



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Juneau Superior Court

Technical Report

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

January 22-26, 2024

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	6
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
Table 11: Roberta C. Erwin: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Roberta C. Erwin: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Margaret McWilliams: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Margaret McWilliams: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: William T. Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Christopher Orman: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Christopher Orman: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Bride Seifert: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Bride Seifert: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Larry Raymond Woolford: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	26
Table 22: Larry Raymond Woolford: Detailed Responses.....	27

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Juneau Superior Court created by the resignation of Judge Daniel Schally. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Roberta C. Erwin, Margaret McWilliams, William T. Montgomery, Christopher Orman, Bride Seifert, Larry Raymond Woolford, and Emily L. Wright. Emily L. Wright withdrew her application; therefore, her survey results are not included in this report.

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>
Roberta C. Erwin	70	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	51	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9
William T. Montgomery	81	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Christopher Orman	54	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Bride Seifert	110	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	29	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.2

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

2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Juneau Superior Court

Introduction

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

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Juneau Superior Court, Sitka Superior Court, and Bethel Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Juneau Superior Court, created by the resignation of Judge Daniel Schally. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Roberta C. Erwin, Margaret McWilliams, William T. Montgomery, Christopher Orman, Bride Seifert, Larry Raymond Woolford, and Emily L. Wright. Emily L. Wright withdrew her application; therefore, her survey results are not included in this report.

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 3,765 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,751) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 14 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 675 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; three surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; four surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 668 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned four paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned. 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, three paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 668 online surveys and three paper surveys, for a total of 671 surveys and a survey return rate of 17.8%. Of the 671 returned surveys, 265 (39.5%) did not rate any of the 14 applicants (seven

Juneau Superior Court applicants, four Sitka Superior Court applicants, and three Bethel Superior Court applicants); 406 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	671	100	406	100
Type of Practice				
No response	1	0.1	1	0.2
Private, solo	118	17.6	63	15.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	74	11.0	40	9.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	79	11.8	35	8.6
Private, corporate employee	14	2.1	3	0.7
Judge or judicial officer	62	9.2	55	13.5
Government	182	27.1	150	36.9
Public service agency or organization	29	4.3	21	5.2
Retired	100	14.9	32	7.9
Other	12	1.8	6	1.5
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	39	5.8	19	4.7
5 years or fewer	89	13.3	71	17.5
6 to 10 years	65	9.7	49	12.1
11 to 15 years	75	11.2	56	13.8
16 to 20 years	69	10.3	44	10.8
More than 20 years	334	49.8	167	41.1
Cases Handled				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.2
Prosecution	45	6.7	36	8.9
Criminal	71	10.6	55	13.5
Mixed criminal & civil	165	24.6	127	31.3
Civil	342	51.0	165	40.6
Other	44	6.6	22	5.4
Location of Practice				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.2
First District	109	16.2	76	18.7
Second District	11	1.6	8	2.0
Third District	446	66.5	271	66.7
Fourth District	71	10.6	41	10.1
Outside Alaska	30	4.5	9	2.2
Gender				
No response	8	1.2	4	1.0
Male	352	52.5	200	49.3
Female	309	46.1	200	49.3
Another identity	2	0.3	2	0.5

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a locked office. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

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

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

Data Management

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

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

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

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Roberta C. Erwin	95	14.2	73.7	21.1	5.3
Margaret McWilliams	60	8.9	85.0	11.7	3.3
William T. Montgomery	100	14.9	81.0	16.0	3.0
Christopher Orman	58	8.6	93.1	3.4	3.4
Bride Seifert	139	20.7	79.1	15.1	5.8
Larry Raymond Woolford	44	6.6	65.9	18.2	15.9

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>
Roberta C. Erwin	93	3.6	4.0	1.2	68	3.5	4.0	1.3
Margaret McWilliams	59	4.0	4.0	1.1	51	3.9	4.0	1.1
William T. Montgomery	100	4.4	5.0	0.9	81	4.5	5.0	0.8
Christopher Orman	58	4.1	4.5	1.1	54	4.1	4.5	1.0
Bride Seifert	137	4.2	5.0	1.1	109	4.2	5.0	1.1
Larry Raymond Woolford	42	4.2	4.5	1.0	29	4.2	4.0	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>	%
Roberta C. Erwin	68	6	8.8	11	16.2	15	22.1	14	20.6	22	32.4
Margaret McWilliams	51	2	3.9	5	9.8	6	11.8	19	37.3	19	37.3
William T. Montgomery	81	1	1.2	2	2.5	4	4.9	20	24.7	54	66.7
Christopher Orman	54	-	-	6	11.1	8	14.8	13	24.1	27	50.0
Bride Seifert	109	2	1.8	11	10.1	15	13.8	20	18.3	61	56.0
Larry Raymond Woolford	29	-	-	1	3.4	6	20.7	8	27.6	14	48.3

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>	
Roberta C. Erwin	26	4.2	12	2.6	3	4.0	1	3.0	14	3.4	6	2.8	1	2.0	5	3.6	-	-	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	11	3.4	5	3.2	-	-	-	-	10	4.0	18	4.4	2	3.5	4	4.3	1	5.0	3.9
William T. Montgomery	7	4.7	4	4.3	3	4.7	-	-	28	5.0	31	4.1	2	4.0	3	4.3	3	5.0	4.5
Christopher Orman	7	2.7	3	3.7	5	4.8	-	-	7	3.6	28	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.0	-	-	4.1
Bride Seifert	14	4.7	18	4.2	6	4.2	-	-	25	4.6	36	3.6	-	-	7	4.6	2	5.0	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	10	4.1	7	4.9	3	5.0	-	-	2	3.5	4	3.3	-	-	3	4.0	-	-	4.2

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>	
Roberta C. Erwin	2	1.0	2	3.5	9	3.3	4	3.0	45	3.8	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	3	4.7	8	4.6	11	4.1	7	3.4	22	3.7	3.9
William T. Montgomery	7	4.7	18	4.2	10	4.3	11	4.3	31	4.8	4.5
Christopher Orman	5	4.6	4	5.0	13	3.8	8	4.1	23	4.0	4.1
Bride Seifert	8	4.3	9	3.4	14	3.6	17	3.9	54	4.6	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	1	5.0	1	4.0	3	2.7	2	4.0	22	4.4	4.2

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>	
Roberta C. Erwin	-	-	4	3.3	20	3.5	38	3.7	6	3.0	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	-	-	3	4.7	20	4.0	27	3.9	1	2.0	3.9
William T. Montgomery	8	4.1	13	4.5	51	4.7	7	4.0	2	4.5	4.5
Christopher Orman	1	5.0	1	4.0	17	3.7	35	4.3	-	-	4.1
Bride Seifert	9	3.4	14	3.4	43	4.4	35	4.4	7	4.4	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	-	-	-	-	10	3.8	19	4.4	-	-	4.2

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>	
Roberta C. Erwin	3	3.0	-	-	62	3.5	2	3.5	1	4.0	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	31	3.8	1	5.0	16	3.9	2	4.5	1	5.0	3.9
William T. Montgomery	5	4.6	4	4.5	38	4.4	34	4.7	-	-	4.5
Christopher Orman	34	3.8	-	-	20	4.7	-	-	-	-	4.1
Bride Seifert	20	4.3	4	3.8	72	4.1	11	4.5	1	5.0	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	22	4.0	-	-	7	4.7	-	-	-	-	4.2

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>	
Roberta C. Erwin	29	4.1	39	3.1	-	-	3.5
Margaret McWilliams	19	4.0	32	3.9	-	-	3.9
William T. Montgomery	49	4.5	31	4.6	-	-	4.5
Christopher Orman	29	4.4	25	3.8	-	-	4.1
Bride Seifert	58	4.2	49	4.2	-	-	4.2
Larry Raymond Woolford	21	4.3	8	3.9	-	-	4.2

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

Table 11
Roberta C. Erwin
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	95	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	70	73.7
Professional reputation	20	21.1
Other personal contacts	5	5.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	51	72.9
Substantial amount of experience	14	20.0
Moderate amount of experience	31	44.3
Limited amount of experience	25	35.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	29	30.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	17.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	7.4
Private, corporate employee	2	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	18	18.9
Government	7	7.4
Public service agency or organization	2	2.1
Retired	12	12.6
Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	8	8.4
5 years or fewer	2	2.1
6 to 10 years	2	2.1
11 to 15 years	11	11.6
16 to 20 years	5	5.3
More than 20 years	67	70.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	5	5.3
Mixed criminal & civil	30	31.6
Civil	51	53.7
Other	9	9.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	8	8.4
Second District	-	-
Third District	82	86.3
Fourth District	3	3.2
Outside Alaska	2	2.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	45	47.4
Female	50	52.6
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Roberta C. Erwin
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	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	70	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	51	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	19	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	14	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	31	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6
Limited amount of experience	25	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	20	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0
Other personal contacts	5	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.8	3.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	26	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	2.8	2.9	3.3	3.0	3.1	2.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.8	5.0	4.7	4.3	3.8	4.0
Private, corporate employee	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.4
Government	6	2.8	3.6	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8
Public service agency or organization	1	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Retired	5	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.0	1.0
6 to 10 years	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
11 to 15 years	10	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3
16 to 20 years	4	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.0
More than 20 years	46	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	4	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	22	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.5
Civil	38	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7
Other	6	3.0	4.2	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	63	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Fourth District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	29	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1
Female	41	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Margaret McWilliams
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	60	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	51	85.0
Professional reputation	7	11.7
Other personal contacts	2	3.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	44	86.3
Substantial amount of experience	19	37.3
Moderate amount of experience	18	35.3
Limited amount of experience	14	27.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	11	18.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	8.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	16.7
Government	24	40.0
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0
Retired	6	10.0
Other	1	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	4	6.7
6 to 10 years	10	16.7
11 to 15 years	11	18.3
16 to 20 years	9	15.0
More than 20 years	26	43.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	1.7
Criminal	4	6.7
Mixed criminal & civil	22	36.7
Civil	32	53.3
Other	1	1.7
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	34	56.7
Second District	2	3.3
Third District	20	33.3
Fourth District	3	5.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	23	38.3
Female	37	61.7
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Margaret McWilliams
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	60	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	51	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	44	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	7	4.0	4.6	4.3	4.1	3.7	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.3	4.5	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	18	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8
Limited amount of experience	14	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.1
Professional reputation	7	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	11	3.6	4.2	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.0
Government	18	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.4
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.5	3.5
Retired	4	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.5	3.8	4.3
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	8	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
11 to 15 years	11	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1
16 to 20 years	7	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.4
More than 20 years	22	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	20	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.0
Civil	27	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Other	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	31	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.8
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Third District	16	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Fourth District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	19	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.0
Female	32	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
William T. Montgomery
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	100	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	81	81.0
Professional reputation	16	16.0
Other personal contacts	3	3.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	77	95.1
Substantial amount of experience	34	42.0
Moderate amount of experience	30	37.0
Limited amount of experience	17	21.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	7.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.0
Private, corporate employee	2	2.0
Judge or judicial officer	34	34.0
Government	39	39.0
Public service agency or organization	5	5.0
Retired	3	3.0
Other	3	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	4.0
5 years or fewer	8	8.0
6 to 10 years	21	21.0
11 to 15 years	13	13.0
16 to 20 years	13	13.0
More than 20 years	41	41.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	8.0
Criminal	16	16.0
Mixed criminal & civil	57	57.0
Civil	14	14.0
Other	5	5.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	8	8.0
Second District	4	4.0
Third District	53	53.0
Fourth District	34	34.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0
Gender		
No response	1	1.0
Male	56	56.0
Female	42	42.0
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 16
William T. Montgomery
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	100	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	81	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	77	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	34	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	30	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	17	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	16	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.3	4.9	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	28	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.0
Government	31	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	5.0	4.9	4.1	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	18	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.4	4.2
11 to 15 years	10	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	11	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	31	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	4.3	4.4	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.1
Criminal	13	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.1	4.6	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	51	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.7
Civil	7	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0
Other	2	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.8	4.6
Second District	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.5
Third District	38	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	34	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	49	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.5
Female	31	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Christopher Orman
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	58	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	54	93.1
Professional reputation	2	3.4
Other personal contacts	2	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	44	81.5
Substantial amount of experience	16	29.6
Moderate amount of experience	19	35.2
Limited amount of experience	19	35.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	12.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	6.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	8.6
Private, corporate employee	1	1.7
Judge or judicial officer	7	12.1
Government	30	51.7
Public service agency or organization	2	3.4
Retired	2	3.4
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.7
5 years or fewer	8	13.8
6 to 10 years	4	6.9
11 to 15 years	13	22.4
16 to 20 years	8	13.8
More than 20 years	24	41.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	1.7
Criminal	1	1.7
Mixed criminal & civil	17	29.3
Civil	39	67.2
Other	-	-
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	36	62.1
Second District	-	-
Third District	22	37.9
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	31	53.4
Female	26	44.8
Another identity	+	+

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

Table 18
Christopher Orman
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	58	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	54	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	44	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	10	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.3	3.4
Substantial amount of experience	16	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	19	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.8
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.4	2.9	2.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.7	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.0	4.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.6
Government	28	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Retired	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.8	4.6
6 to 10 years	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
11 to 15 years	13	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.8
16 to 20 years	8	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.1
More than 20 years	23	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Criminal	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	17	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.7
Civil	35	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	34	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	20	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	29	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Female	25	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 19
Bride Seifert
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	139	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	110	79.1
Professional reputation	21	15.1
Other personal contacts	8	5.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	99	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	39	35.5
Moderate amount of experience	41	37.3
Limited amount of experience	30	27.3
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	17	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	20	14.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	6.5
Private, corporate employee	1	0.7
Judge or judicial officer	35	25.2
Government	43	30.9
Public service agency or organization	1	0.7
Retired	10	7.2
Other	2	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	5.0
5 years or fewer	10	7.2
6 to 10 years	13	9.4
11 to 15 years	17	12.2
16 to 20 years	20	14.4
More than 20 years	72	51.8
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.7
Prosecution	9	6.5
Criminal	15	10.8
Mixed criminal & civil	55	39.6
Civil	51	36.7
Other	8	5.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.7
First District	33	23.7
Second District	4	2.9
Third District	88	63.3
Fourth District	12	8.6
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
Gender		
No response	2	1.4
Male	69	49.6
Female	68	48.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 20
Bride Seifert
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	139	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	110	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	99	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	11	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	39	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	41	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	30	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1
Professional reputation	21	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.6
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	14	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.6
Government	36	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.6
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
6 to 10 years	9	3.3	3.9	3.0	3.7	3.2	3.4
11 to 15 years	14	3.6	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.6
16 to 20 years	17	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9
More than 20 years	55	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	3.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.4
Criminal	14	3.2	3.7	3.1	4.1	3.4	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	44	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Civil	35	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4
Other	7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.4
Location of Practice*							
First District	20	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3
Second District	4	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8
Third District	73	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1
Fourth District	11	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	58	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Female	50	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 21
Larry Raymond Woolford
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	44	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	29	65.9
Professional reputation	8	18.2
Other personal contacts	7	15.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	24.1
Moderate amount of experience	13	44.8
Limited amount of experience	9	31.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	15	34.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	18.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	6.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	3	6.8
Government	9	20.5
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	6	13.6
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	2.3
5 years or fewer	2	4.5
6 to 10 years	1	2.3
11 to 15 years	3	6.8
16 to 20 years	4	9.1
More than 20 years	33	75.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	-	-
Mixed criminal & civil	12	27.3
Civil	29	65.9
Other	3	6.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	35	79.5
Second District	-	-
Third District	9	20.5
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	28	63.6
Female	16	36.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Larry Raymond Woolford
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	44	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	29	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	5.0	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.6	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	13	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3
Limited amount of experience	9	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	7	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5
Government	4	3.5	4.0	3.8	4.3	3.0	3.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	1	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	3	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.3	3.0	2.7
16 to 20 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
More than 20 years	22	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mixed criminal & civil	10	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.8
Civil	19	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	22	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	7	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.3	4.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	21	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.3
Female	8	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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