



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

August 21-25, 2023

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: Kate Demarest: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Kate Demarest: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Kari Lyn McCrea: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Kari Lyn McCrea: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: David A. Nesbett: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: David A. Nesbett: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Danée Pontious: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Danée Pontious: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Rob Sato: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Rob Sato: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 23: Sam Vandergaw: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: Sam Vandergaw: 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 Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge William F. Morse. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kate Demarest, Kari Lyn McCrea, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., David A. Nesbett, Danée Pontious, Rob Sato, 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>
Kate Demarest	91	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	163	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	142	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6
David A. Nesbett	150	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Danéé Pontious	78	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Rob Sato	36	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	82	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5

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

2023 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 vacancies: Anchorage Superior Court, Juneau Superior Court, Sitka Superior Court, and the Alaska Public Defender. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Anchorage Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge William F. Morse. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kate Demarest, Kari Lyn McCrea, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., David A. Nesbett, Danée Pontious, Rob Sato, 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 3,699 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,686) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 13 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 811 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; seven surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; five 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, 799 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned six 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 could not be identified. 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, four paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 799 online surveys and four paper surveys, for a total of 803 surveys and a survey return rate of 21.7%. Of the 803 returned surveys, 255 did not rate any of the 21 applicants (seven Anchorage

Superior Court applicants, two Juneau Superior Court applicants, two Sitka Superior Court applicants, and ten public defender applicants); 548 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	803	100	548	100
Type of Practice				
No response	2	0.2	1	0.2
Private, solo	144	17.9	74	13.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	80	10.0	54	9.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	87	10.8	59	10.8
Private, corporate employee	21	2.6	10	1.8
Judge or judicial officer	67	8.3	63	11.5
Government	259	32.3	222	40.5
Public service agency or organization	35	4.4	27	4.9
Retired	97	12.1	31	5.7
Other	11	1.4	7	1.3
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	33	4.1	20	3.6
5 years or fewer	118	14.7	98	17.9
6 to 10 years	95	11.8	79	14.4
11 to 15 years	92	11.5	76	13.9
16 to 20 years	86	10.7	66	12.0
More than 20 years	379	47.2	209	38.1
Cases Handled				
No response	1	0.1	1	0.2
Prosecution	56	7.0	45	8.2
Criminal	118	14.7	106	19.3
Mixed criminal & civil	191	23.8	151	27.6
Civil	391	48.7	224	40.9
Other	46	5.7	21	3.8
Location of Practice				
No response	4	0.5	2	0.4
First District	114	14.2	77	14.1
Second District	16	2.0	12	2.2
Third District	549	68.4	375	68.4
Fourth District	91	11.3	75	13.7
Outside Alaska	29	3.6	7	1.3
Gender				
No response	10	1.2	7	1.3
Male	445	55.4	299	54.6
Female	339	42.2	235	42.9
Another identity	9	1.1	7	1.3

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, however, one respondent could not be identified because the signature was illegible. 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

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Kate Demarest	142	17.7	64.1	28.9	7.0
Kari Lyn McCrea	194	24.2	84.0	9.8	6.2
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	168	20.9	84.5	12.5	3.0
David A. Nesbett	183	22.8	82.0	13.1	4.9
Danée Pontious	113	14.1	69.0	24.8	6.2
Rob Sato	54	6.7	66.7	20.4	13.0
Sam Vandergaw	95	11.8	86.3	11.6	2.1

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>
Kate Demarest	141	4.2	5.0	1.1	91	4.3	5.0	1.1
Kari Lyn McCrea	192	4.5	5.0	1.0	163	4.5	5.0	1.1
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	166	3.7	4.0	1.2	142	3.6	4.0	1.3
David A. Nesbett	183	4.2	5.0	1.0	150	4.3	5.0	0.9
Danée Pontious	112	3.8	4.0	1.2	77	3.8	4.0	1.2
Rob Sato	54	4.1	4.0	1.1	36	4.1	4.0	1.2
Sam Vandergaw	94	3.5	4.0	1.3	82	3.5	4.0	1.3

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>	%
Kate Demarest	91	2	2.2	6	6.6	12	13.2	17	18.7	54	59.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	163	5	3.1	11	6.7	7	4.3	10	6.1	130	79.8
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	142	7	4.9	24	16.9	31	21.8	31	21.8	49	34.5
David A. Nesbett	150	1	0.7	9	6.0	15	10.0	40	26.7	85	56.7
Danée Pontious	77	3	3.9	10	13.0	14	18.2	19	24.7	31	40.3
Rob Sato	36	2	5.6	2	5.6	5	13.9	10	27.8	17	47.2
Sam Vandergaw	82	6	7.3	14	17.1	20	24.4	13	15.9	29	35.4

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>	
Kate Demarest	5	3.8	3	2.7	16	4.1	5	4.8	14	4.4	38	4.2	6	4.8	4	5.0	-	-	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	12	4.4	15	4.4	13	4.6	1	5.0	32	4.8	76	4.4	8	4.5	5	5.0	1	5.0	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	19	3.7	13	3.3	11	3.4	1	4.0	15	3.3	74	3.7	4	3.3	5	4.6			3.6
David A. Nesbett	22	4.6	10	4.6	19	4.3	-	-	26	4.2	61	4.2	5	4.6	7	4.6	-	-	4.3
Danéé Pontious	12	3.9	7	3.3	13	3.7	-	-	15	3.9	23	3.7	3	4.7	4	5.0	-	-	3.8
Rob Sato	13	3.8	4	4.8	6	3.7	-	-	6	3.7	4	4.8	-	-	3	4.7	-	-	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	1	3.0	5	3.4	9	4.0	-	-	8	3.6	56	3.5	3	3.3	-	-	-	-	3.5

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>	
Kate Demarest	6	3.7	14	4.5	15	4.4	7	5.0	44	4.2	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	36	4.4	20	4.5	26	4.4	20	4.6	54	4.6	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	31	4.1	21	3.5	18	3.4	15	3.0	52	3.8	3.6
David A. Nesbett	33	4.4	15	4.4	11	4.5	19	4.2	68	4.3	4.3
Danée Pontious	1	4.0	10	3.4	12	3.5	20	3.9	30	4.0	3.8
Rob Sato	2	5.0	1	1.0	5	4.6	6	4.0	21	4.0	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	23	3.9	17	3.5	15	3.3	10	3.6	14	3.2	3.5

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>
Kate Demarest	1	3.0	8	4.3	24	3.5	57	4.6	1	5.0	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	17	3.5	41	4.7	59	4.7	42	4.5	4	4.0	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	26	4.7	40	3.4	39	3.2	34	3.7	3	4.0	3.6
David A. Nesbett	19	4.2	38	4.4	44	4.3	44	4.3	5	4.6	4.3
Danée Pontious	6	3.0	18	3.9	24	4.0	29	3.9	-	-	3.8
Rob Sato	1	5.0	1	5.0	10	3.7	23	4.2	1	3.0	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	20	4.8	26	2.9	26	3.0	9	4.2	1	4.0	3.5

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>	
Kate Demarest	7	4.7	-	-	80	4.2	3	4.7	1	5.0	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	10	4.1	4	4.8	131	4.6	15	4.3	2	5.0	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	6	2.7	4	2.8	124	3.7	6	3.7	1	2.0	3.6
David A. Nesbett	7	4.6	3	3.3	132	4.3	5	4.2	3	4.3	4.3
Danée Pontious	8	4.1	1	5.0	65	3.8	2	4.0	1	2.0	3.8
Rob Sato	-	-	-	-	36	4.1	-	-	-	-	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	3	2.3	6	3.7	58	3.5	13	3.7	2	4.5	3.5

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>	
Kate Demarest	40	4.3	49	4.2	+	+	4.3
Kari Lyn McCrea	84	4.4	76	4.7	+	+	4.5
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	97	3.7	41	3.5	+	+	3.6
David A. Nesbett	95	4.4	53	4.1	+	+	4.3
Danée Pontious	42	3.8	33	4.0	+	+	3.8
Rob Sato	25	4.0	11	4.1	-	-	4.1
Sam Vandergaw	51	3.5	29	3.6	+	+	3.5

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

Table 11
Kate Demarest
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	142	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	91	64.1
Professional reputation	41	28.9
Other personal contacts	10	7.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	80	87.9
Substantial amount of experience	28	30.8
Moderate amount of experience	32	35.2
Limited amount of experience	31	34.1
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	12	8.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	28	19.7
Private, corporate employee	6	4.2
Judge or judicial officer	21	14.8
Government	55	38.7
Public service agency or organization	10	7.0
Retired	5	3.5
Other	12	8.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	3.5
5 years or fewer	11	7.7
6 to 10 years	20	14.1
11 to 15 years	24	16.9
16 to 20 years	17	12.0
More than 20 years	65	45.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	4.2
Criminal	15	10.6
Mixed criminal & civil	34	23.9
Civil	81	57.0
Other	6	4.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	15	10.6
Second District	1	0.7
Third District	121	85.2
Fourth District	4	2.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	61	43.0
Female	78	54.9
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 12
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	142	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	91	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	80	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	11	4.7	4.4	4.4	3.8	4.0	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	28	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	32	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	31	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	41	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9
Other personal contacts	10	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	4.6	4.4	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	2.3	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.8	4.0	4.1
Private, corporate employee	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
Government	38	4.5	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	6	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.8
Retired	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.8	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.7
6 to 10 years	14	4.6	4.5	4.6	3.9	4.4	4.5
11 to 15 years	15	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	7	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0
More than 20 years	44	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Criminal	8	4.4	4.0	4.1	3.6	4.3	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	24	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5
Civil	57	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.6
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	7	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	80	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	3	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	40	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3
Female	49	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.2
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 13
Kari Lyn McCrea
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	194	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	163	84.0
Professional reputation	19	9.8
Other personal contacts	12	6.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	144	88.3
Substantial amount of experience	59	36.2
Moderate amount of experience	71	43.6
Limited amount of experience	33	20.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	8.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	9.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	17	8.8
Private, corporate employee	1	0.5
Judge or judicial officer	40	20.6
Government	85	43.8
Public service agency or organization	10	5.2
Retired	5	2.6
Other	1	0.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	10	5.2
5 years or fewer	37	19.1
6 to 10 years	25	12.9
11 to 15 years	31	16.0
16 to 20 years	26	13.4
More than 20 years	65	33.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	17	8.8
Criminal	44	22.7
Mixed criminal & civil	70	36.1
Civil	57	29.4
Other	6	3.1
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.5
First District	16	8.2
Second District	4	2.1
Third District	156	80.4
Fourth District	15	7.7
Outside Alaska	2	1.0
Gender		
No response	1	0.5
Male	93	47.9
Female	98	50.5
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 14
Kari Lyn 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	194	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	163	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	144	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	19	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	59	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	71	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	33	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	19	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	12	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	12	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	32	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Government	76	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.4
Public service agency or organization	8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.5
Retired	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	36	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.4
6 to 10 years	20	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	26	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4
16 to 20 years	20	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
More than 20 years	54	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	17	3.4	3.8	3.5	4.1	3.8	3.5
Criminal	41	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	59	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7
Civil	42	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5
Other	4	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	10	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1
Second District	4	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Third District	131	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6
Fourth District	15	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	84	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4
Female	76	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

Table 15
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	168	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	142	84.5
Professional reputation	21	12.5
Other personal contacts	5	3.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	124	87.3
Substantial amount of experience	58	40.8
Moderate amount of experience	45	31.7
Limited amount of experience	39	27.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	24	14.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	7.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	11.3
Private, corporate employee	2	1.2
Judge or judicial officer	19	11.3
Government	81	48.2
Public service agency or organization	4	2.4
Retired	6	3.6
Other	24	14.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	4.2
5 years or fewer	33	19.6
6 to 10 years	26	15.5
11 to 15 years	23	13.7
16 to 20 years	16	9.5
More than 20 years	63	37.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	30	17.9
Criminal	40	23.8
Mixed criminal & civil	47	28.0
Civil	48	28.6
Other	3	1.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
First District	7	4.2
Second District	4	2.4
Third District	147	87.5
Fourth District	8	4.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.6
Gender		
No response	2	1.2
Male	110	65.5
Female	54	32.1
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 16
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	168	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	142	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6
Experience within last 5 years	124	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	58	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	45	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4
Limited amount of experience	39	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	21	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Other personal contacts	5	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.7	4.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	19	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.4
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.7	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.3
Government	74	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7
Public service agency or organization	4	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.3
Retired	5	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	31	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1
6 to 10 years	21	3.7	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.5
11 to 15 years	18	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4
16 to 20 years	15	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.0
More than 20 years	52	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	26	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7
Criminal	40	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	39	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2
Civil	34	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.7
Other	3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7
Second District	4	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.8
Third District	124	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7
Fourth District	6	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Gender*							
Male	97	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7
Female	41	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 17
David A. Nesbett
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	183	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	150	82.0
Professional reputation	24	13.1
Other personal contacts	9	4.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	131	87.3
Substantial amount of experience	50	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	62	41.3
Limited amount of experience	38	25.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	28	15.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	7.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	24	13.1
Private, corporate employee	4	2.2
Judge or judicial officer	28	15.3
Government	69	37.7
Public service agency or organization	8	4.4
Retired	9	4.9
Other	28	15.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	2.7
5 years or fewer	34	18.6
6 to 10 years	17	9.3
11 to 15 years	18	9.8
16 to 20 years	26	14.2
More than 20 years	83	45.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	21	11.5
Criminal	43	23.5
Mixed criminal & civil	50	27.3
Civil	60	32.8
Other	9	4.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	7	3.8
Second District	3	1.6
Third District	164	89.6
Fourth District	5	2.7
Outside Alaska	4	2.2
Gender		
No response	2	1.1
Male	113	61.7
Female	67	36.6
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 18
David A. Nesbett
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	183	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	150	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	131	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	19	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	50	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	62	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	38	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	24	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.5
Other personal contacts	9	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	22	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.2
Government	61	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	5	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6
Retired	7	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	33	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
6 to 10 years	15	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	11	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
16 to 20 years	19	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
More than 20 years	68	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	19	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Criminal	38	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	44	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Civil	44	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Other	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6
Location of Practice*							
First District	7	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
Second District	3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.3
Third District	132	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3
Fourth District	5	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2
Outside Alaska	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Gender*							
Male	95	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
Female	53	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.1
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 19
Danée Pontious
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	113	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	78	69.0
Professional reputation	28	24.8
Other personal contacts	7	6.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	78.2
Substantial amount of experience	24	30.8
Moderate amount of experience	31	39.7
Limited amount of experience	23	29.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	15.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	8.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	22	19.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	19	16.8
Government	35	31.0
Public service agency or organization	6	5.3
Retired	5	4.4
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	4.4
5 years or fewer	1	0.9
6 to 10 years	13	11.5
11 to 15 years	25	22.1
16 to 20 years	26	23.0
More than 20 years	43	38.1
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	7.1
Criminal	21	18.6
Mixed criminal & civil	33	29.2
Civil	49	43.4
Other	2	1.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	9	8.0
Second District	2	1.8
Third District	99	87.6
Fourth District	2	1.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	53	46.9
Female	58	51.3
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 20
Danée 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	113	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	78	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	61	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	17	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	24	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	31	4.2	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1
Limited amount of experience	23	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7
Professional reputation	28	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.7
Other personal contacts	7	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	12	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	3.3	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.9
Government	23	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7
Public service agency or organization	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.7
Retired	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	10	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.4
11 to 15 years	12	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5
16 to 20 years	20	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9
More than 20 years	31	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.0
Criminal	18	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	24	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.0
Civil	30	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.9
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	66	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Fourth District	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Gender*							
Male	42	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Female	34	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 21
Rob Sato
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	54	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	36	66.7
Professional reputation	11	20.4
Other personal contacts	7	13.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	83.3
Substantial amount of experience	11	30.6
Moderate amount of experience	11	30.6
Limited amount of experience	14	38.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	16	29.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	9.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	16.7
Private, corporate employee	1	1.9
Judge or judicial officer	9	16.7
Government	10	18.5
Public service agency or organization	1	1.9
Retired	3	5.6
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	3.7
5 years or fewer	4	7.4
6 to 10 years	4	7.4
11 to 15 years	7	13.0
16 to 20 years	7	13.0
More than 20 years	30	55.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	1.9
Criminal	3	5.6
Mixed criminal & civil	15	27.8
Civil	33	61.1
Other	2	3.7
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	1.9
Third District	53	98.1
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.9
Male	32	59.3
Female	21	38.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Rob Sato
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	54	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	36	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	14	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	11	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0
Other personal contacts	7	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	13	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	6	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.5	3.7
Government	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
11 to 15 years	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6
16 to 20 years	6	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	21	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Criminal	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	10	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.7
Civil	23	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Other	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	36	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	25	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Female	11	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 23
Sam Vandergaw
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	95	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	82	86.3
Professional reputation	11	11.6
Other personal contacts	2	2.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	81	98.8
Substantial amount of experience	39	47.6
Moderate amount of experience	27	32.9
Limited amount of experience	16	19.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	3.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	6.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	11.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	8.4
Government	63	66.3
Public service agency or organization	4	4.2
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	3.2
5 years or fewer	26	27.4
6 to 10 years	19	20.0
11 to 15 years	22	23.2
16 to 20 years	10	10.5
More than 20 years	15	15.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	24	25.3
Criminal	29	30.5
Mixed criminal & civil	27	28.4
Civil	14	14.7
Other	1	1.1
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.2
Second District	6	6.3
Third District	71	74.7
Fourth District	13	13.7
Outside Alaska	2	2.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	55	57.9
Female	37	38.9
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 24
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	95	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	82	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	81	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	39	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5
Moderate amount of experience	27	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.8
Limited amount of experience	16	3.6	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.4
Professional reputation	11	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.9
Other personal contacts	2	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6
Government	56	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5
Public service agency or organization	3	3.3	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.3
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	23	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.9
6 to 10 years	17	3.4	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.5
11 to 15 years	15	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.3
16 to 20 years	10	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.6
More than 20 years	14	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	20	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8
Criminal	26	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.9
Mixed criminal & civil	26	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.0
Civil	9	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.3	2.3
Second District	6	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7
Third District	58	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.5
Fourth District	13	3.6	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.7
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.5
Gender*							
Male	51	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Female	29	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.