3.8	3.7	3.3
Criminal	15	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	51	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Civil	32	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.8
Other	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Second District	4	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5
Third District	93	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Fourth District	12	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	59	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5
Female	53	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	91	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	71	78.0
Professional reputation	18	19.8
Other personal contacts	2	2.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	60	84.5
Substantial amount of experience	32	45.1
Moderate amount of experience	19	26.8
Limited amount of experience	20	28.2
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
Private, solo	5	5.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	12.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	16.5
Government	40	44.0
Public service agency or organization	4	4.4
Retired	11	12.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.2
5 years or fewer	9	9.9
6 to 10 years	10	11.0
11 to 15 years	14	15.4
16 to 20 years	11	12.1
More than 20 years	45	49.5
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1
Prosecution	19	20.9
Criminal	11	12.1
Mixed criminal & civil	33	36.3
Civil	25	27.5
Other	2	2.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	4.4
Second District	2	2.2
Third District	75	82.4
Fourth District	8	8.8
Outside Alaska	2	2.2
Gender		
No response	1	1.1
Male	59	64.8
Female	31	34.1
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.
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	91	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	71	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	60	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	11	4.0	4.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	32	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.7
Limited amount of experience	20	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4
Professional reputation	18	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	3	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.7	2.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.2
Government	35	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.2
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3
Retired	7	4.6	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.1
6 to 10 years	9	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.6
11 to 15 years	12	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.0
16 to 20 years	10	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5
More than 20 years	30	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	17	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6
Criminal	11	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	27	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4
Civil	15	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.9
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.0
Second District	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Third District	59	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8
Fourth District	5	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.4
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	49	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9
Female	21	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 19
Danée Lynn Pontious
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	77	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	49	63.6
Professional reputation	21	27.3
Other personal contacts	7	9.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	71.4
Substantial amount of experience	15	30.6
Moderate amount of experience	20	40.8
Limited amount of experience	14	28.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	9.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	5.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	16.9
Private, corporate employee	2	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	19	24.7
Government	17	22.1
Public service agency or organization	5	6.5
Retired	8	10.4
Other	2	2.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.6
5 years or fewer	2	2.6
6 to 10 years	6	7.8
11 to 15 years	13	16.9
16 to 20 years	13	16.9
More than 20 years	41	53.2
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	5	6.5
Criminal	3	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	33	42.9
Civil	34	44.2
Other	2	2.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	5	6.5
Second District	3	3.9
Third District	63	81.8
Fourth District	6	7.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	39	50.6
Female	38	49.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 20
Danée Lynn Pontious
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	77	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	49	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	14	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	15	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	20	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	14	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.9
Professional reputation	21	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.9	3.9
Other personal contacts	7	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7
Government	10	3.5	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.5	3.7
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Retired	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.8
Other	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.6
11 to 15 years	9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
16 to 20 years	8	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.5	2.9
More than 20 years	24	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	2.6	3.2	3.0	3.4	2.6	3.0
Criminal	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	22	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0
Civil	20	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other	1	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	3.5	4.0	3.8	4.3	3.8	3.8
Second District	3	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.0
Third District	39	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	3	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	26	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.0
Female	23	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 21
William A. Taylor
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	57	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	43	75.4
Professional reputation	12	21.1
Other personal contacts	2	3.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	31	72.1
Substantial amount of experience	25	58.1
Moderate amount of experience	13	30.2
Limited amount of experience	5	11.6
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.8
Private, solo	3	5.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	8.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	19.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	8.8
Government	26	45.6
Public service agency or organization	3	5.3
Retired	2	3.5
Other	1	1.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	3.5
5 years or fewer	1	1.8
6 to 10 years	7	12.3
11 to 15 years	16	28.1
16 to 20 years	10	17.5
More than 20 years	21	36.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	13	22.8
Criminal	3	5.3
Mixed criminal & civil	27	47.4
Civil	12	21.1
Other	2	3.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	2	3.5
Second District	1	1.8
Third District	48	84.2
Fourth District	5	8.8
Outside Alaska	1	1.8
Gender		
No response	1	1.8
Male	36	63.2
Female	20	35.1
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
William A. Taylor
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	57	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	43	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	31	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	12	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.3	2.9
Substantial amount of experience	25	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	13	3.5	3.4	2.9	3.1	3.5	2.9
Limited amount of experience	5	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.8
Professional reputation	12	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.5
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	4	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.8
Government	19	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.9
Public service agency or organization	3	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.3	2.0
Retired	1	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	5	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8
11 to 15 years	12	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1
16 to 20 years	8	3.6	3.4	2.6	2.4	3.0	2.5
More than 20 years	15	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
Criminal	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	22	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.0
Civil	8	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.3
Other	1	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
Third District	37	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.4
Fourth District	2	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	26	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.7
Female	16	3.4	3.5	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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