



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

August 25-29, 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: John Haley: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: John Haley: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Dustin Pearson: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Dustin Pearson: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Eric Salinger: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Eric Salinger: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Peter A. Scully: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Peter A. Scully: Detailed Responses	23
Table 19: Jonathan Stinson: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Jonathan Stinson: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Sam Vandergaw: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Sam Vandergaw: Detailed Responses	27
Table 23: Matt Widmer: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: Matt Widmer: Detailed Responses	29

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 forthcoming retirement of Judge Pamela S. Washington. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): John Haley, Dustin Pearson, Eric Salinger, Peter A. Scully, Jonathan Stinson, Matt Stinson, Sam Vandergaw, and Matt Widmer. Matt Stinson withdrew his application; therefore, his results will not be included.

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

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
John Haley	74	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Dustin Pearson	65	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5
Eric Salinger	62	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
Peter A. Scully	47	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	78	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	69	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7
Matt Widmer	113	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4

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

2025 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 a vacancy on the Anchorage District Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Pamela S. Washington. This report presents the findings of the survey. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): John Haley, Dustin Pearson, Eric Salinger, Peter A. Scully, Jonathan Stinson, Matt Stinson, Sam Vandergaw, and Matt Widmer. Matt Stinson withdrew his application; therefore, his results will not be included.

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 3,744 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,732) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. One individual received only a paper version of the survey and 11 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; five 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, 697 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned three 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. One 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, two paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 697 online surveys and two paper surveys, for a total of 699 surveys and a survey return rate of 18.7%. Of the 699 returned surveys, 375 (53.6%) did not rate any of the eight applicants; 324

(46.4%) 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		699	100	324	46.4
Type of Practice					
	No response	3	0.4	2	0.6
	Private, solo	118	16.9	36	11.1
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	89	12.7	36	11.1
	Private, 6+ attorneys	99	14.2	55	17.0
	Private, corporate employee	18	2.6	4	1.2
	Judge or judicial officer	60	8.6	40	12.3
	Government	167	23.9	117	36.1
	Public service agency or organization	33	4.7	19	5.9
	Retired	99	14.2	11	3.4
	Other	13	1.9	4	1.2
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	36	5.2	17	5.2
	5 years or fewer	87	12.4	46	14.2
	6 to 10 years	65	9.3	43	13.3
	11 to 15 years	86	12.3	64	19.8
	16 to 20 years	58	8.3	39	12.0
	More than 20 years	367	52.5	115	35.5
Cases Handled					
	No response	7	1.0	4	1.2
	Prosecution	37	5.3	28	8.6
	Criminal	62	8.9	45	13.9
	Mixed criminal & civil	164	23.5	75	23.1
	Civil	387	55.4	158	48.8
	Other	42	6.0	14	4.3
Location of Practice					
	No response	6	0.9	4	1.2
	First District	75	10.7	20	6.2
	Second District	9	1.3	4	1.2
	Third District	519	74.2	274	84.6
	Fourth District	53	7.6	13	4.0
	Outside Alaska	37	5.3	9	2.8
Gender					
	No response	15	2.1	7	2.2
	Male	381	54.5	157	48.5
	Female	300	42.9	159	49.1
	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 11-24 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

		% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
	<i>n</i>		Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
John Haley	99	14.2	74.7	14.1	11.1
Dustin Pearson	74	10.6	87.8	12.2	-
Eric Salinger	72	10.3	86.1	11.1	2.8
Peter A. Scully	64	9.2	73.4	17.2	9.4
Jonathan Stinson	90	12.9	86.7	8.9	4.4
Sam Vandergaw	88	12.6	78.4	17.0	4.5
Matt Widmer	140	20.0	80.7	11.4	7.9

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>
John Haley	98	4.4	5.0	0.9	74	4.4	5.0	0.9
Dustin Pearson	70	3.5	4.0	1.4	63	3.5	4.0	1.5
Eric Salinger	71	4.0	5.0	1.3	61	4.1	5.0	1.2
Peter A. Scully	62	4.5	5.0	1.0	46	4.3	5.0	1.1
Jonathan Stinson	88	3.7	4.0	1.3	77	3.8	4.0	1.2
Sam Vandergaw	88	3.6	4.0	1.4	69	3.7	4.0	1.4
Matt Widmer	138	4.4	5.0	0.9	111	4.4	5.0	0.9

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>	%
John Haley	74	-	-	6	8.1	4	5.4	15	20.3	49	66.2
Dustin Pearson	63	10	15.9	6	9.5	13	20.6	10	15.9	24	38.1
Eric Salinger	61	3	4.9	4	6.6	10	16.4	8	13.1	36	59.0
Peter A. Scully	46	1	2.2	5	10.9	3	6.5	6	13.0	31	67.4
Jonathan Stinson	77	1	1.3	12	15.6	16	20.8	18	23.4	30	39.0
Sam Vandergaw	69	7	10.1	7	10.1	13	18.8	15	21.7	27	39.1
Matt Widmer	111	2	1.8	4	3.6	10	9.0	22	19.8	73	65.8

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>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>	<i>M</i>
John Haley	2	3.5	3	4.7	12	4.2	-	-	10	4.2	43	4.6	3	4.3	-	-	1	4.0	4.4
Dustin Pearson	7	3.4	8	3.1	7	3.7	-	-	8	4.4	26	3.2	2	4.0	3	4.7	2	3.5	3.5
Eric Salinger	4	5.0	5	4.4	6	4.2	-	-	8	4.5	26	3.6	10	4.7	1	5.0	1	5.0	4.1
Peter A. Scully	7	3.0	5	4.4	20	4.6	4	4.8	2	4.0	4	4.8	1	4.0	2	5.0	-	-	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	5	4.0	13	4.5	9	3.4	-	-	18	3.9	30	3.5	1	5.0	1	5.0	-	-	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	4	4.0	2	4.5	7	3.6	-	-	9	4.2	46	3.6	1	2.0	-	-	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	18	4.6	11	4.5	28	4.6	-	-	13	4.1	35	4.4	3	4.7	1	5.0	2	3.5	4.4

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>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>
John Haley	8	5.0	11	4.8	22	4.4	12	4.1	17	4.4	4.4
Dustin Pearson	10	3.0	4	3.8	14	3.1	6	3.5	24	3.8	3.5
Eric Salinger	5	4.4	9	3.9	18	4.0	12	4.0	15	4.5	4.1
Peter A. Scully	2	5.0	7	4.7	5	3.8	8	4.8	20	4.3	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	10	4.3	14	3.5	12	3.3	5	4.0	32	4.0	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	10	4.1	15	3.9	19	3.2	9	3.8	13	3.8	3.7
Matt Widmer	4	4.8	11	4.5	24	4.6	20	4.6	46	4.3	4.4

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>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>	
John Haley	12	4.4	7	4.1	17	4.4	34	4.6	3	3.7	4.4
Dustin Pearson	9	3.9	16	2.7	22	4.0	11	3.6	4	2.5	3.5
Eric Salinger	3	3.0	9	3.9	16	4.5	30	4.3	3	2.3	4.1
Peter A. Scully	-	-	1	5.0	5	3.2	39	4.4	-	-	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	7	2.7	13	3.4	27	4.1	24	4.1	5	3.6	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	21	4.4	16	3.2	21	3.7	7	3.3	4	2.8	3.7
Matt Widmer	9	3.7	17	4.8	38	4.4	39	4.6	8	3.9	4.4

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>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>	
John Haley	4	5.0	2	4.5	62	4.4	4	4.5	2	5.0	4.4
Dustin Pearson	-	-	-	-	62	3.5	1	1.0	-	-	3.5
Eric Salinger	6	2.7	1	5.0	47	4.3	5	4.0	2	5.0	4.1
Peter A. Scully	1	5.0	1	5.0	42	4.3	-	-	-	-	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	1	3.0	-	-	75	3.8	1	4.0	-	-	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	6	2.7	3	3.7	54	3.8	5	3.8	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	4	5.0	2	4.0	97	4.4	4	5.0	3	4.3	4.4

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>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
John Haley	38	4.3	33	4.6	+	+	4.4
Dustin Pearson	37	3.3	24	3.7	-	-	3.5
Eric Salinger	30	4.2	31	4.1	-	-	4.1
Peter A. Scully	29	4.6	14	3.6	-	-	4.3
Jonathan Stinson	35	3.8	41	3.8	+	+	3.8
Sam Vandergaw	40	3.7	28	3.6	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	66	4.5	44	4.4	+	+	4.4

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

Table 11
John Haley
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	99	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	74	74.7
Professional reputation	14	14.1
Other personal contacts	11	11.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	56	75.7
Substantial amount of experience	26	35.1
Moderate amount of experience	31	41.9
Limited amount of experience	17	23.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	2	2.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	5.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	15	15.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	11.1
Government	59	59.6
Public service agency or organization	6	6.1
Retired	-	-
Other	1	1.0
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	4.0
5 years or fewer	12	12.1
6 to 10 years	17	17.2
11 to 15 years	32	32.3
16 to 20 years	14	14.1
More than 20 years	20	20.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.0
Prosecution	17	17.2
Criminal	11	11.1
Mixed criminal & civil	20	20.2
Civil	46	46.5
Other	4	4.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	7	7.1
Second District	2	2.0
Third District	83	83.8
Fourth District	4	4.0
Outside Alaska	3	3.0
Gender		
No response	2	2.0
Male	43	43.4
Female	53	53.5
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 12
John Haley
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	99	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	74	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	56	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.6	3.9	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	26	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	31	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	17	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	3.8	4.0
Professional reputation	14	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1
Other personal contacts	11	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	-	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.2
Government	43	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Public service agency or organization	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	11	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
11 to 15 years	22	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	12	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.1
More than 20 years	17	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	12	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Criminal	7	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.1
Mixed criminal & civil	17	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.4
Civil	34	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Other	3	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	5.0	5.0
Second District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Third District	62	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.5
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Gender*							
Male	38	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3
Female	33	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
Another identity	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 13
Dustin Pearson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	74	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	65	87.8
Professional reputation	9	12.2
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	57	87.7
Substantial amount of experience	31	47.7
Moderate amount of experience	18	27.7
Limited amount of experience	16	24.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	9	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	10.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	9.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	12.2
Government	32	43.2
Public service agency or organization	3	4.1
Retired	3	4.1
Other	3	4.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	8.1
5 years or fewer	12	16.2
6 to 10 years	6	8.1
11 to 15 years	17	23.0
16 to 20 years	6	8.1
More than 20 years	27	36.5
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.4
Prosecution	13	17.6
Criminal	18	24.3
Mixed criminal & civil	25	33.8
Civil	12	16.2
Other	5	6.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.4
First District	1	1.4
Second District	-	-
Third District	70	94.6
Fourth District	2	2.7
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	3	4.1
Male	40	54.1
Female	31	41.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Dustin Pearson
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	74	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	65	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	57	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	8	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.9
Substantial amount of experience	31	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6
Moderate amount of experience	18	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.2
Limited amount of experience	16	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6
Professional reputation	9	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	3.5	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.5	3.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Government	27	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.2
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0
Retired	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other	3	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	12	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.0
6 to 10 years	4	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.8
11 to 15 years	14	3.1	3.9	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.1
16 to 20 years	6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.5
More than 20 years	24	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.4	3.9
Criminal	17	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.1	2.7
Mixed criminal & civil	22	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Civil	11	3.7	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.6
Other	5	2.2	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	64	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Fourth District	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	37	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.3
Female	26	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Eric Salinger
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	72	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	62	86.1
Professional reputation	8	11.1
Other personal contacts	2	2.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	42	67.7
Substantial amount of experience	24	38.7
Moderate amount of experience	24	38.7
Limited amount of experience	14	22.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	5	6.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	9.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	11.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	11.1
Government	28	38.9
Public service agency or organization	14	19.4
Retired	1	1.4
Other	1	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.8
5 years or fewer	7	9.7
6 to 10 years	10	13.9
11 to 15 years	20	27.8
16 to 20 years	12	16.7
More than 20 years	21	29.2
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	4	5.6
Criminal	10	13.9
Mixed criminal & civil	19	26.4
Civil	36	50.0
Other	3	4.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	6	8.3
Second District	1	1.4
Third District	57	79.2
Fourth District	6	8.3
Outside Alaska	2	2.8
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	35	48.6
Female	37	51.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Eric Salinger
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	72	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	62	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	42	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	20	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	24	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	24	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	14	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.5
Professional reputation	8	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.3
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Government	26	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6
Public service agency or organization	10	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.2	4.4
6 to 10 years	9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.8	3.9
11 to 15 years	18	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
16 to 20 years	12	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.0
More than 20 years	16	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.0	3.0	3.0
Criminal	10	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	16	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5
Civil	30	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Other	3	2.0	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	3.0	3.2	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.7
Second District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	48	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	5	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.6	4.0
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	31	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Female	31	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Peter A. Scully
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	64	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	47	73.4
Professional reputation	11	17.2
Other personal contacts	6	9.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	41	87.2
Substantial amount of experience	19	40.4
Moderate amount of experience	15	31.9
Limited amount of experience	13	27.7
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.6
Private, solo	10	15.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	12.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	24	37.5
Private, corporate employee	4	6.3
Judge or judicial officer	3	4.7
Government	9	14.1
Public service agency or organization	1	1.6
Retired	3	4.7
Other	1	1.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	9.4
5 years or fewer	3	4.7
6 to 10 years	9	14.1
11 to 15 years	9	14.1
16 to 20 years	10	15.6
More than 20 years	27	42.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.6
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	3	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	7	10.9
Civil	51	79.7
Other	2	3.1
Location of Practice		
No response	2	3.1
First District	1	1.6
Second District	1	1.6
Third District	60	93.8
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	3	4.7
Male	36	56.3
Female	25	39.1
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
Peter A. Scully
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	64	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	47	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	41	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	6	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.0	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	19	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
Limited amount of experience	13	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.1
Professional reputation	11	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Other personal contacts	6	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	20	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Private, corporate employee	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Judge or judicial officer	2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0
Government	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	7	4.9	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.7
11 to 15 years	5	4.4	3.8	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.8
16 to 20 years	8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.8
More than 20 years	21	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	5	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.0	3.2
Civil	40	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	43	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	29	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	15	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 19
Jonathan Stinson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	90	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	78	86.7
Professional reputation	8	8.9
Other personal contacts	4	4.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	77	98.7
Substantial amount of experience	30	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	31	39.7
Limited amount of experience	17	21.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	7.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	14.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	13.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	20	22.2
Government	34	37.8
Public service agency or organization	3	3.3
Retired	1	1.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	6.7
5 years or fewer	12	13.3
6 to 10 years	15	16.7
11 to 15 years	15	16.7
16 to 20 years	7	7.8
More than 20 years	35	38.9
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1
Prosecution	9	10.0
Criminal	13	14.4
Mixed criminal & civil	31	34.4
Civil	31	34.4
Other	5	5.6
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	2	2.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	86	95.6
Fourth District	1	1.1
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.1
Male	42	46.7
Female	46	51.1
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 20
Jonathan Stinson
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	90	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	78	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	77	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	30	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.4	3.9	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	31	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.9
Limited amount of experience	17	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.4
Professional reputation	8	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.7	1.9
Other personal contacts	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	3.4	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.5	3.9
Government	30	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.3	3.5
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.3
6 to 10 years	14	3.5	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.5
11 to 15 years	13	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.3
16 to 20 years	5	3.6	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	32	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.3	3.7	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	7	3.1	4.4	3.9	4.0	2.4	2.7
Criminal	13	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.2	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Civil	24	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Other	5	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.3	3.6	3.6
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	75	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Fourth District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	36	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.8
Female	41	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.8
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 21
Sam Vandergaw
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	88	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	69	78.4
Professional reputation	15	17.0
Other personal contacts	4	4.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	88.4
Substantial amount of experience	29	42.0
Moderate amount of experience	24	34.8
Limited amount of experience	16	23.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	8.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	5.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	8.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	12.5
Government	54	61.4
Public service agency or organization	3	3.4
Retired	1	1.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	4.5
5 years or fewer	12	13.6
6 to 10 years	15	17.0
11 to 15 years	25	28.4
16 to 20 years	11	12.5
More than 20 years	21	23.9
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	22	25.0
Criminal	21	23.9
Mixed criminal & civil	28	31.8
Civil	13	14.8
Other	4	4.5
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.3
First District	7	8.0
Second District	3	3.4
Third District	70	79.5
Fourth District	6	6.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.1
Male	49	55.7
Female	38	43.2
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Sam Vandergaw
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	88	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	69	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	61	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	29	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	24	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.8
Limited amount of experience	16	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	15	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	2.9
Other personal contacts	4	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2
Government	46	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.6
Public service agency or organization	1	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1
6 to 10 years	15	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.9
11 to 15 years	19	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.2
16 to 20 years	9	3.9	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.2	3.8
More than 20 years	13	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	21	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.4
Criminal	16	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	21	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.7
Civil	7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.3
Other	4	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.8	2.8	2.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	3.5	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.7
Second District	3	3.3	3.7	4.3	3.0	4.3	3.7
Third District	54	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8
Fourth District	5	3.4	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	40	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.7
Female	28	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 23
Matt Widmer
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	140	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	113	80.7
Professional reputation	16	11.4
Other personal contacts	11	7.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	86	76.8
Substantial amount of experience	44	39.3
Moderate amount of experience	46	41.1
Limited amount of experience	22	19.6
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	21	15.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	9.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	34	24.3
Private, corporate employee	1	0.7
Judge or judicial officer	15	10.7
Government	44	31.4
Public service agency or organization	4	2.9
Retired	4	2.9
Other	3	2.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	5.0
5 years or fewer	8	5.7
6 to 10 years	16	11.4
11 to 15 years	27	19.3
16 to 20 years	22	15.7
More than 20 years	60	42.9
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.7
Prosecution	10	7.1
Criminal	24	17.1
Mixed criminal & civil	41	29.3
Civil	54	38.6
Other	10	7.1
Location of Practice		
No response	2	1.4
First District	5	3.6
Second District	2	1.4
Third District	122	87.1
Fourth District	4	2.9
Outside Alaska	5	3.6
Gender		
No response	3	2.1
Male	79	56.4
Female	58	41.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 24
Matt Widmer
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	140	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	113	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	86	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	26	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	44	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	46	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	22	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1
Professional reputation	16	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.3
Other personal contacts	11	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	19	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	28	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1
Government	35	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4
Public service agency or organization	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	3	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.2	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.8
6 to 10 years	11	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	24	4.7	4.8	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.6
16 to 20 years	20	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6
More than 20 years	47	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	4.0	4.2	3.6	3.8	4.2	3.7
Criminal	17	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	38	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Civil	40	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Other	9	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
Second District	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	98	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Fourth District	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.5	5.0
Outside Alaska	4	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3
Gender*							
Male	67	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Female	45	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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